

will not be allowed to work, or it will not work sufficiently in the public interest. Here again is the balance between public and private uses. "Wise progressivism and wise conservatism go hand in hand, and the wise conservative must be a progressive, because otherwise he works only for reaction which inevitably produces an explosion." These were the words of Theodore Roosevelt, a very practical Republican. Better there be carefree adjustments to the legal and social structure in any free country than there be bloodshed in the streets. And has it not occurred to all of us that this country has become the most powerful country in the world and the fastest moving of any newly emerging country, which we have been, in the shorter space of time, with only one bloody revolution? No other newly emerging free power has been able to do this in its history.

The second point that is relevant to this discussion is the function of the opposition. Its job as the minority is to try to become the majority. The opposition must really want to govern. If it has the attitude that its role is merely to oppose for the sake of opposition, it must mean that it has no real desire to govern. A political minority will not become the majority unless it demonstrates to the people what it would do if it had the power of government in its hands. This means programs, as programs are always required to meet different conditions. Here again I return to the theme that Republicans must demonstrate that they care.

Republicans should break new ground. I understand the importance of Republicans putting themselves on the side of the consumer. There is another neglected area where Republicans can and should define the role of the individual in an age of bigness and organized conformity.

President Eisenhower on leaving the Presidency warned the country to beware of the central power of the industrial military complex. Here is the biggest area of Central Government power of all. This is, in fact, the major part of the Federal Government, measured by the tax dollar and the budget. The Republican Party, consistent with its historical concern about big government can make a national issue out of the whole question of reconversion. What happens when that happy day comes and the industrial military complex has to be unwound? What happens when garrison state attitudes, in which every special interest in our system has a stake, overwhelm our initiative or sap our freedoms, or make us so dependent on "hardware" that we lose sight of individual excellence and ignore the humanities and other spiritual, cultural, and social values. There is no planning at all for this complicated eventuality. There is no new thought about it, or program—no idea. This is an issue by itself in any community which feels short changed in the allocation of taxpayers' money for the production of hardware. It ought to be a matter of deep concern to all Americans.

In foreign policy it is especially important for Republicans to understand the function of opposition. We have an obligation as the minority to insist that the Government state its policy. This administration is demonstrably weak in this area. Its tendency will be to avoid debate rather than conduct intelligent discussions.

Presently there is no clear policy with respect to the Far East, Vietnam, China. There has been little if any understanding of the new currents that have swept Europe or of the surges of nationalism that have been gripping the countries of Europe and the Continent itself. Clear policy, we, as members of the opposition, have a right to expect and an obligation to demand.

The third and last point that is pertinent to this discussion, is understanding the significance of running candidates. Policy has little meaning in the abstraction. It needs flesh and blood. It is right and proper that the political systems of each community develop and organize themselves around local candidates. This is meaningful. Abstract policy will not sell in the absence of the personality of candidates to put it around. The shape of the party will be controlled by the extent to which local candidates for office are developed, educated, supported, and tested. The extent to which the community is willing to involve itself in this production, is the measure of the health and vigor of the political system.

Dr. Johnson once said, "Our minds are only clarified by the sight of the gallows." One only discovers the meaning of the loss of power when a candidate is lost in a local or other election. Power lost is power gained by others, and here the control of parties and the formulation of issues and policies takes place.

Those who wish to shape the Government will do so by their involvement in local campaigns and with the daily headache that people in office or standing for office have. And it is almost trite to say that government is only as good as you wish it to be and candidates are only as qualified as you want them to be, but it can stand repetition because it is true. Involvement is the answer and involvement is the obligation.

My conclusion, then, can be simply stated. First, the Republican Party must recapture the middle ground which it abandoned and which the Johnson administration skillfully occupied as the result. Second, it must understand the function of the opposition in the parliamentary and governmental process. The Republican Party must demonstrate that it wants and deserves to govern. Third, the party's preoccupation must be the caliber of candidates for elective office.

I am optimistic about the future of the Republican Party because I believe in the commonsense of the people in their commitment to the two-party system and in the commonsense of the Republican electorate who ultimately will judge and declare what they want. It is not an easy business to run a party because the free democratic system

and its processes are full of imperfections. But take comfort from the words of an honorary citizen of the United States, who, with love and sadness we remember today, Sir Winston Churchill, "Remember," said Sir Winston, "that democracy is the worst form of government ever devised by the mind of man, except for every other form of government."

A Great Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1965, a young constituent of mine, Pfc. James Rory Cook, U.S. Marine Corps, died tragically at the young age of 19 as result of an automobile accident near North Tarrytown, N.Y., and is now buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

On January 6, 1965, he had graduated from the U.S. Marine Corps boot camp at Parris Island, S.C., where he was a member of an honor platoon and had qualified as an expert marksman, and also had been promoted to the rank of private first class.

His parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Cook, and his sister, Rua Cook, all of 31 Bay-side Avenue, Port Washington, N.Y., were justifiably proud of this young marine, who had determined to dedicate his entire career to the service of his country with the Marine Corps. On the day of graduation from boot camp he said to his parents:

I have learned something of great importance in the Marine Corps * * * unless you are willing to try 100 percent, you might as well not try at all.

Rory tried 100 percent. He gave of himself completely as his short-lived record as a marine indicates only too well.

Rory resided in the Third Congressional District of New York for 12 years. He graduated with the class of 1963 of the Paul D. Schreiber High School in Port Washington, where he was a member of the varsity lacrosse team.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to extend my deepest heartfelt sympathy to Mr. and Mrs. Cook and family on this great loss they and the Marine Corps have suffered.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words from Romans 15: 13: *Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing.*

Let us pray.

Eternal God, as we come unto Thee with our many needs, may we dare to trust and be obedient to Thy counsel

and commands, following Thee faithfully and without fear.

We acknowledge that when man looks into his own heart, clearly and honestly, he will find there the cause and cure for the troubles of the world and see there those discords and disharmonies which are written large in the strife and struggle of humanity.

Grant that men and nations everywhere may yield themselves to Thy divine sovereignty whose authority we cannot doubt and whose appeals of love and grace we cannot silence.

the House that on February 11, 1965, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

THE 129TH ANNIVERSARY OF TEXAS DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. POOL. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 129th anniversary of the Texas declaration of independence, I should like to remind my colleagues of the sacrifices which our Texas forefathers made for the sake of personal liberty. We tend to forget in this modern age that in 1836 the guarantees of liberty which we so take for granted were not at all assured to the inhabitants of Texas. They were constantly exposed to raids by the Indians and the erratic despotism of their tyrannical dominators.

The early patriots of Texas had little choice but to engage in physical combat to protect their families and their rights as individuals. Many lost their lives in the belief that death was preferable to defeat and consequent surrender of basic personal liberty. Among these were William Barrett Travis, James Bowie, David Crockett, and James B. Bonham. The sacrifice of these pioneer heroes holds an honored place in the history of Texas. We must never forget the treasure of the inheritance they left behind—that of courage, faith, wisdom, and the initiative necessary to mold a government according to the concepts of freedom and liberty for all.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, today is the 100th anniversary of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of all other legislative business today and after the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes and I may have permission to revise and extend my remarks on this centennial occasion. Mr. Speaker, I further ask that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], the ranking minority member, may be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

HEARINGS ON REAPPORTIONMENT AMENDMENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I announce that hearings will be resumed on the constitutional amendments concerning apportionment of the districts for members of the State legislatures, wherein is contained the provision that one house of the State legislature may be redistricted on a basis other than population. The Committee on the Judiciary held hearings on these constitutional amendments in the last session of the Congress, from July 22 to August 13, which involved 8 days—8 days of intensive inquiry. These hearings will be resumed on April 7. It is hoped that the resolution will in some way be acted upon shortly thereafter.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 26]

Berry	Ichord	Powell
Brock	Kastenmeyer	Roosevelt
Dingell	McEwen	Teague, Tex.
Fisher	Martin, Mass.	Toll
Green, Oreg.	Mathias	Van Deerlin
Griffin	Morton	Widnall
Hanna	O'Brien	Wilson
Holland	Pickle	Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 408 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

TRIBUTES TO MRS. FRANCES P. BOLTON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I have learned our colleague from Ohio, the Honorable Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON, has just attained her 25th year of service as a Member of the House of Representatives. I wish to extend to her my good wishes and I am sure all Members would like to express to her a tribute for her many years of service to our country.

Mrs. BOLTON has attained her 25th year representing the 22d District of Ohio, and I say to her that, as long as she is willing to be a Representative of Ohio, I hope her constituency will see that she is returned to Congress. She represents them well. I am not only proud to serve

with her on this great legislative branch of our Government but proud to serve with her on the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. May you, FRANCES, accept my good wishes today and for the years to be.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I should like to join the distinguished Member from the State of New York, speaking as she has on behalf of our colleague, FRANCES BOLTON, of Ohio.

FRANCES BOLTON has had an enviable record not only in her committee work but also in the House as a whole. All of us, whether Democrats or Republicans, are richer because we know her and each of us is fortunate for his opportunity to associate with her. We all wish her well in the days and months and years ahead. Her service in the future will be an additional reward for her district, her State, and our Nation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I am happy to associate myself with the tribute which the gentlewoman from New York is paying to the gentlewoman from Ohio, and to say that the 25 years which Mrs. BOLTON has spent in the House have been characterized not only by the quantity of her service but also by the quality of service which she has rendered to the House and to the country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, my good friend and our good friend [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. I thank my friend from New York for yielding.

FRANCES, I knew your Chet Bolton when I first came here. He was chairman of the Republican congressional committee and he helped me to get here the first time. He was my friend as FRANCES has been my friend, now.

FRANCES has been here 25 years. She has earned her spurs in this body, which as I have always said, is one of the fastest tracks that anyone can get on. She has been dedicated, selfless, hard-working, always putting the welfare of her country above every other interest. For that, FRANCES, I commend you for your magnificent service here in this body to your State, your Nation, and, may I add, the world.

It has been my privilege, on occasion, to meet with the friends and supporters of our distinguished colleague out in Ohio.

I have always been impressed, at such times, with the love and esteem the people she has represented so faithfully through the years have shown for her.

Let me say that their confidence in her ability and perseverance has been completely justified by the manner in which she has discharged her responsibilities as a Member of this body.

One of the richer rewards of my service in the Congress has been knowing, and working with, FRANCES BOLTON. She

has been one of my dear and good friends as I trust I have been hers.

Mr. McCULLOCH. 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 Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues and friends in congratulating Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, a good, great, gracious lady, on her 25th anniversary of service in the U.S. House of Representatives as a Member from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON followed to Congress an able and effective husband, Chester C. Bolton, who died much too soon.

Mrs. BOLTON comes from a long line of industrial, civic, and political leaders, and she, in her great work, does full justice to them all. Mrs. BOLTON is the mother of former Congressman Oliver P. Bolton, with whom she served in this House as the only mother-son combination in Congress in our country's history.

Mrs. BOLTON, senior minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, has done much to make and implement the foreign policy of our country. May she have just as many more anniversaries as a Member of the House of Representatives as she desires.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I so well recall the statement I made a number of years ago concerning the rewards that come to an individual who is privileged to serve in the House of Representatives. Such a great reward has come to me because of the privilege that I have had in serving these past 25 years with the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio, Mrs. BOLTON. In number of years it may sound a long period, yet in truth, it has been but a seemingly short time. This privilege, I repeat, comes to but few of us when we are permitted to serve together in this great legislative body. I am happy, Mrs. BOLTON, that we have had this close association over the years. I have watched you work diligently, objectively, and conscientiously; you have displayed courage and determination in doing what you believed to be right. The people of your district, I am certain, are proud of your dedicated service. I might add that although I have been whip for these many years past, I have never had to whip you. I have never even wanted to. You have always been on the job and have always clearly defined your position. It has been wonderful to serve with you. I congratulate you on this your 25th anniversary of service in this House.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, February 27, marked the 25th year of service in the House of Representatives by our esteemed and distinguished colleague from Ohio, FRANCES PAYNE BOLTON. Through a special election on that day 25 years ago, the people of Ohio sent Mrs. BOLTON to Washington

to succeed her husband, who had passed away several months earlier, after a brilliant career in the Congress.

FRANCES BOLTON came to us with a splendid heritage of dedicated public service. In her unselfish devotion to the public interest she has immeasurably added to the laurels of her predecessors. Frances has earned the admiration and friendship of all who have been privileged to serve with her in the House. Nowhere is this more true than with her colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

FRANCES BOLTON is now the ranking minority member on the committee. She serves with me on all subcommittees and in the past has given brilliant direction as chairman of a major area subcommittee. Frances has legislative expertise to a remarkable degree and is outstanding for the constructive approach she uses on all foreign policy legislation that comes before the committee. She is a great source of strength when she supports, and when she finds it necessary to be critical, she does it in a way designed to help promote the national interest.

I shall not attempt to cite all of FRANCES BOLTON's accomplishments. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would not be big enough. In addition, most of us are familiar with them because we have witnessed her statesmanlike endeavors and have worked with her in securing the passage of essential legislation through the years.

I do just want to take this opportunity to say how glad I am to have FRANCES BOLTON working with me on the Foreign Affairs Committee and to add that I know I speak for all her colleagues in wishing that we may continue to have the benefit of her wise counsel and legislative skill for many, many more years to come.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, we note with pride and congratulations the quarter-century of service our distinguished colleague from Ohio, FRANCES P. BOLTON, completes this day. Her courage, dedication, and graciousness have made this service noteworthy in every way. On the Foreign Affairs Committee, where she serves as the ranking minority member, she has battled for policies and programs which would make our world leadership strong and objective. Particularly sensitive to the needs and aspirations of less developed nations, she had made countless friends in these areas, projecting an appealing image of American sympathy and understanding. We salute our colleague as an able Member of our body whose devoted efforts are of great significance to this Nation and, indeed, the world. May she long continue her distinguished service.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am often asked whether I approve public careers for members of the fairer sex. Immediately, I always first think of the gentlewoman from Ohio as a prime example of the highest in statesmanship, from whatever source. She is, indeed, an able national leader, even international, and an efficient advocate for her district and State as well. She is the friend of every Member of Congress; and I am glad

that includes me particularly. I am delighted to congratulate her on her 25 years here in the House and wish for her many years of able service in the future.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives with FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, has been and is a rich and valued experience.

In recognizing her 25 years of distinguished service, the Members of the House are taking appropriate note of a public leader who has made her mark in the history of our Nation.

Mrs. BOLTON is well known for her public service in Illinois and throughout the other 49 States. As a colleague and as Representative of Illinois' 12th District, I am proud to join in honoring and congratulating Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON on the 25th anniversary of her service in the Congress.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a truly great woman and public servant, Mrs. FRANCES PAYNE BOLTON, from the 22d District of Ohio, as she celebrates a dedicated and distinguished 25 years of service here in the House of Representatives.

The State of Ohio is indeed proud to place this wonderful lady in the annals of fame as she has so unselfishly contributed much time and effort here in this body on behalf of her constituency as well as the entire Nation by her outstanding position as ranking minority member on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mrs. BOLTON is not only a lady of dignity, but one of dedication, intellect, and talent. Her wise counsel is frequently solicited and genuinely heeded and it gives me great pleasure for this opportunity to congratulate her on a magnificent record of accomplishment. With warm pride and happiness, I extend my heartfelt thanks for her guidance and wisdom. I hope the Nation will have the benefit of her service for many years to come.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I asked to be recognized for a Democratic minute once before, and Sam Rayburn gave me 4 minutes all told. The conversation was all about diapers, and I promised him that I would make you all laugh, and you all did. However, this time the conversation will not be about diapers. This time I am speaking very deeply from my heart and saying that I appreciate all the courtesies that you have shown me. Particularly I appreciate the fact that you have ceased to think of me only

as a Congresswoman, which I was never elected to be. I believe you will not find such a word in the dictionary. I am just one of the boys. I appreciate that more than I can possibly say because we have it back and forth sometimes, and that is what makes for good statesmanship and makes for good sense and makes for the camaraderie we have in this marvelous organization which is the House of Representatives of the United States. I cannot begin to tell you how deeply overcome I am by this expression. I had not expected it at all and I had said nothing about it, but I do want to say to you that I am wearing a pin that was given to me the other night, a pin of gold with diamonds in it and the number "25" underneath. I had that given to me the other night in Cleveland at a Lincoln-Douglas debate anniversary, at which time Ed Brooke, the attorney general of Massachusetts, came down from Boston to speak, and the audience numbered about 2,000. They were mostly nonwhite. They gave me this pin, which I value as much as anything that I have ever possessed. The 22d District has in it the 18th ward, and they go Republican all the time.

So again I give my thanks to all and particularly to you, Mr. Speaker, for this great courtesy.

JOHN F. KENNEDY—YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to remind our colleagues that this afternoon at 1:30 p.m., 3:50 p.m., and 5 p.m. in the caucus room there will be a showing of the USIA film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums."

Members were notified by letter signed by 17 Members of Congress and are invited, as are their staff.

SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT ON SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the affirmative, positive action which we have been taking the past few weeks in South Vietnam is a clear indication of the attitude of the President and meets with the approval, I am sure, of a vast majority of the American people and a vast majority of the Members of this House.

For years, many members of the House Armed Services Committee, and I among them, have stated over and over again that the Communists understand only

one kind of language—the language of force and strength.

We are taking the war to the Communists, and they are beginning to feel the effects of our bombings.

I wanted to take this opportunity to express my wholehearted approval of the actions taken by the President of the United States which I am confident will have a salutary effect, not only upon the Soviet Union and the Vietcong, but also Red China.

There may come a time when negotiation will be in order. That time will arrive when we negotiate from a position of strength. I am sure I can speak for every member of the House Armed Services Committee when I say we will do everything within our power to give the President and the Department of Defense, members of our armed services, and the American people, the men and the materiel necessary to place us in a position in South Vietnam where if negotiations are initiated, we will negotiate not as a supplicant seeking help, but as a victor dispensing justice.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the President. He needs our support. He is doing the job we want him to do and we must stand behind him.

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the remarkable and distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton]. I am not only familiar with her unusual record of service in the House but I claim a distinction probably not shared by any other of the Members, to wit, that I am a cousin of the distinguished gentlewoman. She is a member of what she herself describes as the Bingham clan. May I say that she, as one who was born a Bingham, has made her many cousins throughout the country proud of their name.

SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT ON SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. WAGGONER. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] for having brought again to the attention of the House the position of the United States with regard to Vietnam. I want to assure the gentleman from South Carolina and the other Members of this House and anyone else who is interested that the words he has just spoken do speak for me

as one Member of this House. I add my hope again as I have before that they speak for every Member of this House in support of the President in this matter. He deserves our support and he needs it. There is as has been said nothing to be negotiated now. I ask the question, if we don't stand here then where do we stand? I believe most Americans mean it when they say they are tired of continually yielding to the Communists. I assure you I am.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO HON.

ROBERT H. MICHEL

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today is a special day for one of our colleagues. He is known as a singer of some ability, a softball player of congressional renown, an ardent basketball fan of the teams from his alma mater, but, more important, known as an able legislator and a distinguished representative of the people of his district.

Our colleague is a member of Cosmopolitan International, sponsors of six consecutive student science fairs in his home city. He has been the recipient of a Distinguished Alumnus Award from Bradley University.

And so, his fellow members of the Cosmopolitan Club of Peoria, Ill., join with me in extending best wishes for a happy birthday to our colleague, Bob Michel.

TELEPHONE SERVICE NO LONGER A LUXURY

Mr. HARSHA. 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. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge President Johnson and Congress to give serious consideration to permitting the Federal excise tax on telephone service to expire on June 30, 1965.

Other utilities such as electricity, gas, and water enjoy exemption from this tax; yet, excise tax on telephone service remains as a part of our revenue system, imposing an unjust burden on the telephone companies and their consumers. It is a discriminatory public utilities tax which was never intended to be permanent.

No longer can telephone service be considered a luxury. It is an essential household item needed by the people in the conduct of their everyday affairs. In this day and age, telephone service is a necessity. Many people rely on this service to do their shopping, to be informed as to their work, as a means of communication between their children and emergency agencies. For many, it

is the only means of contact with law-enforcement officials, with the fire department, doctors, and hospitals.

Originally enacted by Congress as a wartime emergency measure, this tax was intended to be one of short duration. It has long outlived that period and should be allowed to expire without any further extension proposed.

Many have urged that Congress eliminate excise taxes now, but may I remind my colleagues that we are now in the fourth quarter of fiscal 1965 and this anticipated revenue has already been committed for expenditure and in many cases already expended. To eliminate this revenue now would be to add to an already large deficit for fiscal 1965. The more responsible action would be to let the present tax expire as it will on June 30. Then the budget for fiscal 1966 can be adjusted accordingly and expenditures can be reduced accordingly before they are committed or even expended, and thus not add to the predicted deficit for 1966.

CRIMINAL LEGISLATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the difficulty with criminal legislation is that it applies to everyone. A general law acts with impartial force upon the law-abiding as well as upon the lawless. A limitation upon the liberties of the criminal must necessarily restrict the liberties of the innocent.

A law that is intended to discourage crime and to restrain criminals may also have the effect of condemning and restricting the innocent and the honest. Since the great and overwhelming majority of Americans are decent, honest, and lawful, such criminal legislation is totally unacceptable.

In my judgment the so-called omnibus crime bill recently approved by the Whitener subcommittee falls within this category and I shall oppose it in committee and in the House.

I applaud the President's goal of "establishment in the District of a model system which will best achieve fair and effective law enforcement." I support the President's intention to appoint a commission to concern itself specifically with crime and law enforcement in the District. But this situation does not stand still. The crime rate is increasing and the job is getting bigger. The President will have to act promptly and effectively to attain this goal he has announced. If the President delays in taking the leadership in this matter he will surely witness the commission of bad crimes and the enactment of bad laws.

If the President will act with energy and speed, I am confident that many Members of Congress will join with me in pledging ourselves to work with the commission, with the District authorities

and the Metropolitan Police, with the bench and bar, and with the civic minded citizens of the District of Columbia to give the District a model code.

HOURLY MEETING ON THURSDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the arrangements for the ceremonies commemorating the 100th anniversary of the second inaugural address of Abraham Lincoln, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet at 11:15 on Thursday morning.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE ON CITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Throughout man's history, the city¹ has been at the center of civilization. It is at the center of our own society.

Over 70 percent of our population—135 million Americans—live in urban areas. A half century from now 320 million of our 400 million Americans will live in such areas. And our largest cities will receive the greatest impact of growth.

Numbers alone do not make this an urban nation. Finance and culture, commerce, and government make their home in the city and draw their vitality from it. Within the borders of our urban centers can be found the most impressive achievements of man's skill and the highest expressions of man's spirit, as well as the worst examples of degradation and cruelty and misery to be found in modern America.

The city is not an assembly of shops and buildings. It is not a collection of goods and services. It is a community for the enrichment of the life of man. It is a place for the satisfaction of man's most urgent needs and his highest aspirations. It is an instrument for the advance of civilization. Our task is to put the highest concerns of our people at the center of urban growth and activity. It is to create and preserve the sense of community with others which gives us significance and security, a sense of belonging and of sharing in the common life.

Aristotle said: "Men come together in cities in order to live. They remain together in order to live the good life."

The modern city can be the most ruthless enemy of the good life, or it can be its servant. The choice is up to this generation of Americans. For this is truly the time of decision for the American city.

¹ In this message the word "city" is used to mean the entire urban area—the central city and its suburbs.

In our time, two giant and dangerous forces are converging on our cities: the forces of growth and of decay.

Between today and the year 2000, more than 80 percent of our population increase will occur in urban areas. During the next 15 years, 30 million people will be added to our cities—equivalent to the combined population of New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Baltimore. Each year, in the coming generation, we will add the equivalent of 15 cities of 200,000 each.

Already old cities are tending to combine into huge clusters. The strip of land from southern New Hampshire to northern Virginia contains 21 percent of America's population in 1.8 percent of its areas. Along the west coast, the Great Lakes, and the Gulf of Mexico, other urban giants are merging and growing.

Our new city dwellers will need homes and schools and public services. By 1975 we will need over 2 million new homes a year. We will need schools for 10 million additional children, welfare and health facilities for 5 million more people over the age of 60, transportation facilities for the daily movement of 200 million people and more than 80 million automobiles.

In the remainder of this century—in less than 40 years—urban population will double, city land will double, and we will have to build in our cities as much as all that we have built since the first colonist arrived on these shores. It is as if we had 40 years to rebuild the entire urban United States.

Yet these new overwhelming pressures are being visited upon cities already in distress. We have over 9 million homes, most of them in cities, which are run down or deteriorating; over 4 million do not have running water or even plumbing. Many of our central cities are in need of major surgery to overcome decay. New suburban sprawl reaches out into the countryside, as the process of urbanization consumes a million acres a year. The old, the poor, the discriminated against are increasingly concentrated in central city ghettos; while others move to the suburbs leaving the central city to battle against immense odds.

Physical decay, from obsolescent schools to polluted water and air, helps breed social decay. It casts a pall of ugliness and despair on the spirits of the people. And this is reflected in rising crime rates, school dropouts, delinquency and social disorganization.

Our cities are making a valiant effort to combat the mounting dangers to the good life. Between 1954 and 1963 per capita municipal tax revenues increased by 43 percent, and local government indebtedness increased by 119 percent. City officials with inadequate resources, limited authority, too few trained people, and often with too little public support, have, in many cases, waged a heroic battle to improve the life of the people they serve.

But we must do far more as a nation if we are to deal effectively with one of the most critical domestic problems of the United States.

Let us be clear about the core of this problem. The problem is people and the quality of the lives they lead. We want to build not just housing units, but neighborhoods; not just to construct schools, but to educate children; not just to raise income, but to create beauty and end the poisoning of our environment. We must extend the range of choices available to all our people so that all, and not just the fortunate, can have access to decent homes and schools, to recreation and to culture. We must work to overcome the forces which divide our people and erode the vitality which comes from the partnership of those with diverse incomes and interests and backgrounds.

The problems of the city are problems of housing and education. They involve increasing employment and ending poverty. They call for beauty and nature, recreation, and an end to racial discrimination. They are, in large measure, the problems of American society itself. They call for a generosity of vision, a breadth of approach, a magnitude of effort which we have not yet brought to bear on the American city.

Whatever the scale of its programs, the Federal Government will only be able to do a small part of what is required. The vast bulk of resources and energy, of talent and toil, will have to come from State and local governments, private interests, and individual citizens. But the Federal Government does have a responsibility. It must help to meet the most urgent national needs; in housing, in education, in health, and many other areas. It must also be sure that its efforts serve as a catalyst and as a lever to help and guide State and local governments toward meeting their problems.

We must also recognize that this message, and the program it proposes, does not fully meet the problems of the city. In part, this is because many other programs, such as those for education and health, are dealt with separately. But it is also because we do not have all the answers. In the last few years there has been an enormous growth of interest and knowledge and intellectual ferment. We need more thought and wisdom and knowledge as we painfully struggle to identify the ills, the dangers, and the cures for the American city. We need to reshape, at every level of government, our approach to problems which are often different than we thought and larger than we had imagined.

I want to begin that process today.

We begin with the awareness that the city, possessed of its own inexorable vitality, has ignored the classic jurisdictions of municipalities and counties and States. That organic unit we call the city spreads across the countryside, enveloping towns, building vast new suburbs, destroying trees and streams. Access to suburbs has changed the character of the central city. The jobs and income of suburbanites may depend upon the opportunities for work and learning offered by the central city. Polluted air and water do not respect the jurisdictions of mayors and city councils or even of Governors. Wealthy suburbs often form an enclave whereby the well-to-do and the talented can escape from the

problems of their neighbors, thus impoverishing the ability of the city to deal with its problems.

The interests and needs of many of the communities which make up the modern city often seem to be in conflict. But they all have an overriding interest in improving the quality of life of their people. And they have an overriding interest in enriching the quality of American civilization. These interests will only be served by looking at the metropolitan area as a whole, and planning and working for its development.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

To give greater force and effectiveness to our effort in the cities I ask the Congress to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Our urban problems are of a scope and magnitude that demand representation at the highest level of Government. The Housing and Home Finance Agency was created two decades ago. It has taken on many new programs. Others are proposed in this message. Much of our hopes for American progress will depend on the effectiveness with which these programs are carried forward. These problems are already in the front rank of national concern and interest. They deserve to be in the front rank of Government as well.

The new Department will consist of all the present programs of HHFA. In addition it will be primarily responsible for Federal participation in metropolitan area thinking and planning. This new Department will provide a focal point for thought and innovation and imagination about the problems of our cities. It will cooperate with other Federal agencies, including those responsible for programs providing essential education, health, employment, and social services. And it will work to strengthen the constructive relationships between Nation, State, and city—the creative federalism—which is essential to progress. This partnership will demand the leadership of mayors, Governors, and State legislatures.

INCENTIVES TO METROPOLITAN AREA COOPERATION

The Federal Government cannot, and should not, require the communities which make up a metropolitan area to cooperate against their will in the solution of their problems. But we can offer incentives to metropolitan area planning and cooperation. We can help those who want to make the effort but lack the trained personnel and other necessary resources. And the new Department should have regional representatives in our metropolitan areas to assist, where assistance is requested, in the development of metropolitan area plans.

We already have Federal programs in which assistance depends upon the completion of soundly conceived metropolitan area plans, such as the mass transportation program passed by the 88th Congress. This program strikes at the heart of one of our most critical and urgent needs—a transportation system which can relieve congestion and make it possible for people to travel with comparative ease to places of work, learning, and pleasure.

I am proposing other programs which will also require sound, long-range development programs as a condition of Federal assistance. Wherever it can be done without leaving vital needs unmet, existing programs will also be keyed to planning requirements.

Among the most vital needs of our metropolitan areas is the requirement for basic community facilities—for water and sewerage. Many existing systems are obsolete or need major rehabilitation. And population growth will require a vastly increased effort in years ahead.

These basic facilities, by their very nature, require cooperation among adjacent communities. I propose a program of matching grants to local governments for building new basic community facilities with an appropriation of \$100 million for fiscal 1966. These grants will be contingent upon comprehensive, area-wide planning for future growth; and will be made only for projects consistent with such planning.

One of the greatest handicaps to sound programs for future needs is the difficulty of obtaining desirable land for public buildings and other facilities. As growth is foreseen it should be possible to acquire land in advance of its actual use. Thus, when the need arises, the land will be there. I recommend a Federal program for financial assistance to help in this advance acquisition of land. Federal grants would be made available to cover the interest charges for 5 years on loans obtained by public bodies. Thus we will cover the costs during the period before the facilities are constructed.

Last year alone 1 million acres were urbanized. As our cities spread, far too often we create the ugliness and waste which we call urban sprawl. At times we find we have built new slum areas in our suburbs. Some of our programs are designed to stem this tide by helping city governments to plan their growth. But we must continue to depend upon the private developer and lender for most of our construction. And they sometimes lack the economic resources to insure high standards of development. I therefore recommend a program of federally insured private loans, backed by Federal mortgage purchases where necessary, to finance the acquisition and development of land for entire new communities and planned subdivisions.

This program should enable us to help build better suburbs. And it will also make it easier to finance the construction of brandnew communities on the rim of the city. Often such communities can help break the pattern of central city ghettos by providing low- and moderate-income housing in suburban areas.

This program will be complemented with a program of Federal financial assistance to State land development agencies. Under this program public bodies would acquire land, install basic facilities, and then resell the improved land to private builders for the construction of suburbs or new communities.

All of these programs would be dependent upon the existence of areawide planning for growth to which the aided developments must conform. They are designed to stimulate the farsighted

planning for future growth which is necessary if we are to prevent sprawl and new slums, and to create standards which will guarantee a decent environment for our future city dwellers whatever their race or income. In addition, these programs should enable us to build better suburbs, since it will be possible to acquire land and improve it before the imminent approach of the city has sent costs skyrocketing upward.

RESOURCES FOR PLANNING

To plan for the growth and development of an entire metropolitan area takes a wide range of skills and a large number of trained people. These vital human resources are in short supply. They are beyond the command of many of our cities. To help meet this need I propose to establish an Institute of Urban Development as part of the new Department.

This Institute will help support training of local officials in a wide range of administrative and program skills. It will administer grants to States and cities for studies and the other basic work which are the foundation of long-term programs. And it will support research aimed especially at reducing the costs of building and home construction through the development of new technology.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL COMMISSION

Good planning for our metropolitan areas will take not only determination, the spirit of cooperation, and added resources, it will also take knowledge, more knowledge than we have now. We need to study the structure of building codes across the country: their impact on housing costs, how building codes can be simplified and made more uniform, and how housing codes might be more effectively enforced to help eliminate slums.

Zoning regulations also affect both the cost and pattern of development. We must better learn how zoning can be made consistent with sound urban development.

Few factors have greater impact on cost, on land speculation, and on the ability of private enterprise to respond to the public interest than local and Federal tax policies. These, too, must be examined to determine how they can best serve the public interest.

Finally, we must begin to develop better and more realistic standards for suburban development. Even where local authorities wish to prevent sprawl and blight, to preserve natural beauty and insure decent, durable housing they find it difficult to know what standards should be expected of private builders. We must examine what kinds of standards are both economically feasible and will provide livable suburbs.

To examine all these problems I recommend the establishment of a Temporary National Commission on Codes, Zoning, Taxation, and Development Standards. I predict that the body masked by such an unwieldy name may emerge with ideas and instruments for a revolutionary improvement in the quality of the American city.

This entire range of programs is designed to help us begin to think and act

across historic boundaries to enrich the life of the people of our metropolitan areas. We do not believe such planning is a cure-all or a panacea. It can sometimes be a slender reed. It must be flexible and open to change. And we cannot wait for completed plans before trying to meet urgent needs in many areas. But it will teach us to think on a scale as large as the problem itself, and act to prepare for the future as well as to repair the past.

I hope that, as time goes by, more and more of our Federal programs can be brought into harmony with metropolitan area programs. For in this approach lies one of our brightest hopes for the effective use of local as well as Federal resources in improving the American city.

THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

We owe the quality of American housing to the initiative and vitality of our private housing industry. It has provided the homes which have made most of our citizens the best housed people in the world. Our Federal housing programs are designed to work in support of private effort, and to meet the critical needs which can only be met through Government action.

After World War II we worked to revitalize the housing market and provide homes for a growing number of our people. This effort has been successful far beyond our initial hopes. However, the problem now has a different shape. It is not enough simply to build more and more units of housing. We must build neighborhoods and communities. This means combining construction with social services and community facilities. It means to build so that people can live in attractive surroundings sharing a strong sense of community.

To meet new objectives we must work to redirect, modernize, and streamline our housing programs. I will ask the Congress to begin the process this year, while continuing those programs which are providing necessary assistance.

We hope to achieve a large increase of homes for low and moderate income families—those in greatest need of assistance—through an array of old and new instruments designed to work together toward a single goal: To insist on stricter enforcement of housing codes by communities receiving Federal aid, thus mounting an intensified attack on slums.

But such insistence is not realistic, and often not desirable, unless we can provide realistic alternatives to slum housing. We will do this by—

Providing rent supplements for families across a wide range of lower and moderate income brackets so they can afford decent housing;

Providing rent supplement assistance to those forced out of their homes by code enforcement and all forms of federally assisted Government action, from highways to urban renewal;

Using both urban renewal funds and public housing funds to rehabilitate existing housing and make it available to low and moderate income families. There is no reason to tear down and rebuild if existing housing can be improved and made desirable;

Emphasizing residential construction and rehabilitation on a neighborhood-wide scale in the urban renewal program.

These instruments, combined with existing public housing and direct loan programs, will greatly strengthen our existing effort. They should offer direct assistance to the housing of 1 million families over the next 4 years. Moreover they will immensely add to our flexibility in the process of building neighborhoods.

RENT SUPPLEMENTS

The most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city is the rent supplement.

Up to now Government programs for low and moderate income families have concentrated on either direct financing of construction; or on making below-the-market-rate loans to private builders. We now propose to add to these programs through direct payment of a portion of the rent of needy individuals and families.

The homes themselves will be built by private builders, with Federal Housing Administration insurance, and, where necessary, mortgage purchases by the Federal National Mortgage Association. The major Federal assistance will be the rent supplement payment for each eligible family.

This approach has immense potential advantages over low-interest loan programs:

First, its flexibility will allow us to help people across a much broader range of income than has hitherto been possible. And it will therefore make it possible significantly to increase the supply of housing available to those of moderate income.

Second, the payment can be keyed to the income of the family. Those with lower incomes will receive a greater supplement. Under present direct-loan programs the amount of the subsidy is the same for all who live in a federally assisted development regardless of individual need.

Third, the amount of assistance can be reduced as family income rises. It can be ended completely when income reaches an adequate level. Thus we will not end up, as is sometimes the case, helping those who no longer need help.

Fourth, it will be unnecessary to evict from their homes those whose income has risen above the point of need. This will eliminate what is often a great personal hardship.

Fifth, since the supplement is flexible it will permit us to encourage housing in which families of different incomes, and in different age groups, can live together. It will make it unnecessary for the Government to assist and even require the segregation by income level which detracts from the variety and quality of urban life.

In the long run this may prove the most effective instrument of our new housing policy. In order to give it a fair chance we are limiting it to carefully designed categories of need—

In a program of rental and cooperative housing for those low- and moderate-income families displaced by Government action or now living in substandard

housing. The subsidy will help them pay rent or meet payments on a federally insured mortgage.

In a program of homeownership for those displaced or living in substandard housing who display a capacity for increasing income and eventually owning their own home.

In a program to provide a broader range of housing for the elderly with inadequate incomes. The existing direct loan program for the elderly will continue at its existing level with the funds already provided by the Congress. I intend to insure a steadily increasing supply of federally assisted housing for older Americans.

On this basis our rent supplement program should finance more than 500,000 homes over the next 4 years, while improving our ability to make these homes serve the social needs of those who live in them. If it works as well as we expect, it should be possible to phase out most of our existing programs of low-interest loans.

REHABILITATION

We have concentrated almost all our past effort on building new units, when it is often possible to improve, rebuild, and rehabilitate existing homes with less cost and less human dislocation. Even some areas now classed as slums can be made decent places to live with intensive rehabilitation. In this way it may often be possible to meet our housing objectives without tearing people away from their familiar neighborhoods and friends. Sometimes the same objective can be achieved by helping local authorities to lease standard homes for low-rent families.

I recommend a change in the public housing formula so that we can more readily use public housing funds to acquire and rehabilitate existing dwellings—and to permit local authorities to lease standard housing for low-rent families. This will assist particularly in providing housing for large families.

I recommend the use of urban renewal funds to permit low-income homeowners to repair their homes and nonprofit sponsors to rehabilitate and operate homes for low-income families at rents they can afford.

I have recommended the appropriation of funds for low-interest rehabilitation loans under urban renewal, designed to help rescue our existing housing from blight and decay.

EXISTING PROGRAMS

I ask Congress to continue, on a modified basis, the existing housing programs which have proven their ability to meet important needs. But I also wish to state my intention to reduce or eliminate these programs whenever new and more flexible instruments have shown they can do a better job.

The public housing program should be continued with an authorization ample enough to permit an increase in the number of new units as well as to conduct a program of rehabilitation.

I ask the continuation, at the rate of 40,000 additional units for fiscal 1966, of the program of below-market-interest-rate mortgage purchases for housing for moderate-income families. At the same

time we must recognize that the benefits of this program are decreasing as the rising costs of Federal borrowing narrows the difference between the interest we ask and that demanded in the private market.

I urge continued support for our college housing program which is struggling to keep up with the needs of a rising volume of students.

I ask that our urban renewal program be increased to a level of \$750 million a year by 1968. This program has done much to help our cities. But we have also learned, through hard experience, that there is more to eliminating slums and building neighborhoods than knocking down old buildings and putting up new ones.

Through using funds for rebuilding existing housing and by providing more and better assistance to families forced out by urban renewal, we can make this program better serve the people it is meant to help. We will continue to use urban renewal to help revitalize the business and industrial districts which are the economic base of the central city. But this program should be more and more concentrated on the development of residential areas so that all our tools—from the poverty program to education and construction—can be used together to create meaningful and livable communities within the city.

To accomplish this purpose cities must develop long-range programs which take into account human as well as construction needs. Therefore I recommend that every city of 50,000 or larger develop a community renewal program as a condition of Federal help for urban renewal. These programs will provide an orderly schedule and pattern for development of areas of blight and decay—combining social and educational services with the planning of physical construction.

NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES

A community must offer added dimensions to the possibilities of daily life. It must meet the individual's most pressing needs and provide places for recreation and for meeting with neighbors. I therefore recommend a new program of matching grants to help local governments build multipurpose neighborhood centers for health and recreation and community activity. Related to our housing programs, these centers can help urban renewal and public housing meet the goal of creating a meaningful community.

At the same time these centers must not be isolated expressions of interest. They should be a part of an overall program for improving the life of people in disadvantaged areas. Therefore, I am recommending that in cities participating in the war against poverty these grants be made only when they are consistent with an approved community action program.

BEAUTIFYING THE CITY

In my message on natural beauty I pointed out that much of the effort of the new conservation would be directed toward the city. I recommend changes in the open space program, broadening its authority to help local governments acquire and clear areas to create small

parks and squares, malls and playgrounds. In addition, I recommend special grants to cities for landscaping, the planting of trees, the improvement of city parks and other measures to bring beauty and nature to the city dweller.

But beauty is not simply a matter of trees and parks. The attractiveness of our cities depends upon the design and architecture of buildings and blocks and entire urban neighborhoods. I intend to take further steps to insure that Federal construction does not contribute to drab and ugly architecture. But in this field, as in so many others, most of our hopes rest on the concern and work of local governments and private citizens.

CONCLUSION

This message can only deal with a fragment of the effort increasingly directed toward improving the quality of life in the American city. The creation of jobs, the war against poverty, support for education and health, programs for natural beauty and antipollution are all part of an effort to build the great cities which are at the foundation of our hopes for a Great Society.

Nor can we forget that most of our programs are designed to help all the people, in every part of the country. We do not intend to forget or neglect those who live on the farms, in villages, and in small towns. Coordinated with the Department of Agriculture, the programs I have outlined above can do much to meet rural America's need for housing and the development of better communities.

Many of these programs are intended to help the poor and those stripped of opportunity. But our goal is more ambitious than that. It is nothing less than to improve the quality of life for every American. In this quest the future of the American city will play the most vital role. There are a few whose affluence enables them to move through the city guarded and masked from the realities of the life around them. But they are few indeed. For the rest of us the quality and condition of our lives is inexorably fixed by the nature of the community in which we live. Slums and ugliness, crime and congestion, growth and decay inevitably touch the life of all. Those who would like to enjoy the lovely parks of some of our great cities soon realize that neither wealth nor position fully protects them against the failures of society. Even among strangers, we are neighbors.

We are still only groping toward solution. The next decade should be a time of experimentation. Our cities will not settle into a drab uniformity directed from a single center. Each will choose its own course of development—whether it is to unite communities or build entirely new metropolitan areas. We will seek new ways to structure our suburbs and our transportation; new techniques for introducing beauty and improving homes. This is an effort which must command the most talented and trained of our people, and call upon administrators and officials to act with generosity of vision and spaciousness of imagination.

I believe today's proposals are an important start along that road. They

should help us to look upon the city as it really is: a vast and myriad complex of homes and communities, people and their needs, hopes and frustrations. It can liberate the expectations of men, or it can crush them in body and spirit.

For underneath all the rest, at the very bottom of all we do, is the effort to protect, under the conditions of the modern world, values as old as this Nation and the civilization from which it comes. We work in our cities to satisfy our needs for shelter and work and the ability to command a satisfying way of life. We wish to create a city where men and women can feed the hunger of the spirit for beauty and have access to the best of man's work; where education and the richness of diversity expands our horizons and extends our expectations. But we also look for something more.

The American city should be a collection of communities where every member has a right to belong. It should be a place where every man feels safe on his streets and in the house of his friends. It should be a place where each individual's dignity and self-respect is strengthened by the respect and affection of his neighbors. It should be a place where each of us can find the satisfaction and warmth which comes only from being a member of the community of man. This is what man sought at the dawn of civilization. It is what we seek today.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 1965.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE CITIES

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the housing and urban development legislation recommended in the President's message on the cities.

Although we are launched on the greatest period of growth in our history, we are still without tools adequate to direct the growth in channels most beneficial for our society. Certainly, if we are to achieve the Great Society which President Johnson envisions, we must plan and execute our plans with greater efficiency and force.

The pressures of modern change, the great growth of our population are threatening to blight and even destroy the charm of our cities.

The expansion of our urban areas is too frequently unplanned; housing is sprawled along the highways; community facilities—including schools and health facilities—are inadequate and sometimes totally lacking; space, a precious asset, is consumed in disorderly fashion and at a frightening rate when one considers the future needs of a growing population.

This housing and urban development legislation provides a tool for orderly planning and better execution of the plans for community growth.

In the planned towns and subdivisions which can now be seen going up in parts of the country we have evidence of what can be accomplished by effective planning arrangements. This type of orderly development should be encouraged and facilitated. This legislation does so, and its passage will be a boon to the communities facing problems of expansion which they cannot solve without Federal help.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of the President's message on the cities, and that they may also have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject, if they so desire.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear the President's expression of continued concern for the welfare of the elderly in this country. Sometimes, when I see the administration's profound and continuing interest in the problems of poor people, I wonder whether the old people are not being lost in the process. The elderly generally labor under the double handicap of infirmity and lower income. As a result, their problems are heavier under the double burden.

But here, today, I see a clear indication that this administration is unequivocally behind efforts to lift these burdens from the backs of America's old people. The housing problem is one key expression of their need, since it makes visible their inadequate incomes, and their inadequate community support.

Now the administration has gone on record to offer a dramatic solution to these problems that amplifies the existing housing programs for the elderly.

I am particularly cheered to know that there is no intent to scrap any of the current elderly housing programs, but rather to enlarge upon them. Too many groups have expressed an interest in helping to develop elderly housing for us to abandon this fine approach to better living for our seniors.

I want to commend the administration in this endeavor, and pledge my support as it tries to work out the actual legislative and administrative details of its program.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of the proposed housing and urban development legislation as suggested in the President's message today. I urge its passage particularly because its provisions fit into the national effort that is being made to reduce the effects of poverty.

It is not necessary for me, Mr. Speaker, to labor the point to be made—that poverty and inadequate housing are found together. In fact, one of the most conspicuous ways in which poverty shows itself is in the inadequate housing in which the poor are forced to live. The impoverished live in dwellings lacking in basic amenities, in bad physical condition, and which are a serious threat to their health.

In 1960, housing census figures showed clearly the relationship between low income and bad housing. Of nearly 8.5 million housing units counted substandard in that census, almost 4 million, or 47 percent, were occupied by families with incomes of less than \$2,000; and another 1.3 million, or 16 percent, were occupied by families having incomes between \$2,000 and \$3,000.

We cannot say that poverty is synonymous with poor housing, but these figures certainly show that there is a high incidence of low income and bad housing among families with incomes at the poverty levels.

Better housing will not end poverty, but better housing is a mighty step in the right direction.

The message today, calling for aids to expand the supply of housing for the low-income groups, is a necessary weapon in the war on poverty.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the paradox of massive growth being accompanied by decay in urban America has finally taught us that these problems are complex and that our former remedies and approaches need to be coordinated more realistically and focused more intensely. The Federal Government first recognized this in 1947 with the establishment of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. In that postwar year, the problem was to stimulate production of housing. HHFA was made responsible for the general coordination of two distinct and functionally separate housing finance programs—the mortgage insurance program of the Federal Housing Administration and the program of Federal aid to local communities to provide public housing for low-income families.

Now 18 years later, we find HHFA still coordinating these programs—although they are greatly expanded—and administering a wide range of other programs including urban renewal and redevelopment, urban and metropolitan planning, open-space land, mass transit, and community facilities. This Agency's housing responsibilities have grown to embrace support for the mortgage market, housing for the elderly through private and public financing, and many types of special housing needs such as low- and moderate-income, college, and disaster housing.

The Federal participation in urban development and housing has been built up bit by bit—even piecemeal—until it is now a large and diverse involvement. It is my considered judgment that reapportionment is going to make State legislatures more sensitive to urban problems and that they will join cities in asking further Federal assistance. I predict that these legislatures will create many new special districts, authorities, and regional associations to deal with problems that do not respect city limits or county or even State lines.

The Congress needs to combine in a more orderly fashion the many Federal activities in housing and urban development to face these challenges. New programs should not be piecemeal, but should evolve in terms of overall community and regional development. Although planning and development are

done locally, they can be encouraged and accelerated by a coordinated and refined Federal participation. To attain this I join President Johnson in urging my colleagues to create without delay a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the dynamics unleashed by the accelerating growth and changes in the towns and cities of this Nation are awesome to think about when one realizes that an estimated additional 45 million individuals have crowded into these urbanized areas in the past 25 years.

President Johnson's message on the cities calls for a continuation and expansion of Federal planning assistance to help communities to prevent growth from becoming chaos.

It is difficult to grasp what an impact such numbers have on water, sewer, and transportation systems, on recreational facilities, educational institutions, utilities, and on and on it goes. Just imagine, for one thing, how much more trash and garbage 45 million people will put out the back door each week.

These demands appear never to stand still, but instead continue to rise at ever-accelerating rates, and these dynamics recognize no boundaries of political subdivisions—not city limit lines, not county lines, and not even State lines.

The Congress has recognized for some time the need for planning in transportation, land use, in recreation, and public facilities. Federal assistance for this has been available for some time now. But this planning in many cases is attacking the problems piecemeal on a one-at-a-time or one-after-another basis. The massiveness and rapidity of change in our urban areas do not permit us the luxury of such a leisurely pace in planning. Indeed, circumstances demand planning on a scale matching the magnitude and the urgency of these changes.

I join President Johnson in recommending that this Congress not only continue the Federal planning assistance being provided but also encourage, and indeed require, where related to other Federal aids, comprehensive, wide area planning. This will help correct unwholesome, uncomfortable, and unsightly conditions in and around our towns and cities and insure that new construction will contribute to the orderly growth and development of our urban areas.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin my remarks in support of the President's message on the cities by quoting in part from the President's vision of the Great Society as "the time when every slum is gone from every city in America, and America is beautiful."

I urge careful consideration and speedy enactment of the legislation that will be proposed because it will offer a springboard for achieving an America without slums, with decent housing for all, with open space for our spiritual and physical refreshment, with community facilities adequate for the needs of a growing population, and with aids to planning and execution of plans that will indeed make for a beautiful America.

To appreciate the urgency for this legislation we need only to examine the cat-

alog of our urban problems and to remind ourselves that, as President Johnson has pointed out, the cities are places in which "it is harder and harder to live the good life."

Our cities are now the homes of more than two-thirds of the American people, and the trend toward urbanization is continuing. We must act to reverse the cities' image as bad places to live. That is the intent of this message which seeks to help the cities build adequate housing, set aside open space and develop new suburbs, replace or rehabilitate slum areas, provide community facilities and neighborhood centers. In short, it seeks to help our urban communities to improve urban life, to make of the cities communities which promote, not hinder, the good life.

The concept of Federal aid is now well established in these programs, and I think it is the right one.

While the Federal Government can do much to stimulate and aid development of local programs, their effectiveness requires local initiative and the effort of local government at every level, as well as of individual citizens, business, and other groups. Only, thus, with cooperation at all levels, can we hope to meet successfully the challenge of remaking our cities "with," as Jefferson so eloquently phrased it, "an eye to the effect made upon the human spirit by being continually surrounded with a maximum of beauty."

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk briefly about the President's proposals for the new housing and urban development legislation for 1965 because they offer us an opportunity to right many wrongs that we Americans have committed over many years.

Look at our country today—its countryside a monument to ugliness, many forests all but denuded, its roadsides junkyards and lined with lurid signs, its cities decayed and deteriorated.

Is there no hope for "America the Beautiful"?

Yes there is. We have been shown the way through such programs as urban renewal and open space land acquisition. In urban renewal some 800 cities are now undertaking 1,800 projects. From the slums of yesteryear are now arising residential and nonresidential buildings and even whole new neighborhoods, cleaner, more efficient, and more livable than ever before.

Also, in the program to help cities acquire open space, 300 applications have been approved, for a total of 125,773 acres that have been purchased. These will be saved for recreation, scenic, historic, and conservation purposes for generations to come.

This is a good record—but it is not good enough. That is why I am urging passage of the kind of bill proposed in the President's message on the cities. It would authorize many measures for continuation and expansion of urban renewal, open space, mass transportation, community facilities, and urban planning for future growth.

It is the opportunity of a lifetime for us to retrieve, rebuild, and safeguard the

America we want—America the beautiful.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we are within striking distance of the objective of the Housing Act of 1949—"a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

Through the urban renewal and other housing programs we have eliminated thousands of acres of loathsome slums, rehoused more than 100,000 families into decent, safe, and sanitary housing, and rebuilt former blighted areas with new homes, offices, factories, hospitals, schools, universities, cultural facilities, and recreation areas.

The housing and urban development program for 1965 proposed by President Johnson will continue the momentum of the urban renewal program. But more than that, it will add a new dimension to urban renewal—a direct tie-in with the objectives of the antipoverty program.

As the urban renewal program has evolved, we have seen that, more and more, it has involved the needs of people of lower and middle incomes. They are the most difficult to relocate, and at the same time they are the ones who can benefit most by urban renewal and the new educational and employment programs stimulated by this administration.

The new bill calls for a much greater consideration of the human involvement in urban renewal. It includes increased aid to low-income families and elderly persons; housing for all income groups, particularly those least able to afford decent housing; rehabilitation of existing structures; and for other measures in transportation, urban planning, and public housing.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, there are, at present, 576,000 families, composed of more than 2,100,000 persons, living in federally subsidized dwellings in 2,200 communities in this country.

It is estimated that more than 5 million families with incomes of less than \$3,000 still occupy substandard homes in the United States. They include unskilled workers, the handicapped, the minorities, children, and others who live at the bottom of the economic barrel. For most of these people to secure standard housing, they would have to either pay rent grossly disproportionate to their small incomes, which would be prohibitive, or live overcrowded, which is undesirable.

It is my belief that the Government has a duty to assist people below a certain economic level to find decent homes in which to live, and the best solution so far advanced toward meeting this need is public housing.

Public housing projects have not only improved the condition of the people who live in them but they have raised the standard of the entire neighborhood, resulting in healthier communities and a greater America. Its extension and strengthening, called for in President Johnson's message, are basic to solving our problem of urban poverty.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message on the cities offers to every urban and suburban dweller in the United States the hope

that solutions to the many and constantly increasing problems which beset our cities may soon be brought under control.

Under a department of housing and urban development such as his message urges creation of, the blight which is befalling our cities could be halted; imaginative planning techniques could avoid future urban blight; urbanized Americans could be assured of adequate, beautiful communities with sufficient services to accommodate them all, and the trends toward increase in crime and school dropouts could be reversed.

President Johnson's vision of urbanized America can be fulfilled under such a bold, sweeping program as he has proposed, and I hope the 89th Congress will make possible its attainment by enacting the legislation he has requested.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, the first of the postwar baby boom is now arriving at the altar. This means a sudden surge in the rate of new family formation—from half of a million to about a million new families a year. Nearly all of these will find their future in urban areas.

This fact stresses the urgency of President Johnson's housing and urban message to the Congress. It particularly underscores the crucial need for meeting one segment of our housing need with new and effective means.

I refer to the lower middle income families, already a major part of the problem area of housing in our cities. They include the newcomers, the young people, along with people displaced by urban change, the elderly, the minority groups, and the less skilled wage earners whose opportunities we must improve.

The President recommends that for this left-out group we institute a program of rent subsidies, or supplements, that will enable this group to find decent housing on the private market. Today we provide good housing within the means of average and upper income people, and public housing for the lowest income group. Between these, however, are millions who are forced to remain in substandard and blighted housing.

We need the President's program to serve these people. We need it to solve the pressing needs of displaced and lower wage people in our cities. We need it to expand the market for private housing production consistent with our growth.

We no longer can temporize with or ignore this need. I join with President Johnson in advocating this new program of rent subsidies to bring these people into the market for good housing and into the mainstream of healthy community life.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar today may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record on the subject of the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, since the Private Calendar is being called today, the first time during the 89th Congress, I would like to take this opportunity to set forth some of the history behind, as well as describe the workings of, this calendar. I hope this might be of some value to the Members of this House, especially our newer colleagues.

Of the five House calendars, the Private Calendar is the one to which all private bills are referred. Private bills deal with specific individuals, corporations, institutions, and so forth, as distinguished from public bills, which deal with classes only.

Of the 108 laws approved by the First Congress, only 5 were private laws. But, their number quickly grew as the wars of the new Republic produced veterans and veterans' widows seeking pensions and as more citizens came to have private claims and demands against the Federal Government. The 49th Congress—1885-87—the first Congress for which complete workload and output data is available—passed 1,031 private laws, as compared with 434 public laws. At the turn of the century, the 56th Congress—1899-1901—passed 1,498 private laws and 443 public laws—a better than 3-to-1 ratio.

Private bills were referred to the Committee of the Whole House as far back as 1820, and a calendar of private bills was established in 1839. These bills were initially brought before the House by special orders, but the 62d Congress—1911-13—changed this procedure by its rule XXIV, clause 6, which provided for the consideration of the Private Calendar in lieu of special orders. This rule was amended in 1932 and then adopted in its present form on March 27, 1935.

A determined effort to reduce the private bill workload of the Congress was made in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Section 131 of that act banned the introduction or the consideration of four types of private bills: first, those authorizing the payment of money for pensions; second, for personal or property damages for which suit may be brought under the Federal tort claims procedure; third, those authorizing the construction of a bridge across a navigable stream; or, fourth, those authorizing the correction of a military or naval record.

This ban afforded some temporary relief but was soon offset by the rising postwar and cold war flood of private immigration bills. The 82d Congress—1951-53—passed 1,023 private laws, as compared with 594 public laws. The 88th Congress—1963-65—passed 360 private laws and 666 public laws.

Under rule XXIV, clause 6, the Private Calendar is called the first and third Tuesdays of each month. The consideration of Private Calendar bills on the first Tuesday is mandatory unless dispensed with by two-thirds vote. On the

third Tuesday, however, recognition for consideration of the Private Calendar is within the discretion of the Speaker and does not take precedence over other privileged business in the House.

On the first Tuesday of each month, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table for reference only, the Speaker directs the call of the Private Calendar. If a bill called is objected to by two or more Members, it is automatically recommitted to the committee reporting it. No reservation of objection is entertained. Bills unobjected to are considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

On the third Tuesday of each month the same procedure is followed with the exception that omnibus bills embodying bills previously rejected have preference and are in order regardless of objection. Such omnibus bills are read by paragraph, and no amendments are entertained except to strike out or reduce amounts or provide limitations. Matter so stricken out shall not again be included in an omnibus bill during the session. Debate is limited to motions allowable under the rule and does not admit motions to strike out the last word or reservation of objections. The rules prohibit the Speaker from recognizing Members for statements or for requests for unanimous consent for debate. Omnibus bills so passed are thereupon resolved into their component bills, which are engrossed separately and disposed of as if passed severally.

Private Calendar bills unfinished on one Tuesday go over to the next Tuesday on which such bills are in order and are considered before the call of bills subsequently on the calendar. Omnibus bills follow the same procedure and go over to the next Tuesday on which that class of business is again in order. When the previous question is ordered on a Private Calendar bill, the bill comes up for disposition on the next legislative day.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to describe to the newer Members the official objectors system the House has established to deal with our great volume of private bills.

The majority leader and minority leader each appoint three Members to serve as Private Calendar objectors during a Congress. The objectors have the responsibility of carefully studying all bills which are placed on the Private Calendar. When the Private Calendar is called, the objectors are on the floor ready to object to any private bill which they feel is objectionable for any reason. Seated near them to provide technical assistance are the majority and minority legislative clerks.

Should any Member have a doubt or question about a particular private bill, he can get assistance from the objectors, their clerks, or from the Member who introduced the bill.

The great volume of private bills and the desire to have an opportunity to study them carefully before they are called on the Private Calendar has caused the six objectors to agree upon certain ground rules. Those rules limit consideration of bills placed on the Private Calendar only shortly before the

calendar is called. The agreement is as follows:

Reaffirming the policy initially adopted on June 3, 1958, the members of the majority and minority Private Calendar objectors committees have today agreed that during the 89th Congress they will consider only those bills which have been on the Private Calendar for a period of 7 calendar days, excluding the day the bills are reported and the day the Private Calendar is called.

It is agreed that the majority and minority legislative clerks will not submit to the objectors any bills which do not meet this requirement.

This policy will be strictly observed except during the closing days of each session when House rules are suspended.

The agreement was entered into by the majority objectors—the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]—and the minority objectors—the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. McEWEN], and the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT].

I feel confident I speak for my colleague objectors when I request all Members to enable us to give the necessary advance consideration to the private bills, by not asking us to depart from the above agreement unless absolutely necessary.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 3, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] had 53 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] had 51 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the record shows, without my repeating it, that I support S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act. My only regret is that we are unable at this time to go further toward relieving the economic hardships and privations suffered by the people of this region. S. 3 is all right, as far as it goes, but it is only a start toward putting the Appalachian highlands region back on its feet, so that it can share in the progress of 20th-century America.

A century ago, this was one of the richest and loveliest regions of America, inhabited by a race of tough, aggressive Americans, who were able to subjugate the wilderness and make homes for themselves and their families through the development of the abundant natural resources of the region. Coal, timber, and other minerals were present in large quantities, ready for development. Under the methods then in practice, they formed the basis for a strong local economy, although it was somewhat isolated from the surrounding regions by the mountain barriers to transportation. Toward the end of the last century, rights to much of the natural riches of coal and timber were acquired by big corporations and wealthy speculators from outside the region.

During the first half of the present century, development proceeded rapidly, without much consideration of the long-term human needs of the people. With the changing technology of the mid-20th-century coal industry, the economy of the region has been thrown into turmoil, leaving unemployment and human misery that is sapping the strength of the people. Declining employment, lack of financial resources to pay for construction of roads, bridges, and other public facilities, and out-migration of many of our best people, have created conditions that are so severe as to warrant the use of the term crisis. This crisis can be met only by a substantial program to bring new money into the region to undertake the types of community improvement and development projects and programs which are an essential basis for a stable economy. In other words, we need to bring new money into the region to replace the natural resources, exploitation of which over past decades has contributed so much to the enrichment of the American Nation.

The funds provided by S. 3 are not handouts to a poor region that is in desperate need. Rather, the enactment of this legislation will permit a profitable investment to be made in an 11-State region of the United States, thus restoring vitality to the economy of the Appalachian highlands, and enabling the people again to stand on their own feet, control their own destiny, and make a contribution to the economic growth of the Nation.

It has been my privilege to work toward the passage of Appalachian development legislation for a long time. My people of the seventh district in Kentucky have long suffered the results of the exploitation of the coal and timber resources by absentee owners. Lacking capital of our own, we permitted the cream of our resources to be skimmed off for the benefit of other regions. Many of our people were forced to depend on a bare subsistence agriculture which depleted our soil resources and led to increased problems in the management of water resources. Improper soil disposal from mining operations permitted mountainsides to be laid bare by erosion, and stream valleys to be choked with debris. Acid mine wastes have polluted our water supplies. Our valleys are subjected to severe flood hazards

every winter and spring, while the dry periods during summer and fall finds inadequate water supplies in our streams to meet needs of our cities and industries. Twice in the last decade record-breaking floods have struck eastern Kentucky, making it necessary for portions of the area to be declared a disaster area.

It has long been my view that the place to start toward the economic salvation of my district was the development of its water resources.

Thus, on February 12, 1962, during the 87th Congress, I introduced the first bill, H.R. 10346, to provide for a conservation program for the Appalachian highlands area. This was aimed at providing a solution to the pressing problem of watershed development, since the Public Law 566 program was proving to be inadequate to cope with the problems of my district. In the 88th Congress, I expanded my bill to call for the development of all the land and water resources of the Appalachian highlands, the acceleration of all Federal public works programs in the area, and other programs for providing technical and financial assistance to land development, including an amendment to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit expanded Federal operations under terms that would encourage participation by the depressed areas of Appalachia. This was encompassed in H.R. 5525 of the 88th Congress, which I introduced on April 8, 1963.

Following the evolution of the broader program developed by the President's Appalachian Regional Commission subsequent to my initial introduction of an Appalachian Highlands conservation bill, the administration submitted a draft bill to carry out the program. This bill passed the Senate in September 1964. This year I introduced H.R. 132, patterned after last year's Senate bill and including the whole broad range of programs being considered to provide some relief for the economic problems of Appalachia. I am pleased that S. 3, as passed by the Senate, and reported by the House Public Works Committee, incorporates most of the provisions of my bill. While I am sure that the bill does not go far enough in all respects, it will permit a start to be made toward rejuvenating the economic development of the Appalachian highlands. As work progresses, there will be opportunity to amend the law, if necessary, to more clearly adapt the program to the needs of the area. At such time consideration should be given to authorization of an expansion of the program authorized by the Public Works Acceleration Act—Public Law 87-658—in the Appalachian region, as well as increases in the levels of other programs to the extent contemplated in my bill, H.R. 132.

The bill strikes at the heart of one of the chief causes of the poverty in Appalachia—its isolation from the mainstream of American economic and social progress because of the lack of major highways and the extremely poor and often impassable byways. The construction of roads and highways, both developmental and access, to assure every family

ready access from its home to a job, to a market, to school, and to those other centers of activity that have meaning in our modern society, must command the highest priority. My only reservation concerning the highway and road construction provisions of this legislation is that the bill does not authorize a large enough investment in the construction of these roads. I emphasize the word "investment" because of the construction of roads and highways throughout eastern Kentucky and all of Appalachia will erase its isolation and will permit natural economic forces to allow Appalachian families to enjoy the general prosperity of the Nation. In many communities in my district there are many families living on roads which are completely impassable to automobiles in many months of the year.

The Grayson Reservoir, now under construction, requires the relocation of several miles of KY 7 and this would be an ideal time to build a modern highway connecting the Mountain Parkway from a point between Campton and Salyersville through West Liberty and Sandy Hook to I-64, between Grayson and Carter Caves with an eventual extension onto U.S. 23 along the Ohio River. In addition U.S. 119 in Kentucky and West Virginia, U.S. 23 and U.S. 460 in Kentucky, KY 80, and other feeder roads should be brought up to modern standards.

I have received the following wire from Henry Ward, Commissioner of Highways, Commonwealth of Kentucky, today which reads as follows:

In connection with the debate in the House of Representatives on the proposed Appalachian area legislation, the Commonwealth of Kentucky has had some experience in the building of a developmental highway penetrating the Appalachian area which has demonstrated conclusively the validity of the Appalachian developmental highway system.

Through the issuance of revenue bonds, Kentucky built a toll road from Interstate 64 near Winchester in central Kentucky to Campton, a distance of 40 miles, and an extension of the toll road from Campton to Salyersville, a distance of 38 miles. Freeway extensions to this major highway would be constructed under the Appalachian program. In the first year of operation of the toll road from Interstate 64 to Campton, revenue totaled \$634,056. The traffic engineers' estimate for collection in that same period was \$558,996. The original estimate was based upon completion of the freeway extensions. The significance of the fact that this 40-mile toll road produced, in 1964, \$85,000 more than the traffic engineers estimated is underscored by the fact that the original engineers' estimate was based upon completion of the freeway sections.

This major highway undertaking constitutes the first developmental highway from central Kentucky into the heart of the Appalachian area. In addition to the actual revenue that exceeded expectations, this highway project has stimulated real hope and prospects for economic development of the Appalachian area. Other developmental routes which would be provided by the Appalachian bill would make the greatest contribution possible toward the economic salvation of this important area of our Nation.

In thousands of places families must ford creeks on foot or use footbridges to reach their homes. The lack of ready access to public facilities such as schools,

hospitals, physicians, public libraries, courthouses, markets, and similar outlets for the everyday needs of American families today is one of the major reasons for the low level of economic activity. There is little wonder that school dropout rates are high when school buses cannot negotiate the creeks and rutted roads over which they must pass in order to reach many communities. This difficulty of communication extends not only from the family home to the marketplace, to the school, and to the county seat, but also to the larger metropolitan areas of greater commercial and industrial activity.

Appalachia, released from its isolation by the construction of modern roads and highways and other community facilities, will be able to make a great contribution to the prosperity and wealth of the entire Nation because it is a region containing great natural wealth. Eastern Kentucky, that portion of Appalachia which it is my privilege to represent in Congress, in addition to its coal resources and commercially significant deposits of other minerals, abounds in water resources. Four major rivers, three of which are almost totally unharnessed and untamed, present a constant flood threat, yet could be a source of economic vitality. With the constant threat of flood, many of the available land areas suitable for commercial enterprise do not invite capital investment. The siltation and pollution of streams created by a combination of inordinate and uncontrolled rainfall combined with waste as a result of mining operations, has increased the need for a positive, constructive, and effective system of reservoirs and stream and land correction measures. In this respect, the program conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is of vital importance to the region and should be expanded and accelerated within the limits of engineering know-how and feasibility. Those reservoirs which have been already authorized by the Congress should be built at the earliest possible date and at the same time, additional reservoirs should be quickly authorized in order to provide maximum flood protection and additional controlled water supply as well as to strengthen the already widely recognized recreational potential of the area.

The Dewey Reservoir, on Johns Creek, a tributary of the Levisa Fork of the Big Sandy River, completed in 1949, has been found by the Corps of Engineers to serve many more visitors than is normal for Corps of Engineers projects. Total attendance was 764,700 in 1963, with a peak daily attendance of 18,650. At the same time the reservoir prevented flood damages estimated at \$1,519,000 during 1963. As the total cost of the reservoir was only about \$6½ million, it seems obvious that the cost of the reservoir will be returned many times over, during its life, by the flood damages prevented, while at the same time yielding very substantial recreational benefits.

I mention this existing reservoir only as an example of the type of development I envision as stemming from the water resources survey to be authorized

by the Appalachia bill. We have every reason to believe that similar results will be achieved through the development of other reservoirs in the Appalachian region. Surveys of some basins are progressing under previous authorizations, and need not await action under section 206 before being considered by Congress. In particular I am looking for early action on the report on the Big Sandy River and tributaries which is now under consideration in the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the Corps of Engineers. The report contains recommendations for authorization of three new reservoirs, Yatesville and Paintsville in Kentucky, and Panther Creek in West Virginia. Each of these will have substantial flood control, low flow augmentation for water quality control, and recreational benefits. Additional reservoirs are needed, but have been excluded from the report by the restrictive criteria followed by the Corps of Engineers.

The criteria for program development spelled out in the Appalachian legislation should permit the lower Knox Creek Reservoir to be added to those recommended as a part of the Big Sandy development, and I am urging that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors take steps to include this project when the report is sent out to the States for review.

I am also hopeful that the bill will spur a vast construction program of other types of public works and community facilities, water systems, sewage facilities, and public parks. It would be most helpful in this respect if it had been possible to incorporate the provisions of section 215 of my Appalachian development bill, H.R. 132. This would provide an authorization for an additional \$500 million for basic community facilities in Appalachia under the Public Works Acceleration Act.

The acceleration of the construction of vocational education buildings to implement the construction authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is of tremendous importance and would assure as soon as possible that every young person in the Appalachian area will be provided with an educational opportunity comparable to that afforded in areas of the Nation which have not been similarly depressed by the action of the forces of technological revolution.

Of great importance in the bill are provisions to permit the extremely small family farm to develop pastureland. This will not help very much in the more mountainous areas of Appalachia, but in the rolling or hill areas of Appalachia, there are many families that are barely subsisting on small acreages. Financial assistance to develop pasturage for livestock will aid them greatly, without adding to farm surpluses, by providing dairy products and meat, enabling many families to have a more balanced diet. At present many of these families are not consumers of such farm products. Hopefully, these provisions will prove a means whereby land that has been ravished by either the harvesting of timber or the extraction of minerals could be quickly converted from being a source of siltation and flood runoff, to an area

which would assist in the retardation of rapid runoff, thus helping to reduce floor stages.

Some of the provisions of S. 3 may not have the desired effect if limitations added to the bill in the Senate are allowed to stand. I have particular reference to the provisions of section 205 which allows \$36,500,000 for mining area restoration and for a 2-year study of strip mining in the entire United States, but which prevents any of the funds being used on nonpublic lands until authorized by law after completion of the study. This will probably have the effect of delaying any action, at least in eastern Kentucky, if not in many of the other problem areas of Appalachia, for at least 2 years.

The need for a 2-year study of strip mining problems is not apparent to me. A great deal of research has been done already, including several projects at Berea College, Kentucky, for which funds were obtained during the past few years. I have been told that far greater amounts of research on the restoration of strip mining areas has been done in other States. Thus, we know what the problems are, what causes them, and what needs to be done to ameliorate them. It certainly appears unnecessary to hold up taking action until the completion of a 2-year-long study, which is what is likely to happen if the Lausche amendment is allowed to stand.

In connection with the water resources survey that would be authorized by section 206 of S. 3, which is an important part of my original program for Appalachia, it would be shortsighted indeed if we were to permit restrictive criteria on cost sharing, cost allocation, reimbursement of costs, and computation of benefit-cost ratios, that are being developed by the Bureau of the Budget as a means of holding down Federal expenditures in the field of water resource development, to hold back the very projects that are needed to stimulate economic growth in Appalachia. The bill appears to recognize this issue, by including a program development criteria in section 224(a) (3), calling for consideration to be given to the relative financial resources available to the States or local interests seeking to undertake the project. This should permit deviations from restrictive policies where needed to foster development. Once we get this region back on its feet, economically, it will be time to institute requirements for non-Federal cost sharing, reimbursements, and the intricate details of benefit-cost analysis upon which so many projects in Appalachia have foundered in the past.

I see no need for descriptive reiteration of all the many provisions of the bill which have been covered in the committee reports and in the statements on the floor of the bill. I support the bill wholeheartedly, but I think it would be desirable if its scope could have been larger; I have particular reference to the need for additional funds under the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962. The bill as reported will provide an adequate start toward a program aimed at making the Appalachian region self-sufficient. This must be our goal, any

other would lead to perpetuation of conditions that I think, we all must agree, should not be permitted to exist amid the prosperity of America today.

For all intents and purposes the Lausche amendment will delay for at least 2 years while this study is being carried on any reclamation work in my area and I believe by and large throughout the Appalachian area. But my good friends on the Committee on Public Works tell me that we can come back and they are going to review this legislation. It is for this reason I am wholeheartedly supporting S. 3.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Of course, the committee thought there was a great need to hurry along the studies that are being made by the Department of the Interior regarding the restoration of the strip mining areas of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania. However, the studies have not reached the point where they have been concluded to the extent of making recommendations to the committee at this time.

As I explained it yesterday, in talking about that section of the bill, we do hope that the work done on public lands will be of such value that we can take the information we obtain from those studies and apply it to private lands at some subsequent date.

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us a bill which I believe to be one of the most poorly drafted bills ever presented. Despite the comment of the gentleman from Alabama earlier in the debate, I believe it to be one of the most poorly drafted bills, covering a program which will be subject to a greater amount of political favoritism or public works "pork barreling," than any bill which has been before the Congress in recent years. And I do not exclude the two programs which were so highly discredited—the accelerated public works program, involving expenditures of almost \$900 million, as well as the area redevelopment program, not even proposed for additional appropriations. Even the accelerated public works was not proposed for additional authorization.

I wish to cite what I believe to be the most flagrant example—the one that sticks out like a sore thumb—with respect to what I am talking about, the political "pork barreling." I refer to the access road provision in the bill before us.

I should like to take just a minute on this, and I should like for Members to look at the bill itself as well as the report. Let us see what the bill says.

Often, in debate, Members get on the floor of the House and say, "This is what we believe the bill does." When I debate a bill, I like to point to the words, to the language of the bill itself, which speaks for itself, and which should leave

no question and no doubt as to what it does.

Of course, there are many things which the proponents would like to see this bill do, but the bill will not do them. There are certain ways the proponents would like to see this program carried out, but the bill does not provide for it.

I saw an interesting quote only a few minutes ago, which came in on the ticker tape, by UPI, from Appalachia.

This is from Appalachia, from Louisville, Ky. This is from one of its outstanding residents, one of the leading authorities on Appalachia. He said that the region is facing the same problems which it faced 50 years ago and that the President's billion-dollar aid bill is not going to change matters. This is Mr. Harry Caudill of Whitesburg, Ky., the author of "Night Comes to the Cumberlands." He says that the real problem there is not being met, which is the problem of getting education for these people. He says that the \$840 million aid to Appalachia is ticketed for roads, which he feels is a mistake, although he says that it will be of some help. Now, here is an authority on the question of Appalachia and its problems. He says that this bill will not do the job, and it will not. This is just another layer, just as the accelerated public works was. They were in here a few years ago and they said, "You give us that \$900 million authorization for accelerated public works, and we are going to solve unemployment in America." They said after that, "You give us training under the Manpower Development and Training Act and give us a certain number of millions of dollars for that and we will train these people. Give us \$30 to \$40 million a year for job retraining and we will do the job and find jobs for them either in their home communities or elsewhere." Last year they said, "Give us \$1.4 billion next year." As I recall it, it was some \$360 million to be spent this year. They said, "What we will do is put into effect the nationwide antipoverty bill and we will solve the problem of poverty in America." What we have done here is stick layer upon layer and we have more coming. We have more coming. You are going to have area redevelopment on the floor of this House, I believe within a month, but they cleverly planned it to be on the floor of the House after and not before Appalachia. So that will be another layer in Appalachia as well. You are going to have additional regions brought up, similar to the Appalachian "pork barrel" approach, on the floor of the House. You are going to have this approach for the Ozarks. You are going to have it for the upper Great Lakes. You are going to have it for the northeastern United States. This is documented by the statements of distinguished Members of the other body saying that while they were supporting this bill, even though they do not represent the region it is to aid, they were supporting it because they were expecting a region to be set up in their area.

Now, this bill will cost, according to the record, an estimated \$4 billion before it is all over with in Appalachia alone. It is estimated that it will cost between \$10 and \$12 billion to do the same job

in the other regions, and the best authorities admit and indicate that it is not going to solve the unemployment problem. It will cost close to \$10 billion, and in support of that figure I cite the testimony of Mr. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., staff engineer and staff counsel, National RECA, on page 217 of the testimony.

This is what you are getting into. This is what is forthcoming. This is the first in a series of bills that are going to set up regions and set up supergovernments and are going to give the Federal Commissioner a cochairmanship in those supergovernments. This bill is going to give that cochairman, the Federal representative, an absolute veto power over every program and over every project provided for in this legislation. That is what is coming in the series of bills to follow.

Now let us examine what is in the bill specifically. I started out to mention access highways as an example of the pork barrel, boondoggling effect that is going to result from this legislation. This is admitted in the record. They would not admit that with respect to the accelerated public works or the area redevelopment. They kept denying it, although that is the application that it had. They admitted in the record of these hearings that these access roads can be and are expected to be built to private enterprise facilities, including swimming pools, golf courses, ski slides and including beach areas and privately owned motels and anything, in fact, that in the imagination of the Commission or the Federal Commissioner will result in the development of the area.

The other body did a good job on this so far as the proponents are concerned.

The other body made a very clever amendment to the legislation so that in its present wording—and this is admitted in the record, too—these access highways do not even have to be built to minimum standards; they may build the lowest class highways if they want to. These highways would not have to be maintained; this 1,000 miles of access highways would not have to have any State or local maintenance. This is the first time in the history of highway legislation that you have Federal-aid funds involved and do not even have to build the roads to standards and do not have to maintain them. And then they may be built to private enterprise facilities, including swimming pools, ski slides, golf courses, and so forth. It says so in the bill.

If you will look at page 13 of S. 3, lines 15 to 19, it says:

There are authorized to be constructed not in excess of 1,000 miles of local access roads, that will serve specific recreational, residential, commercial, industrial, or other like facilities or will facilitate a school consolidation program.

It is wide open—unquestioned; that is the intent, that is the purpose. And I say to you that if this provision is written into this bill—and we intend to try to strike it out, it is not in the substitute bill—if this provision alone is written into this legislation it is going to make the pork-barreling, favoritism aspects of

APW and ARA look like peanuts, because it is a wide-open invitation.

A lot has been said with regard to preferential treatment. It is our position, and rightly so, and no one can deny it—it has even been admitted by the man who probably will wind up as the Federal commissioner, Mr. Sweeney, as shown at page 42, that this is intended to be and is in fact a discriminatory approach, a favoritism approach. Mr. Jones asked the question, and Mr. Sweeney said:

Yes, sir. I think we ought to speak frankly. The name of the Appalachian game is preferential treatment.

Let me repeat that; this is the Federal witness, the proponent speaking in behalf of this legislation.

The name of the Appalachian game is preferential treatment.

That is precisely what we are saying, that there is no justification for discriminating against the rest of the Nation, for setting up one region to the exclusion of the other parts of the Nation that are equally poverty stricken. This map was exhibited yesterday, and it shows that there are other poverty stricken areas, some of which are even more poverty stricken than those in Appalachia. Every green and every gold area on the map is a so-called depressed area under either Area Redevelopment or under Accelerated Public Works Acts. And yet this bill deals solely on a single regional basis, sets up a supergovernment structure solely in that portion of the 11-State area known as Appalachia. What happens to the rest of the Nation? What happens to eastern Texas, for instance, which has considerable unemployment? What happens to the great State of Oklahoma, I would like to ask the majority leader, if he were here? What happens to the great State of Oklahoma that has numerous depressed areas? What happens to the State of Mississippi? What happens to the rest of the State of Alabama? Or the State of Louisiana, I would like to ask the majority whip, if he were here? What happens to those States that are excluded?

Our substitute recognizes that this is a totally discriminatory approach.

Our substitute makes available sound programs, properly conceived, properly drafted, solely for the purpose of seeking the development of the area, and eliminates the pork barrel aspects of the Appalachian bill, some of which I have described.

Mr. Chairman, what is more fair? What is the best approach? Are we going to set section against section and region against region in America? Are we going to tax all of America and make the benefits available to this one region, solely to this one region of the country, exclusive of the other areas of the country?

Mr. Chairman, when this Nation was founded it was founded under the credo of one nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all. Are we going to now change that credo to one nation indivisible but with liberty and justice and the antipoverty program for only this section of the country?

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, for whom I have the highest regard, made the statement that this effort is to stretch out the hand of help. This is the hand that is stretched out to Appalachia and this is the hand that is stretched out, palm up, to the rest of America.

Mr. Chairman, if we pass this bill we are going to give a helping hand but everybody is going to have to pay the bill, even though one comes from an area that is more depressed than this one. You are going to say that we are going to take from you with this hand, palm up, to help a few. That is the approach.

The gentleman from Texas also said that we will lift this area up by its bootstraps. What are they going to do to the rest of America? They are going to kick the rest of America with the toe end of the boot. That is what they are going to do. It is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, the argument has been made with respect to discrimination, in opposition to that point of view which I hold, that this is similar to TVA. This is the gimmick that has come into it. However, I have long viewed this as an effort to actually set up another TVA area.

Mr. Chairman, they say we have other regional projects of reclamation and other programs. But the answer to that is so obvious that I am amazed it is being offered as a good argument. The answer to it is that these programs, be they rivers, harbors or reclamation and what have you, are available to the whole Nation, not just areas in one portion of the Nation, and the State or local community must meet certain criteria and certain cost-benefit ratio repayment.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact there is presently a reclamation project in the State of Florida, the central and southern flood control projects, and projects at other places located throughout the Nation which can equally qualify if in fact they meet the basic standards.

Mr. Chairman, one cannot argue against the fact that this intentionally sets up a super-Government approach on a broad basis. It cuts across hospitals, it cuts across agriculture, and other things, and I cannot understand why some of the members of the committees whose jurisdiction over these matters are involved have not been heard with respect to this. Many programs of this type have been turned down time and time again by these committees. I would mention in this connection the committee that turned down the proposal contained in the mental retardation program with reference to 100 percent Federal participation in the operation of those hospital facilities. The committee having jurisdiction over that subject matter said no, we will not do this.

Mr. Chairman, the committee having jurisdiction over it said, "No, we will not do this because this would be closely approximating socialized medicine; this brings the Federal Government into 100 percent participation in the payment of doctors' bills, nursing fees and what have you in the operation of these facilities." Yet, lo and behold, the Public Works Committee of the House, having no ex-

pertise whatsoever on the subject matter, having no real knowledge as to the background of these programs, is asking the Congress to provide for 100 percent of the cost of the operation of these facilities over the first 2-year period, and 50 percent of the cost of the operation thereafter, with absolutely no strings of any kind attached, except Federal control.

Mr. Chairman, if one looks on page 16 one will see exactly what I am talking about with reference to demonstration health facilities.

Here we are—hospitals, regional health diagnostic treatment centers, and other facilities necessary to health.

Section (c) provides \$28 million for operation of these facilities. I just hope the House knows what a bucket of worms we are getting here, and what kind of program we are getting into, setting a precedent for future legislation. I will read:

Grants under this section for operation (including equipment other than initial equipment) of a project may be made up to 100 per centum of the costs thereof for the two-year period beginning on the first day such project is in operation as a health facility. For the next three years of operations such grants shall not exceed 50 per centum of such costs.

It does not require that the area receiving aid needs that kind of money. Why, these demonstration health facilities can be built in Huntsville, Ala., where, out of the billion-dollar outer space contracts awarded in the year 1963, some \$200 million was awarded in Huntsville, one of the most prosperous areas in the United States. Huntsville could have one of these demonstration facilities, with the Federal Government picking up 100 percent of the cost of operation over a 2-year period and 50 percent after 2 years, this in spite of the fact that a legislative committee having jurisdiction of this matter has at no time approved such legislation, and has, in fact, turned it down summarily. That is another example of what is wrong with the bill we have before us today.

Incidentally, our substitute eliminates the aspect relating to operational costs of health facilities.

How has this Appalachian region been set up? Why is it since the bill was before us last year, when we were told at that time "this is a perfect bill, this will do the job, we are not going to have any changes," the reins are tightened up this year, even though there were four major amendments in the Senate and numerous amendments in the Senate committee, why is it we were not allowed to cross a "t" or dot an "i" in our committee? We were not able to make a single change. We were not able to provide that these roads be built to certain standards or be maintained by the local communities. No changes whatsoever. The Senate added a number of counties to the bill after the Appalachian Commission reported. Was not the Appalachian Commission report the basis for drawing the lines for an area? Oh, no. Additional counties were added by the other body, but not a single county

was permitted to be added in the House deliberations.

This Appalachian region was set up on the basis of a \$3,000 a year criteria as representing poverty. You know, it is interesting to me after they have spent in the last 5 years about \$12 billion—and I put some of the programs in the RECORD yesterday, you can see them there listed—some \$12 billion have been put into unemployment projects and other things of that kind. Of course, when the candidates were running for office those candidates said they knew all the answers to the problem, they were going to spend \$12 billion of Federal money. They come before you and say we have now in America some 20 percent of American citizens earning less than \$3,000, and are in poverty. We have now 37 million in poverty when we were told 5 years ago by President Kennedy that we had 17 million people who went to bed hungry at night, then after having spent \$12 billion here we are with \$1.1 billion being asked for one section under a program which will cost eventually \$4 billion, and if other regions are added we will have \$10 billion spent. This is not the answer to the problem.

Referring to the \$3,000 income standard, let us examine that for a minute. There are 76 counties in this proposed Appalachian area that have no poverty. They are not depressed areas, they are not under ARA, they were not under APW. If you will examine the minority views you will see examples in State after State where the poverty is not so great in Appalachia as it is in some of the other States throughout this Nation of ours. You will find the Governors of some of these Appalachian States testifying to the effect their State does not have a real serious poverty problem.

Take, for instance, the Governor of the State of Virginia. On page 38 of the minority views, his testimony before the committee is quoted:

There is little that this bill envisions that is not already being undertaken by existing agencies of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

He said that of the 21 counties included, he does not know why they were included in Appalachia, except that somewhere 2 or 3 years ago some individual simply drew a line on the map at the foot of the mountains. This, from the Governor of the great State of Virginia. The Governor of Tennessee emphasized in his testimony last year that not only were not all of the places in Appalachia in a depressed condition, but on the contrary some of the State's most prosperous industrialized complexes were included, such as the Kingsport-Johnson City-Bristol area, the Morristown-Greenville area, and the Knoxville-Alcoa-Oak Ridge areas, to mention several. This is the Governor of Tennessee testifying on this situation.

Interestingly enough, no Governor, no representative of the States outside of Appalachia were even invited to testify, and no highway department outside of Appalachia, and this despite the fact that for the first time in the history of highway legislation where a major system is involved we are legislating on a regional basis to the exclusion of the rest

of America. You are being called on to build highways in this region but in no other. I say this is a dangerous precedent.

What about the \$3,000 as being the test for poverty in Appalachia? In the summation of benefits under social security I ask this question, that if \$3,000 is the test for poverty, then is not the U.S. Government itself guilty of impoverishing millions of Americans in this country today, those who receive social security, for instance? What is their average income? Their average income, according to the official documentation, of a worker, aged wife, with one or more children, was \$1,891, so every one of them would be termed impoverished. A worker with a young wife and one or more children should be considered impoverished since he gets \$1,785 a year.

What does a lieutenant in the armed services get? A lieutenant in the armed services gets less than \$3,000 a year, yet that is the test we use. A second lieutenant's pay is \$241.20 a month, or \$105.60 below the \$3,000 poverty level described in this legislation. That shows the total incredibility of the tests used to try to document that this is such a heavily impoverished area.

Further, with regard to the question of the highway program, which is three-quarters of this bill, 76 percent of this bill is building highways, and I want you to listen to this, this is what they are doing by their own admission, from the testimony before our committee. This is their program to help unemployment in Appalachia. Eighty percent of the highways to be built are not new highways in new locations, they are improvements on existing highways, highways built already, not, as it states in the bill, to open up areas for development. Eighty percent are going to be improvements on existing highways. So where you have a two-way highway you are going to make a four-way highway out of it. Does that sound like the best investment of the taxpayers' money to help poverty in this area? I say no.

Let me give you a summary of the statement of the Bureau of Public Roads on this question.

They said:

It is assumed the construction of the mileage under the development system on access roads will be along existing routes of travel and will be an addition to the current ABC Federal-aid program so far as money is concerned.

You will note it says "existing routes of travel." Let us see what that means relating to a specific State.

The other evening I took the State of Pennsylvania. We do not have any maps before our committees as to where they are going to build these highways so I took the State of Pennsylvania as an example, and I put on that map the present interstate system that is being proposed and under construction. Incidentally, do you know how much the Appalachian States got under the interstate allocation for 1966? The Appalachian States got \$802,700,000 for 1 year alone to build interstate highways in the 11 States containing the Appalachia area. Does anyone believe that

this \$840 million more offered by S. 3 is going to do the job for unemployment? Of course not. The \$800 million and all the money that they have gotten and are going to get under the Federal-aid highway program by 1972 is not going to do the job, particularly the way they are going to do it. So our substitute changes that.

Here is what they are doing, as shown on the map of Pennsylvania. This is the Interstate System—the straight lines. The jagged lines on this map which I am holding up for you to see indicate the developmental highways that they are going to build. Look at how Pennsylvania is already crisscrossed with the Interstate System. Over \$800 million a year is being spent in Appalachian States for that alone. The jagged lines indicate where they are going to build development highways.

If you will notice, in every instance you have existing primary highways on these same locations. Now I ask you: How much of this industrial development is this going to accomplish for the great State of Pennsylvania? Our substitute requires these highways to be built on locations that will improve industrial development and not duplicate present existing highways. This is what is wrong with this legislation. As a matter of fact, it appears to me that what they did was that Appalachia said they wanted whatever program each Federal Department can dream up that might make a contribution to the Appalachia problem. That is exactly what they did. And, oh boy, you talk about a dilly. You ought to look at that agricultural program. I wish, and I would hope, that some of those who are authorities on agriculture will take a look at that one. It really is a dilly. Here again we are dealing with a subject that our committee knows little or nothing about. Last year as a matter of fact, they admitted that the section was so bad that the result of it would be that you would increase the acreage available for grazing purposes very substantially and, therefore, they agreed to strike the section out. Lo and behold, it comes in this year and it is going to have about the same effect and they insist upon keeping it in. They are going to give Federal funds to anyone who has a farm, to subsidize him to improve 50 acres of that farm. One of the improving practices that they can use is the planting of grass and other crops which can be used for grazing purposes, and we are right back where we started before. That money can be made available not just to those people who earn less than \$3,000. It can be made available to millionaires—to suitcase farmers who go out into an area and have an investment in a farm. They do not live on it—it is an investment. It is an investment where they hide their tax money that they do not pay to Uncle Sam. They put it on a farm and anybody can get \$2,500 out of this program just as any farmer who actually works and lives on the farm.

I wish the time permitted me to examine in similar depth many other sections in this bill. At a later time I will

have an opportunity to discuss in greater detail the substitute and how we have made corrections relating to criticism which I have leveled at the proposal relating to the bill, S. 3.

But I would hope that you would take a look at the minority views. They are synopsized on page 33. They are documented there, after a full discussion, and the substitute starts on page 59 and it overcomes most of the shortcomings which I have just discussed.

Before too long we shall have an opportunity to discuss the substitute itself.

I trust that this legislation will be defeated. As I say, it is about the worst piece of legislation I can remember coming before this House in some time.

Anyone who knows the area and its problems, including the gentleman from Louisville, Ky., Mr. Caudill, knows full well this is not the answer to the problems of unemployment, even in Appalachia.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have been asked by a number of Members who represent the States in the great Northwest which have been hit by the enormous floods during the Christmas week, "does the fact that we are going into a new program to help raise the economic benefits of a region mean we are going to forget about these people who suffered so severely in the flood damage of Christmas week?"

Mr. Chairman, I am today announcing that hearings are to be held next week starting on Tuesday, March 9, 1965, by the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works under the chairmanship of the Honorable ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama, on the severe floods which occurred in the Northwestern United States during Christmas week of 1964. As many of the Members know, I appointed a special subcommittee headed by Congressman JONES to inspect this area during the week of January 10, 1965. This action was in accordance with the desires of the President and the Speaker as well as my own wishes as chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

These floods were some of the most disastrous that have ever occurred in the United States, particularly with respect to the magnitude and destructive nature of the flood flows. The subcommittee found that millions of dollars of damage had been caused and entire communities disrupted for long periods of time. In fact, there is one area in the basin of the Eel River in northern California which will have an unemployment problem for as many as 4,000 people for periods of up to 6 months.

In the State of California preliminary estimates of damages which are believed incomplete approximate \$300 million. An additional \$256 million damages are estimated to have occurred in Oregon, and another \$87 million in the States of Washington and Idaho. Damages to farm and forest areas, included in these totals, approximate \$100 million, and

highway damages in Oregon and California alone exceeded \$135 million. In the Eel River Basin damages were especially catastrophic. Herds of valuable dairy stock were lost, towns, roads, and bridges were destroyed, and an estimated 100 miles of Northwestern Pacific Railroad tracks were washed out or severely damaged. In the Sacramento River, San Joaquin and Lahontan Basins approximately 425,000 acres of land were flooded and total damages are estimated in these areas to be about \$31 million. Completed works, and projects under construction, of the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation and the State, in the Sacramento Basin are estimated to have prevented about \$246 million of damages that would have otherwise occurred.

In Oregon, floods exceeded the intensity of those which had not been exceeded previously since 1861. Estimated actual damages are believed to have approximated \$184 million in the basins of the Willamette, Columbia, Rogue, Umpqua, Coquille, and other smaller basins. Existing projects, including approximately two-thirds of the projects authorized for the Willamette basin which had been completed, are estimated to have prevented about \$570 million of damages on the Willamette, and \$50 million worth of damages on the Columbia. Authorized projects not yet completed or undertaken could have prevented an additional \$34 million worth of damages.

It is interesting to note that damages prevented in the Willamette basin in this one flood greatly exceed the total investment to date in flood control and multiple purpose projects in that basin. Most of the damage occurred where there is only partial or no flood protection. Studies now underway by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are considering a number of multiple-purpose projects which will have further effect on flood control in the damaged areas.

However, we cannot wait until these studies are complete. Immediate consideration is necessary. This disaster has been so overwhelming and the immediate need for assistance so great that I feel it is essential to give this matter the highest priority and for that reason the hearings are being scheduled at this time.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, a massive broadside attack on poverty and distress in Appalachia is long overdue.

In transmitting his bill on Appalachia to the Congress on April 28, 1964, President Johnson called for "an active beginning to end an old problem in Appalachia."

About 3 months later, on July 20, 1964, a "clean" bill, H.R. 11946, to be known as the Appalachian Development Act of 1964, was introduced into the House of Representatives by Congressman Davis of Tennessee, to provide an effective, far-reaching approach toward overcoming the economic stagnation in Appalachia. Congress adjourned, however, without taking action on the bill.

As a Representative in the Congress of the United States from a distressed district included in the Appalachian region, I would like to speak briefly in strong support of this legislation.

Appalachia is a region apart, an area which, in the words of President Johnson, "The general economic progress of the Nation has passed by." This mountainous region includes all of West Virginia, and parts of Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, my own State of Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia.

During this post-World War II era of general prosperity in the United States as a whole, Appalachia, with its 15.3 million people, has suffered economic want and deprivation.

In this troubled area, Federal expenditures for welfare aggregate almost \$500 million a year.

The major problems confronting Appalachia, according to the President's Appalachian Regional Commission, are "low income, high unemployment, lack of urbanization, low educational achievement, and a comparatively low standard of living."

First of all, throughout Appalachia about 1 in 3 families has an annual income of \$3,000 or less. For the rest of the country the figure is 1 in 5. A family income of \$3,000 is used as the dividing line between poverty and some degree of comfort by the President's Council of Economic Advisers, with full recognition of the limitations involved.

In Appalachia, only 8.7 percent of all families have incomes of \$10,000 a year or more, compared with 15.6 elsewhere in the Nation. The median family income in metropolitan areas in Appalachia during 1960, the latest year for which such data have been computed, was \$5,287, or 16.4 percent below the median of \$6,324 for comparable areas in the rest of the United States.

Likewise, the median rural farm income in Appalachia was \$2,624 in 1960, or \$450 under the like figure for the balance of our country.

Second, unemployment plagues this region. In 1962, the latest year for which such regional figures are available, about 500,000 workers were without jobs. This army of unemployed represented about 8.8 percent of Appalachia's work force. But during the same year, the national average rate of unemployment was 5.6 percent.

Furthermore, the Appalachian portion of Georgia, Kentucky, Ohio, Virginia, West Virginia, and my State of Pennsylvania had unemployment rates in 1962 which exceeded the national rate by more than 50 percent.

However, unemployment in those parts of this 10-State region which are not within Appalachia—all of West Virginia lies within Appalachia—averaged only 4.7 percent in 1962.

Low income and the desperate lack of jobs have caused a steady outmigration of workers, in hope of finding employment elsewhere. During the decade 1950-60, the Appalachian region experienced an outmigration of an estimated 2 million persons.

Furthermore, the most productive age group—18 to 64 years—in the rest of the United States expanded by 8.6 percent during the 10 years, 1950-60, but in Appalachia this age group actually declined by 5.1 percent.

Chronic unemployment besets the Appalachian region because of declining industries on the one hand and automation on the other.

Appalachia is our Nation's leading coal-producing region. All our anthracite coal and two-thirds of our bituminous coal are supplied by this area. However, competition from other fuels has eaten into the market for coal. Furthermore, coal mining is extensively automated. Therefore, employment in the Appalachian coal mines dropped from more than 462,000 in 1950 to 191,000 in 1960. This was a decline of almost 60 percent.

Most of the hard-core unemployment in my own congressional district of Pennsylvania, which comprises Washington, Greene, and Fayette Counties, is due to automation of coal mining, and to the closing down of worked-out mines, as well.

Employment on the railroads has similarly been reduced by mechanization and competition from other means of transportation.

And with greater use of machinery on farms, agricultural employment has also declined sharply.

Third, the predominance of rural, non-farm areas in Appalachia is a major factor in the economic stagnation of this extensive area.

Rural in Appalachia does not mean a checkerboard of rich farms; instead, dense but narrow ribbons of bleak habitation wind along the valley roads and up the tributary hollows, threatening among the wooded hills.

This is the true description of these rural localities used in the report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission.

This type of land is too barren to support prosperous farming. Currently, about half the farms in Appalachia gross less than \$2,000 a year.

Most of the inhabitants work in coal mines, or on railroads; or have no work at all.

Fourth, educational deficits have impeded progress in Appalachia. For example, "for every 100 persons over 25 years of age elsewhere in the United States, 8 have failed to finish 5 years of school. In Appalachia, that figure rises to more than 11. Although the level of educational attainment in the Appalachian portion of three States is above the national average, in the remainder of these States the percentage of persons failing to finish 5 years of school ranges from 11 percent to 22 percent. It is estimated that 1½ million of Appalachia's inhabitants are functionally illiterate.

Thirty-two out of every 100 Appalachians over 25 have finished high school, contrasted to almost 42 persons of similar age elsewhere. No section of Appalachia reaches the national norm for the rest of the United States and one State dips to 58 percent below that norm.

"Appalachia also suffers from a shortage of college graduates. In the rest of

the United States, eight of every 100 persons over 25 years of age have completed at least 4 years of college. In Appalachia that figure drops to five," so reports the President's Appalachian Commission.

And finally, standards of living in Appalachia are woefully inadequate as a result of low incomes and joblessness. The condition of housing in Appalachia is generally wretched. In 1960, according to the census of housing, 26.6 percent of the homes in Appalachia needed major repairs and 7.5 percent were in such dilapidated condition that they endangered the health and safety of their inhabitants. The comparable percentages for the rest of the United States were 18.1 and 4.7 percent, respectively. The situation was more aggravated in rural areas. Here almost one out of four homes had basic deficiencies that required correction to provide adequate housing; 1 out of 10 was dilapidated. More than half of the farm homes lacked adequate plumbing.

Standards of health and nutrition are also low. Severe personal health problems in Appalachia include nutritional deficiencies, dental diseases, chronic diseases, infant deaths, and communicable diseases.

To give a final indication of deficiencies in standards of living, in Appalachia, 5.9 percent of the population receive some form of Federal assistance, against 4.1 percent for the rest of the Nation.

These conditions of misery throughout Appalachia demonstrate the crying need for comprehensive regional action to cope with such widespread economic blight.

S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, would "provide public works and economic development programs—needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region."

Briefly, this proposed measure would establish a joint Federal-State commission to plan and coordinate the "various undertakings involved in improvement of the region." Suggested new programs include, first, the Appalachian Development Highway System which provides for the development of 2,850 miles of highway, and, second, the construction of demonstration health facilities.

Third, the act would provide for pasture improvement and development in order to promote the conservation and fuller utilization of the region's important land and water resources.

Fourth, the establishment of timber development organizations would also be encouraged for the purpose of improving timber productivity and quality and to increase the return to landowners.

Fifth, the act would provide for mining area restoration in Appalachia to seal and fill voids in abandoned coal mines, plan and execute projects for extinguishing underground and outcrop mine fires; and also to expand and accelerate fish and wildlife restoration projects.

And, sixth, the Secretary of the Army would be authorized to prepare a comprehensive plan for the development and

efficient utilization of the water and related resources of the Appalachian region.

In addition, certain supplements and modifications of existing programs are provided for by the bill. For example, grants to the States in the Appalachian region for vocational education facilities under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 would be liberalized.

Likewise, grants for sewage treatment works to Appalachian States under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act would be liberalized.

And the Housing Act of 1954 would be amended to make the Appalachian Regional Commission eligible to receive comprehensive planning grants under this act.

Mr. Chairman, as a representative in the Congress of the United States from the 26th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, a depressed area, I have observed the ravages of economic distress at first hand. It is my firm conviction that this suggested legislation, providing as it does for long-term economic growth, would be of great assistance not only to my own congressional district, but also to the entire Appalachian region and ultimately to the whole United States.

I, therefore, urge the Congress to take immediate affirmative action on this carefully thought out proposal for directing this 10-State region up the road of economic rehabilitation and long-term growth, as contained Senate bill 3.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK].

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, the business before the House, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, is the product of more than 10 years of consideration and research by a great many persons and organizations. It has been scrutinized in great detail during extensive hearings both this year and last year, in both bodies of Congress.

Almost everything that can be said about the proposal, pro and con, has been said, and nothing would be gained by repetition of established argumental theses. At this point in the deliberations, however, we must not lose sight of one central fact: notwithstanding our record of strong, continuous national economic growth since the end of World War II, the States of the Appalachian region have not properly shared in that growth.

During those years we have had recessions, and we have bounced back, but the Appalachian States have felt each recession more severely than their neighbors, and have bounced back more slowly. In consequence these States, by and large, have not been positioned to bear their full share of responsibility for the fulfillment of our national objectives.

Congress has recognized the reality and scope of the problem. We have authorized previous programs to deal with portions of it. We have appropriated funds, and to some degree we have secured a betterment of conditions.

The Accelerated Public Works Act was a tool designed to reshape the communities in Appalachia and elsewhere by en-

couraging community betterment programs and by stimulating job opportunity through immediate application of construction funds.

The economic opportunity or antipoverty program is a long-range effort to upgrade the capacity of individuals, principally those who have never broken out of the poverty cycle from generation to generation. It is an educational effort of a specialized kind. We expect to secure a return on our investment in this program through the better developed capacities of these people to fill their roles as citizens.

The Appalachian proposal is not a duplicate of either effort. It is a proposal with a 6-year lifespan, requiring State and local participation, and aimed at improvement of certain fundamental conditions which chronically inhibit economic growth and recovery in this region, as we have learned from the historical record.

Without proper access to materials and markets there can be no development, and consequently some 80 percent of the money is to be spent on roads. Most of the balance will go to correct negative conditions which have come as a by-product of uncontrolled land and minerals exploitation. It is an investment in fundamental needs, justified by the conviction that planned improvement will do away with the need for antipoverty programs in the next generation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DYAL].

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the factual remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, the member from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], concerning our flood damage problems in the great State of California. It is especially pleasing to me as I intend to address my remarks to section 206 of the bill now before us for consideration.

The protection and preservation of the Nation's water resources is of concern to all Americans—we who live in a semi-arid area may be envious of the annual rainfall records of Appalachia but we also know that without long range planning abundant water can come to an end as use increases. Water is so valuable we cannot afford to mismanage or waste this great resource.

Appalachia is going to grow and prosper under this bill, S. 3. As it does, the preservation of its water becomes mandatory. Under section 206 there has been established a comprehensive water resource survey for the entire region. The Secretary of the Army under this bill will coordinate the studies and will be assisted by all interested agencies and will coordinate all previous legislation under the program.

Appalachia has a priceless asset in its annual rainfall. With top-level management and control, water will provide the essential base for recreational, industrial, residential, and commercial development. The section has certain obvious priorities, for the rest of this regional development program would be hindered without planning against flooding, pollution, and sewage problems.

This great annual rainfall is not kept in channels and behind dams in much of its area. Appalachia's geography demands that man create impounded areas to preserve its water. Impounded water is controlled water, an economic blessing in all areas whether for industrial, commercial or recreational use.

In California we understand the disaster that comes with shortages of water when burgeoning population and industries come faster than new sources of water. Appalachia will grow and develop; water organizations and development must keep pace.

We in California have understood the problems of water for many generations. My own ancestors were among those early pioneers who brought irrigation to the Southwest over 100 years ago. Movement of water to areas of need is vital. Witness the transportation of water in the Holy Land from Lake Huleh to the Negev which I have visited. The great Feather River project of my State and now, under this bill we need to know the future of the Delaware, the Ohio, Susquehanna, and Potomac basins. This section will accomplish planning needs for the coming generations.

We had those without vision in our State who were afraid of the regional concept. But those with wisdom knew the benefits and the State of California approved the California water plan to the benefit of all. There were those who wished to stop the program—18 million Californians are grateful today we did not stop.

Had we started eliminations by amending areas the great benefits now accruing would have been denied.

When I was about 7 years of age my father took me to the Imperial Desert—a desolate area which became green and fruitful with the aid of Federal funds. There is now shipped from this area a billion dollars of produce in the markets of the world each year.

Mr. Chairman, please note there is no contemplation of either a new Federal agency or Government corporation in carrying out the provisions of section 206. It provides for planning—for coordinated programs for construction and utilization to use past Federal and local programs in an overall concept to bring benefits, not only to Appalachia but to all of the United States. The prosperity of this area will benefit mine.

As the plans are developed, the Congress and the President will review the findings. Each specific recommendation will require its specific authorization. There is no blanket authorization under this section. It is a good bill; a bill with vision—I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to preface my remarks by noting that it was my privilege, during my past 7 years in Congress, to have served on the Committee on Public Works, and to have worked closely with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], who is now the chairman thereof. I should like to pay my respects to my good friend, GEORGE FALLON, to wish him

well in his new duties, and to say that I know he will carry out those duties in an admirable fashion.

At the same time, I cannot resist saying that I regret that this proposal (S. 3) is the first major bill reported out of committee by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] in this session, because I think it is both unwise and unsound—in its present form—and I find myself unable to support it.

I shall leave the broader specifics of the criticism I have for this bill in the capable hands of those now serving on my old committee who share my views and who have so well carried the burden of presenting them to you.

I do this, in order to concentrate my remarks on the amendment that was added to the so-called Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 in the other body, which amendment would have the effect of including certain New York State counties in the program "on an appropriate basis"—whatever that may mean—if certain findings are made by the proposed regional commission and not vetoed by the Federal representative.

Those New York counties were not specifically named except, for purposes of "legislative history," during the brief debate on the amendment in the other body. On that basis, however, we find that they are 13 in number and that, by coincidence, the 4 New York counties that I have the honor to represent—Broome, Tioga, Chemung and Tompkins—are all included.

Naturally enough, I know these counties well—and I know the people who live therein because I am one of them, born and raised.

I am sure that to most of those people—as to me—it came as something of a shock to discover, almost overnight in this fashion, that we were a "depressed" area, for these counties—this region of New York—must be considered as being as prosperous as the average of their sister counties across the Nation.

This does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that we do not have unemployment. We do, indeed. Nor, does it mean that we are without poverty. We have impoverished families—and, as elsewhere, even one would be too many.

Nor does it mean, Mr. Chairman, that we do not have villages and cities and rural areas that "progress" has passed by for the time being—we have those, too.

Nor does it mean, Mr. Chairman, that we do not have needs—and real needs—for better highways, and schools and hospitals, or need for help in revitalizing our cities, in developing our water resources and in building badly needed sewage treatment works and the like.

We do have all these needs, Mr. Chairman, and many more—but, until this measure was so amended in the other body, I doubt if there were any of my constituents who viewed those needs as being so urgent, comparatively speaking, that we felt we should be moved, in this fashion, to the head of the line of those of our sister communities waiting for help to meet such needs under the various, existing and ongoing Federal-

aid programs designed to promote their solution in an orderly and equitable manner.

In any event, since the adoption of this amendment in the other body, I have awaited with interest the reaction of my constituents. The people of these four counties—of this region—are a proud and self-reliant people. They have never quite gotten over the old-fashioned idea of helping themselves and helping each other—nor have they ever quite accepted the notion that all progress comes from Washington. It has come to me as no surprise, therefore, that I have had, to date, only one constituent who has written to me suggesting I vote for this measure because we might get some help from it. On the other hand, I have had a goodly number of letters from other constituents who have written complaining about the action taken in the other body, and who have stated they that feel most strongly that our area should not be considered for assistance under this program.

And, Mr. Chairman, just the other day, the Board of Supervisors of Tompkins County—one of the counties included in that 13—passed a resolution asking that their county be removed from this bill; and this again did not surprise me.

I have considered this request, Mr. Chairman, but have decided not to attempt to take action along these lines. Why?

Well, chiefly because it seems to me that the very fact of the tentative inclusion of these 13 counties under this program—inclusion for study purposes only, mind you, since there is surely no money in this bill for them at the present time—points up the major defect in attempting to approach the economic problems of a particular region of the country on this basis.

Of these 13 counties of New York, only 3 have ever been eligible for assistance under the formula of "need" set forth under either the area redevelopment program or the accelerated public works program—and it is my understanding that only one of those counties, Chautauqua, is presently so eligible.

This means that, once again, we are preparing to make the same mistake we did in drafting the area redevelopment program—which has never yet worked as its sponsors promised it would. That mistake is that, for political reasons, we are not taking dead aim at the real areas of distress in what might be called hard-core Appalachia—which is something that I would favor—but that we are again using a "scattergun" approach in an effort to make this bill more palatable until, as you can obviously see, Appalachia is virtually bulging at the seams. And, once this bill is passed—as I am sure it will be—off we will go to bring the same sort of relief to any other number of regions of distress that can be thought of across the whole 50 States.

This is why I cannot vote for this bill in its present form—I think it would be an irresponsible act for me to do otherwise even though there may well be some unforeseen political hazards for me to take such a position.

And this is why I will most certainly support the amendment that I understand is to be offered which will restrict aid under this program, except for highway construction, to those counties that are eligible for assistance under the formula set forth in the accelerated public works program. It is also why I will also support, failing the adoption of that amendment, the Republican substitute which I also understand is to be offered—perhaps as a recommittal motion—and which would apply such broad assistance as is to be provided under this program to all areas of special economic need on a nationwide, rather than a regional, basis, which is the only commonsense approach to such problems.

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, I might mention the fact that if this Congress—if the Public Works Committee—really wants to help my area of New York; if you really want to help my counties and these other nine New York counties achieve a faster rate of economic growth than we have been, all you need to do is to agree upon some formula under which our State will be reimbursed, either in money or in substitute mileage, for the cost of the New York State Thruway that we built at our own expense but that was subsequently incorporated into the Federal Interstate Highway System. This fact has, for years, shortchanged my State in the rightful and originally intended share of Federal highway moneys we should be receiving, and has delayed the reconstruction of New York State Route 17, a key highway running east and west through most of those 13 counties we have been considering. Our State has been doing the best it could to rebuild this road, using 50-50 Federal-State moneys when we ought to have the benefit of 90 percent Federal aid for its reconstruction. If you would give us, instead of the questionable benefit of being included in Appalachia, the equitable relief we have long demanded, here, we would be most pleased, and I am quite sure that, thereafter, it would not be necessary to ever even consider us again as being in need of special assistance of the sort provided under what I think is an ill-conceived and unwise measure.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, the legislation being considered today is being presented by other members of our Public Works Committee. Therefore, I shall direct my comments to the measure that Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CLEVELAND, and Mr. McEWEN, and I have introduced as a substitute to the so-called Appalachia bill.

In introducing the constructive alternative, we have tried to give the Members of the House a choice that we honestly believe is more in keeping with the proven administrative procedures of our Federal system of Government—procedures in which we utilize the existing agencies to carry out recommended

programs rather than create new Federal regional organizations that conceivably could conflict with the best procedure in established Federal-State relations.

I do want to point out, however, that our alternative will permit the promotion of intergovernmental organizations and agreements to attain economical performance, if the units of Government or States involved so desire.

The major difference between the two bills is of course, the fact that our bill makes available assistance to areas throughout the entire country, but we do restrict this aid to counties that are categorized as depressed areas.

The administration has taken a position that no amendment will be supported unless it affects areas in or immediately contiguous to the Appalachian region.

As many of you know, four counties of my congressional district were hit hard during the recent flood in northern California. I have received many wires asking that an amendment be introduced to add our disaster area to the bill to permit assistance to this hard-hit section. In checking with counsel and the Parliamentarian, I have been advised such an amendment would be ruled out of order as not germane to this regional bill.

Therefore, I have no alternative but to support the substitute measure so that my section of the country would be included and therefore eligible.

In drafting the alternative bill, we have worked hard to take the better sections of the Appalachian bill, improve them and eliminate the portions of the bill that we believe are unnecessary.

Personally, I am most appreciative of the committee's consideration of my district's problems. The chairman of this ad hoc committee, Mr. JONES, and many members of the committee took the time to come to my district immediately following the flood to personally see the damage. For this our people shall remain eternally grateful.

While it is highly improbable, in view of the administration's position, that amendments will be added, I nevertheless strongly urge adoption of our substitute bill. This would permit partial assistance to our flood-damaged counties.

Further, our committee is now gathering data and compiling information on the extent of our problems with a view toward offering assistance. I do want to admonish my colleagues now that additional recommendations will be forthcoming. Our plight is categorized as an act of God and somewhat different in that our recovery requirements are necessary due to the extraordinary rainfall and historic flood conditions that can hit any one of us, without warning. I simply mention this now to establish a legislative record and also to serve as a continuing reminder to a sympathetic Congress.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER].

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, there are those throughout our history who have sought to scoff at particular regional developments. Certainly we

owe much to the great memory of Daniel Webster whose dedication to the principle of national supremacy and whose heroic devotion to the Constitution shall never be forgotten. Yet, even the great Webster in a classic debate over westward expansion proved to be a poor prophet. He once referred to the territories of the Louisiana Purchase and the great Northwest Territory, out of which the great State of Iowa has developed, in narrow regional terms. Here is what he said:

What do we want with this vast, worthless area? What do we want with this region of savages, wild beasts, of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts and those endless mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their bases with eternal snow? What can we ever hope to do with the western coast, a coast of 3,000 miles, rockbound, cheerless, and uninviting. And not a harbor on it.

To those of little faith and vision who want us to defeat the Appalachia program, I ask—where would our Nation be today if the Congress had listened to Webster's negative appeal?

Geographic regional frontiers and our expansion westward are no longer subjects of debate in our national life. For all his great worth in other areas of public policy we can soberly reflect what kind of a society we would have today if the narrow regionalism Webster stressed above had become our national policy. Today instead, as a great nation, we do not hesitate to boldly explore the heavens themselves. Can we shamefully desert our heritage as a strong Christian nation to say that we lack the boldness to attack a great domestic regional problem of human despair and economic stagnation?

The continued existence of poverty which is a part of a deep regional pattern of economic stagnation is the very definition of discrimination. The Appalachia region has approximately 8½ percent of the Nation's population. But the total Federal funds spent in this region last year represented only 5 percent of all dollars spent nationally. Included within that 5-percent total was an expenditure of more than \$400 million for welfare programs.

Shall we continue to discriminate against the people of Appalachia by turning our faces coldly against the massive regional problem of economic stagnation? Shall we also turn our faces coldly against the discrimination against every taxpayer in the United States that is inherent in this situation? This is exactly the choice that we have, because if we fail to recognize the serious nature of this regional problem, we are saying in effect, that every taxpayer in this Nation is bound to continue to contribute to pay into welfare programs which, because of complex regional problems, can only treat the periphery of this basic problem and never truly solve it.

Shall we continue to discriminate against all citizens of our Nation, not just those in Appalachia, by denying to our Nation the economic stimulation and growth that can only come through a massive attack upon this economic disaster area?

When the people of Appalachia can buy more food, the agricultural producers and industrial workers in Iowa, the Dakotas, Nebraska, and Illinois, and other Midwestern Plains States will sell more livestock, more feed grains, more soybeans, and all of the other commodities which we produce in such great abundance. When the people of the Appalachian region can increase their purchasing power and become taxpayers instead of taxeaters they will be able to buy food at the same rate as the average American today. This increase in their purchasing power and in their consumption will increase the demand for American food by over \$2 billion—approximately double what this Nation has invested in this program.

Let us address ourselves more specifically to this point and answer the question, How could the various sectors of our Nation's economy benefit from economic stimulation in Appalachia? First of all, the biggest increase would be in the production of livestock and livestock products in Iowa and other areas of the Midwest. Producers in these areas would benefit by the estimated amount of \$230 million. This increase means that my constituents who raise livestock in Cedar, Johnson, Muscatine, and all the other great livestock producing counties in the First District of Iowa would receive one nickel more for every dollar they previously received. Can those who acclaim this program as discriminatory justifiably inform the livestock producers of this great Nation that they do not deserve this 5-percent increase in receipts?

But what about the other vital industries that will benefit from this program? The transportation and warehousing industries throughout the Nation would realize an additional \$64 million of increased production. Our national wholesale and retail trades would benefit to the extent of an additional \$72 million; and the list could go on and on into all sectors of our economy.

Personally I do not feel that we should be ashamed of undertaking the solution to the problem of Appalachia on the simple Christian ground that we have a moral obligation to intelligently solve this problem. But we can also state without hesitation that the very economic growth and development of our entire Nation demands action. As we seek to fulfill our obligation to our brothers in the Appalachia region, this bill will enable them to better fulfill their obligations to the citizens of all regions in the United States.

When our brothers in the Appalachia region can become taxpayers instead of tax eaters, when they can revive private purchasing power and initiative, they will return many times to the rest of the Nation the contributions that were made to them.

Let us follow the Webster of hope who in days of better spirit said:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I join in support of those here today and yesterday who are so effectively pointing out the deficiencies of the proposed Appalachia legislation. I submit that this proposal is motivated by political considerations, is planned with a view to very specialized benefits instead of the public interest, is written carelessly, is defended largely on the basis of emotional appeal rather than reason, and is generally unworkable. I want to commend the minority members of the Public Works Committee for their clear and effective statement citing the problems inherent in the proposal.

We all favor economic development. Nobody wants to see poverty persist in any part of the United States. But appeals to emotion should not be a substitute for effective action. This bill would set aside 360 counties in 11 States for special treatment, ignoring entirely the other 39 States. It is dangerous to put the Government in the business of giving aid to just certain areas. The White House says that it will consider other areas for special treatment later, but if this is so, why do we not consider the total national economy situation at once. Obviously, the answer is that if the public is given the whole package at one time, it may wake up to the fact that the program cannot be justified.

The proposed Appalachia bill establishes artificial and illogical standards which are open to political manipulation, as we have already seen in the proposed addition of 13 New York counties to the region.

Many of the 360 counties to be helped are prosperous and have no need for help, according to the Governors of their own States. The most wealthy county in South Carolina is to be included.

Statistics cited in support of the bill are based on 1960 information, much of which is now obsolete.

The bill would establish 100 percent Federal financing of the operation of health facilities and hospitals. This is a step which we must certainly consider very carefully because it introduces full Government control into the area of health and medicine. This is not a move we can adopt solely on the approval of the Public Works Committee without at least the consideration of other House committees.

This proposal would set up a single Federal authority which would have veto power over all parts of the program. Because the Appalachia area pays no need to State lines, the new Commission's function would erode the kind of State authority and responsibility which is vital to the continued success of our system of government.

Federal domination of the States is unsavory enough even when some attention is given to State boundaries. When we adopt a program giving to a Federal czar a centralized program which ignores State boundaries, we take a giant step along the road to eventual abolition of the integrity of our system of State government.

A large part of the spending in this program would be for road construction and would be superimposed on existing State and Federal high construction plans. This would be a needless and foolish duplication which could lead only to confusion and inefficiency.

It would also provide a so-called land improvement program. But past experience has shown that the Federal Government meets with remarkably little success when it attempts to set up farm programs of this kind. The proposed payments by the Government for reclamation and other purposes would be wasteful and ineffective.

The bill would establish a new program similar to TVA. But more than 25 percent of the Appalachia area is already in the Tennessee Valley Authority area. Its language calling for the generation of hydroelectric power is entirely lacking in specifics and deserves further explanation.

The Appalachia legislation would set up a public works program which not only would overlap activity of the Area Redevelopment Authority, but which is similar to the public works acceleration program which has proven to be a failure except as a political device for the party in control of the bureaucracy. This section of the bill also is ambiguous, incomplete, and would lead to manipulation which cannot be in the public interest.

The minority members of the Public Works Committee, in their statement, have rightly emphasized that a dramatic proposal, based largely on emotional appeal, cannot be a substitute for well-conceived legislation.

I am opposed to discriminatory, vague, and ambiguous programs of this kind. The Appalachia proposal would simply increase the army of Washington bureaucrats dispensing favors according to their own rules and where it is politically expedient to do so.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does the gentleman have a statement that will take longer than the 2 minutes allotted to him?

Mr. MATHIAS. Perhaps; yes, sir.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS. I thank the gentleman for his kindness.

Mr. Chairman, I have become a co-sponsor of this bill because I feel that many of the programs which are included within it are very badly needed for the good of the entire country, and I want to congratulate my colleague in the Maryland delegation, the dean of our delegation and chairman of the Committee on Public Works, for the deliberate speed with which he has been able to bring this bill to the House this year. I say I feel these programs are very badly needed on the basis of personal experience and personal observation.

I represent a district which includes counties that are within the definition of "Appalachia." In 1961 we were undergoing some very difficult economic experiences. Some parts of my district had unemployment as high as 20 percent. This was not a new experience for us. This was an experience that we have had over a period of time. If one looked at a graph of our economic health it would be seen that there were recurring economic fluctuations in our part of Appalachia. Sometimes particular industries would be prosperous and at other times the whole community would be badly depressed.

At a conference that I assembled in the spring of 1961 we came to the conclusion that there were several pressing needs. That conference, I might say for the benefit of the Members here who may wish to evaluate the recommendations of the conference, was composed of businessmen, representatives of chambers of commerce, representatives of management, representatives of agriculture, representatives of labor, representatives of local government and of the Federal Government and State government.

We had just about all the people sitting down together who had had experience and who had constructive ideas on the kind of things that needed to be done to even out the economy of Appalachia and to eliminate the economic dips so that the people living in Appalachia would have a reasonable opportunity to establish a decent standard of living. It was determined at the time we had this conference that local initiative was, of course, a prime requisite to lift up the economy of the area. Local initiative has been exercised through the years and particularly through the last 4 or 5 years. But the physical needs, the material needs are beyond the scope of local initiative.

One of the great needs in the area is better roads and highways. We need roads in order to convey economically the substantial natural resources of the area to their markets. Highways can and will open the area to tourism—a real and largely untapped potential in this region of great beauty. Geography dictates, however, that these new roads and highways should be an interstate system, and that is beyond the power of a single State to plan or to build.

Another great need is the appropriate development of water resources—water needed by industry and water needed by people for consumption and for recreation purposes and dams and other structures for flood control and for water storage and protection.

The interstate character of the rivers that flow through Appalachia requires a program that transcends the authority of a single riparian State. In my district, for example, we have several industries which are prepared to expand and to hire more people at the present time if they can be assured of more favorable water resources and more dependable water resources. Without these resources and without the assurance that they will have the water upon which their industry depends, they cannot expand and they cannot provide new jobs and new economic opportunities.

Where highways may benefit one area, water development may benefit other areas.

In my opinion, we must consider the economic differences of region and maintain a flexibility which will enable us to assist communities and counties in the manner in which they most need assistance.

I think this bill provides the appropriate means by which we can lend assistance; the appropriate means by which an impact can be made in this area that will be felt; a means by which the area can realize that extra bit of needed effort that will allow it to thrive, to be self-sufficient and to enjoy an economic growth rate commensurate with the rest of the country.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER].

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in support of legislation authorizing the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. I am coauthor of this bill, and can attest to the critical, pressing need for it.

I have lived most of my life in Appalachia. Seven of the eight counties of my present 10th Congressional District lie in Appalachia, as do all three of the new counties—Perry, Morgan, and Washington—that I will acquire through reapportionment. So I know something about the conditions that exist in that region of our great country.

I know that the rate of unemployment in some of my Appalachian counties is holding steady at 8, 9, and even 10 percent. I know that our wage earners, when they are able to find work, often must labor and toil for as little as 70 percent of what their neighbors make in more affluent regions of America. I know that overall health facilities in Appalachia are substandard and inferior. Our highway system is incomplete, inadequate and, in some cases, antiquated. I know that lack of economic development is compelling the Federal Government to spend \$500 million a year, year in and year out, on welfare programs in Appalachia. This heavy expenditure does not get at the root of the problem; in a way, it merely subsidizes it.

But we have heard a lot of talk from the other side of the aisle, from the Republican side, that the Appalachia program is not needed, that it is ill conceived, that it is discriminatory and that it should be defeated. I agree that the Appalachian program is discriminatory—it discriminates against hunger and disease, against unemployment and despair; it discriminates against the prime causes that have combined to make Appalachia the last remaining depressed area in this great land of ours.

More than 15 million people live in Appalachia. It is a region character-

ized, in part at least, by low incomes and high unemployment, by low educational achievement, and below average standards of living. To be specific:

Appalachia accounts for 35 percent of the unemployment in all the Nation's redevelopment areas, from Florida to Alaska, from Maine to Hawaii.

Incomes in Appalachia are up to 80 percent below the national average.

One in every five of Appalachia's 15 million inhabitants is subsisting on commodity doles or food stamp welfare.

This is not the kind of America I want. It is not the kind of America that you want.

The assertion by some that Congress should do no more for Appalachia than it has done for other, more fortunate regions of America does not impress me. It smacks of Anatole France's satirical statement that the law in its majestic equality forbids the rich, as well as the poor, to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, to steal bread for the dinner table. The truth is that no man is an island unto himself, nor is any one region of America isolated and cut off from the other. The entire Nation benefits and grows stronger when any section of our common country prospers.

Yet, while the Nation as a whole is experiencing the longest and most dramatic economic boom in history, Appalachia is mired in grinding poverty and chilling despair. It alone of the regions of America is being denied the blessings of our more fruitful and abundant society.

If Appalachia's economy merely equaled the national average—and passage of this bill will start it in that direction—if Appalachia's economy equaled the national average, \$12 billion a year could be added to our gross national product through increased retail sales.

If Appalachia's economy equaled the national average—and passage of this measure will start it in that direction—if this happened, \$5.2 billion would be added each year to our country's annual rate of personal income.

If Appalachia's economy matched the national average—and passage of this bill will start it in that direction—another billion dollars worth of new housing starts could be made in America each year.

Most assuredly, what is good for Appalachia is good for the United States.

The objective of this bill is to provide a Federal investment program that will assist Appalachia toward fuller participation in our Nation's robust economic growth. This bill authorizes an appropriation of \$840 million for the Appalachian development highway system—a system that will open up the most remote areas of Appalachia to modern, industrial America.

Appalachia lies just beyond the reaches of the greatest concentration of wealth and population in this Nation. But its lack of adequate transportation facilities has effectively isolated it economically from the broad sweep of industrial growth which has blessed most of our Nation in the years since World War II. We all know that industry does not and cannot go into areas that lack first-rate distribution routes.

As the President's Commission on Appalachia has said:

Its [Appalachia's] penetration by an adequate transportation network is the first requisite of its full participation in industrial America.

I want to emphasize that the Appalachian States are not seeking something for nothing. They are ready and willing to provide \$360 million from their own scarce funds to help finance the highway building program—a program acknowledged to be the "first requisite" for bringing better times to Appalachia and its people.

This legislation would establish the Appalachian Regional Commission, consisting of the Governors of each Appalachian State and one Federal representative. This Commission, made up of the men who best know the problems of Appalachia, would prepare plans and programs needed to revitalize that region of our country. The Commission would guarantee local and State participation in all phases of the program. It would be a politically bipartisan body of both Democratic and Republican Governors.

Another important provision provides Federal assistance in modernizing the health facilities of Appalachia. The low income of Appalachia is reflected in the lack, if not nonexistence, of the kind of health facilities that most Americans take for granted. The committee report lists this finding:

Sound health services can play as much a role in the economic development of a region as any other instrument of development. Without such services, no community or subregion can hope to attract modern industry * * *. In many sections of Appalachia, this problem is particularly acute. The low income in these sections impairs a reasonable support of private medicine and the tax base necessary for even rudimentary public health facilities is nonexistent.

The bill I speak for today provides grants for the development, equipment, and operation of multicounty demonstration health facilities, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic and treatment centers, and other facilities necessary for good health.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Appalachia are a proud and independent people. They are willing to work and work hard. I think most of us recognize that the economic problems of these people cannot be met and solved by them alone. Their plight arises not out of any lack of self-reliance, or out of any lack of individualism on their part. It stems, rather, from the complexities of a changing society; it stems from the underdevelopment of the region in which the live, and from the steady march of progress in industrial America which has made obsolete many of the skills and trades of yesteryear.

Industrial progress is sometimes a two-edged sword. It cuts both ways. While benefiting the many, it can sometimes have disastrous effect on certain segments of our population. The coal mining industry serves as a specific example of what I am talking about.

For generations, many of the men in Appalachia worked in the coalfields of southern Ohio, Kentucky, West Virginia,

Pennsylvania, and Alabama. It was the No. 1 industry.

But automation, changing heating methods, and increased use of diesel fuels served to blight a good part of the coal region. Of the multiple thousands of miners gainfully employed in Appalachia just a few years ago, a staggering number have been forced out of their jobs, and, in many cases, onto the relief rolls. The same fate even now awaits hundreds and thousands of other miners in Appalachia.

Many of these people had toiled in the coal mines since their earliest working days. They had no trade to fall back on. So they unwillingly joined the ranks of the more or less permanently unemployed.

Let it be stressed and emphasized that these people do not want handouts—they ask only for a helping hand; they do not want relief checks—they want only the opportunity to earn regular pay checks.

Mr. Chairman, we of this Congress have the great opportunity to lend a helping hand in time of dire emergency to the people of Appalachia. They deserve far better than they have been getting. The bill that we debate here today will bring new hope to my people. It will complement the other farsighted and far-reaching economic programs which Congress, in its wisdom, has authorized for the good of the Nation.

Let us pass the Appalachian program; let us get on with the business of making America truly the land of hope and opportunity for all.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this very important piece of legislation. First, I wish to point out that not one penny will accrue to the State of Illinois should the bill be enacted into law. Further, I point out that it has been my privilege for 11 years to represent a district which has had a lot of unemployment. I know what it means to see people out of work.

This is not a complicated bill at all, my colleagues. This bill is quite simple, and I should like to boil it down to four basic points, if I may, in the few minutes I have.

I am supporting this bill, and I hope you will support this bill, for four basic reasons.

The first reason is that the Appalachian region has economic differences from the remainder of the country, and must be handled in a different manner.

The second reason is that the per capita income in Appalachia is less than \$1,400 as compared to \$1,900 for the remainder of the Nation, and this certainly indicates a priority need.

Third, whether we like it or not, as I pointed out to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] on yesterday, the American taxpayer is pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into the Appalachian region every year for relief and related programs. I believe it is time that we stopped this and turned the relief checks into paychecks, and that is what the bill is designed to do.

Lastly, the Appalachian people do not want handouts. They want a hand. I have talked to Governors and other people in this region. They want a hand of friendship and help from a grateful nation, such as we enjoy by living in this country.

I am reminded of the story of a big, husky, 250-pound man who was walking down the street in my hometown one day, with a little 3-year-old boy tagging along. This little boy was hanging on to the forefinger of his father. As the big, husky gentleman strolled down the street, the little boy had to double time and triple time to keep up. Finally, after he had hung on as long as he could, he reached up and pulled on his father's hand and said, "Daddy, I have to slow down." With that the big, husky arm reached down, and instead of having the little boy hang on, a large hand wrapped around the wrist of the little boy and pulled him on down the street without any effort at all.

This is what we need to do in Appalachia. For years upon years the people of Appalachia have been hanging on. They have been hanging on to what little economy they could find with the small amount of natural resources they could promote in this region. It is time that a grateful nation, the most powerful nation on the face of the earth, reached down and grabbed this region by the hand and pulled it on instead of permitting it to stumble and falter down the street of economic progress.

We have heard a great deal of talk in the past few days about what a boondoggle this bill is. I should like to quote some of the things which have been said on this floor.

This bill "is discrimination." This bill "is preference treatment." This bill "has several counties included that are not really in need."

Some go on to say that the approach is wrong. Let me say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that these are all excuses and certainly not reasons, because all these arguments can be met and will be met in the public law itself.

Let me say further, in all sincerity, I have great respect for my dear friend from Florida who is going to offer a substitute. Let us lay it on the line. The substitute which is to be offered today by my friend from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] primarily would increase the road building program for the entire Nation.

This bill calls for 3,350 miles of roads to be built in the 11-State Appalachian region—2,250 miles of arterial highways and 1,000 miles of access roads.

My friend BILL CRAMER's substitute calls for about 10,000 miles of roads for the entire Nation. I would remind my colleagues that we are now building a 41,000-mile road system, the Interstate Highway System, which calls for more than 4 times as many miles of roads as this substitute and I might add much more exclusive roads. But we still have our problems in Appalachia. This is not the answer. We must attack this problem on many fronts and not just on the front of roadbuilding alone. As I pointed out, we are spending in the Federal highway program, which is the

largest building program ever undertaken in the history of America, almost \$50 billion, and we still have people walking the streets in Appalachia. So this substitute is not the answer to the problem.

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

Mr. GRAY. I will be glad to yield briefly to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Has the gentleman read the other sections of the substitute which point out that in addition to the highway program it includes a vocational education program, a hospital demonstration facilities program, forest development programs, and sewage disposal programs?

Mr. GRAY. Will the gentleman agree that most of the substitute is roadbuilding?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes. And so is the administration bill composed of 76 percent for highways.

Mr. GRAY. But the gentleman is spreading this money through 50 States in his substitute and we are leaving it in 11 States. I think the gentleman's bill will not do any good for Appalachia. We are here legislating for a priority region called Appalachia and not for the entire Nation at this time. I will support a program, if the gentleman wants to offer it, to accelerate the roadbuilding program. We have a bill sponsored by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] and myself from our Public Works Committee, which would create a public works program for the country, and I hope the gentleman will support that bill when it comes before the committee, but the fact of the matter is that we are here trying to help Appalachia and we should direct our efforts to this region right now.

Mr. CRAMER. Does not the gentleman feel as far as his district is concerned, which is an impoverished district, that the substitute bill I intend to offer will provide a program for his district which S. 3 does not?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman mentioned my district. My district has been impoverished. In fact, before I came to Congress things were so slow in my district that the Mississippi River was only running 3 days a week through the district. We do need some help. We want to help Appalachia now in this bill. We hope to be bringing a bill out which will call for an expenditure of \$2 billion for public works for the entire Nation, and I hope that the gentleman will support this bill at that time.

Mr. CRAMER. Let me say to the gentleman that if he will support the substitute which we are offering, we will get the Mississippi River running through his district every day in the week.

Mr. GRAY. I doubt it, because spreading this money all over the United States would be just like spitting in the Atlantic Ocean and expecting it to overflow. That is just about how far it would go.

Now, gentlemen, this is a serious problem. Those of you who represent districts with people who are hungry and out of work and with children having to drop out of school because they do not have the clothes or the textbooks with

which to go, know that this is a serious problem. I would like to recite a poem here if I may. If you will listen to the words of this poem, you will understand why we must pass this bill and go on to help the people of Appalachia. The answer for a yea vote on this bill is found in this poem. The poem is entitled "The Bridge Builder."

I once saw an old man going down a lonely highway, when he came in the evening cold and gray, to a chasm vast and deep and wide, and the old man crossed over to the other side. When safe on the other side, he went back to build a bridge to span the tide. "Old man," said a fellow pilgrim near, "you are wasting your strength with building here. Yes, your journey may end with the passing of this day. You may never again pass this way." "Oh," the builder lifted his old gray head, "Good friend, down the path I have come," he said. "There follows after me today, a youth whose feet must pass this way. This stream which has been nothing to me; to that fair-haired youth might a pitfall be. He, too, must cross in the twilight dim. Good friend, I am building this bridge for him."

The Members who represent districts who are fortunate enough not to have much unemployment and poverty should want to build a bridge from your prosperous areas over to this land of less opportunity. Do you not believe it is incumbent upon us as Americans all to want to share this great wealth and abundance that we have with those less fortunate people in the Appalachian region? Yes, we may be poor in some areas of southern Illinois, but we still want to share what we have with those less fortunate in Kentucky and Pennsylvania and Alabama and any other State of the Union in need.

I believe that to take a less forthright attitude would be a dereliction of duty on my part to those whom I represent. They are Christian-thinking people and I believe they want to extend a hand of fellowship, friendship, and support. Think of this poem, "The Bridge Builder." Let us build a bridge of economic stability in America, not by borders, not by States.

If you will vote "no" on the Cramer substitute and cast a "yea" vote on this bill tomorrow, you will be building a strong economic bridge—one bridge for America and one for all.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CRAMER. With regard to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], and this bridge that he talks about, I would suggest that he ought to support the substitute under which we will build a highway from that bridge to his district so that his district may become a part of the redevelopment of the whole Nation. I believe he should give consideration to a bill that would support not only highway development, but demonstration health facilities, tim-

ber development organizations, mining area restoration, water resource study, vocational education facilities, sewage treatment works, for his district as well. So I wish he would give serious consideration as I think everyone else should, to the depressed areas of the country outside of Appalachia.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking in the interest of the passage of the Appalachian bill. To give you a concrete example of the way darkness has descended into the Cumberlands, I will give you a brief history of Harlan County.

Harlan County in 1910 had a population of 10,000. Coal was first commercially produced in that county in 1910. The population rose to 70,000 by 1928 and 15 million tons of coal per year were produced. This was the peak of the county's economy and population.

About this time the loss of markets for coal began. Then later, automation threw thousands of miners out of work. The population began to shrink and has shrunk from 70,000 to 45,000. The employment situation is bad. A large percentage of the people are out of work. They live in substandard homes on very poor highways. They are without sanitary facilities and exist largely on Government-supplied food.

The largest coal tippie in the world is in Harlan County and is owned by the U.S. Steel Co. The wealth is sent out in thousands of coal cars each day to the blast furnaces in Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan. Very little is left of this wealth by these companies in Harlan and in the other counties of this area.

The road system is quite poor. We only have three U.S. Highways traversing the whole area of the Fifth District.

To my side of the House, I would state that my district has been strictly Republican since 1867. Other areas have received much more regional aid. Where would our West be if it were not for the high dams and reclamation projects?

We have seen TVA punch "holes in the darkness" of Tennessee, part of Alabama, northern Mississippi, and part of Kentucky. We have seen what the Hoover and Grand Coulee Dams have done for the West. It is our belief that the Appalachian plan would by its system of highways, sewerage disposal plants, health facilities, conservation, stream pollution control, remove the "night which has fallen over the Cumberlands and Appalachia."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. CARTER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to compliment my distinguished colleague from southeastern Kentucky on his maiden speech in this Chamber. The gentleman has correctly stated the question in using Harlan County as an illustration. Harlan County is typical of all the coal mining communities throughout eastern Kentucky. My colleague from Kentucky has ably stated the problem and I am sure that the Members in this Chamber will not let the opportunity go by to help an area and to assist a region that has

contributed so much to the general welfare of this entire country.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I would be delighted to yield to my friend and colleague the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question with reference to the language which appears on page 18, section 203(b) of the land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control section. In connection with the landowners who wish to take advantage of the grazing aspects or to get some of their farmland improved in Appalachia under this program, and assuming for instance that a small marginal farmer wanted to improve a couple of fields of small acreage, would this particular provision—based upon a reading of section (b), require the farmer to produce a complicated plan or would he just have to submit a simple plan? How would that provision operate?

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] is well versed on this point and I yield to the gentleman from Texas to answer the question.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would say to the gentleman from Kentucky that there is no requirement that the plan encompass a total of 50 acres, and in specific reply to the gentleman's question, if a farmer owned less than 50 acres, for example, and desired to come up with a plan for the long-range soil stabilization and conservation of his particular acreage, whether it be by terracing or by the planting of legumes or something of this nature—whatever would meet the approved practices recognized by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee of his county, or be it the Soil Conservation Service, then they would enter into a simple agreement with him. There is nothing in the act that would require that a total of 50 acres be encompassed. But the act states that assistance can be given on no more than 50 acres. That is the limitation which exists in the law.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman from Minnesota will yield further, if I understand the gentleman from Texas correctly, then it would be only a simple plan on that portion of the farm that he may want to improve as pastureland and the ASC and the Soil Conservation Service will be the agencies within the Department of Agriculture who will furnish the assistance in the carrying out of this operation, and the ASC administering this program.

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes; the gentleman is essentially correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the Appalachian region has many natural resources. One of its most abundant resources—and certainly one of its most valuable—is the annual rainfall.

This region enjoys one of the highest annual rainfalls in the United States. It is only exceeded by some sections of the southern delta and some sections of the Pacific Northwest.

Throughout the northern half of the Eastern United States, great lakes dot the terrain. These lakes were made during the ice age, as the glaciers pushed south. Unfortunately for Appalachia, the glacier movement stopped short of most of its territory.

As a consequence, natural impoundments, which these northern lakes provide for the area, are not found in Appalachia. The impoundments must be man made, just as they were in the Tennessee Valley.

If they are not created, a good bit of the developable land in Appalachia will remain unsuitable for economic development because of periodic floods. And because there is such a shortage of level land in Appalachia, the necessity for its protection becomes even more obvious.

Furthermore, this high average rainfall, which now spills down the slopes of the Appalachian Mountains into raging streams, can be put to far better recreational, industrial, and residential use if it is properly impounded.

The natural beauty of Appalachia will only be fully utilized when its water is controlled. This controlled water, held in big and small reservoirs, will insure the development of a year-round recreation industry in Appalachia.

These same impoundments can provide a constant supply of clean water for industrial and residential use.

The purpose of section 206 is to provide a coordinated plan under which these impoundments can be programmed and constructed. This section requires a comprehensive, regionwide survey of all of the Appalachian water resources and a recommendation as to how each resource can be best exploited.

Specifically, this study, which will be coordinated by the Secretary of the Army will have three objectives:

First. To consider the needs for water resources development in terms of total economic development of the region and to assess how such development can stimulate economic growth.

Second. To relate potentials for water resources development to other actions planned to stimulate the economy.

Third. To develop a general plan and action program in keeping with regional planning.

In meeting these objectives, full consideration will be given to the preparation of a general plan that would assist Appalachia to compete with other regions of the Nation, taking into account the impacts of such a developmental program on those regions. The plan and specific projects will be formulated under current administration guidelines and procedures governing river basin and project planning which are printed in Senate Document No. 97.

To complete this study, the Secretary is directed to work closely with all agencies, Federal, State, and local, which have an interest in this subject.

I would like to point out that the particular interest of the Tennessee Valley

Authority would be totally protected under this section. It is not intended that the Secretary would overlap or duplicate any of the TVA programs. With the assistance of TVA and the other Federal agencies and the Commission, general planning criteria would be established as the basis for preparation of the plan, consistent with the study objectives and sound planning objectives. This framework would provide the basis for TVA to assess its program in view of the study objectives, and to consider further water resources development in the TVA portion of Appalachia which it would accomplish consistent with the overall comprehensive plan for the region.

It must be clearly understood that this comprehensive plan in no way commits the President or the Congress to its findings. Each of the specific recommendations within the plan will require new authorization. While this comprehensive plan will become part of the overall regional plan to be developed by the Appalachian Regional Commission, it should not be interpreted as a blanket authorization.

Current procedures established by law for seeking congressional authorization and appropriations for water resource projects will be used as the basis for plan implementation and administration. It is not contemplated that either a new Federal agency or Government corporation would be required for this purpose. The scope of the program would be similar to program recommendations contained in river basin studies such as the Delaware River. The plan would embrace the programs of the Federal and State agencies concerned who would be responsible for implementing their programs under their procedures.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, the contents of the bill and the objectives of the whole regional approach of the Appalachia program all are directed at the most severely distressed area in America.

I shall attempt to limit myself to one major proposal being advanced by the other side to the whole of the bill, and that is the criteria for AWA and area redevelopment applied to these counties.

First. When the accelerated public works bill was brought up—and I happen to be one of the authors, and one of the many sponsors of the program—it worked splendidly. The accelerated public works program, like the area redevelopment program, is a proposal in which there is primary Federal assistance in terms of grants that is literally a rifleshoot into a given community for a specific purpose—water facilities, nursing homes, hospitals, streets and lighting, and so forth, for short-term immediate assistance. The ARA is to encourage private industry on a longer term range. But the whole concept of this area redevelopment is a continuity not only of geography but a continuity of history in which depletion of resources characterizes the source of the economic problems which cause them all. The problems are quite similar, whether it be West Virginia, Pennsylvania, eastern Tennessee, eastern Kentucky, or western North Carolina, or north-central Alabama and

Mississippi. There is a concept. There is a continuity, and the concept of this regional approach involves areas which are rural and semirural.

Let us say we undertake a project, and let us say it will be a vocational training school. It will most likely serve an area, and within that area will be several counties. We call it multicounty—five, six, or seven. It will happen once in a while that these four, five, or six depressed counties that need help will be adjacent to a county a little better off, primarily a municipality. This merely says when such instances arise the program to be undertaken will serve the best interests of most of the people. Say we have a municipality nearby in proximity or encircled by five distressed counties. It would not take much more money to enlarge the facilities for vocational training and other school facilities with minimum costs which will be utilized in training untrained and unskilled youngsters or dropouts from the rural area. Under this program the people will likewise seek employment now that they have a school in that urban center. The same would be true if you had a health center. Would it not be better to utilize the medical facilities of a community such as that and expanding it somewhat in the service of the surrounding rural area than to build small, inadequate medical centers in each of the counties?

This concept is better than eliminating certain counties and having a patchwork type of operation, the only effect of which would be to erect barriers or to erect impediments and make it more difficult to have an effective program.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act has one purpose—regional economic development. The argument that there are no standards for eligibility of counties to receive assistance misses the whole point of the regional approach to economic development.

The regional effort outlined in this bill calls for a combination of the best efforts of both the rich and the poor areas of Appalachia. The small, sparsely settled counties of the region cannot hope to take, on their own, the steps that are essential to future economic development. They must join with their more prosperous neighbors in a common effort.

This cooperation is essential—it is the major objective of the Governors of the Appalachian States who signed the report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission and who gave their total support to this bill in their statements to the House Public Works Committee.

This cooperation cannot take place if the funds which are to be spent under this bill can only be spent in the counties eligible for accelerated public works. I would like to use a hypothetical example to illustrate this point.

If we are to create regional health centers under section 202 of this bill, it would be foolish to restrict the location of these centers only to poor counties. Let us assume that a regional health center is to serve a combination of five counties. The road patterns in those five counties might lead to a convergence of the best roads at a single locality. Yet

that locality might be located in a county which is ineligible under the Accelerated Public Works Act. If this amendment were to be adopted, those five counties would have to plan the location of the regional health center at a site outside of the ineligible county. Such an arbitrary restriction might destroy the value of such a center.

This same kind of example can extend to all of the sections of this bill. A vocational training center might best be located in a county ineligible by accelerated public works standards. The same thing might be true for an airport which could be assisted under section 214, the supplemental grant section.

Alternatively, suppose a somewhat urbanized county is eligible for accelerated public works but its future is darkened by water pollution originating in an upstream area that is not eligible. Under this amendment, the accelerated public works eligible county could not be helped by a sewage treatment facility upstream.

I cannot believe that Congress would wish to create such an inflexible standard which would, in effect, create impediments, obstruct, and waste the dollars invested. If we pass this bill, we have stated in its preamble and I quote:

The public investments made in the region under this act shall be concentrated in areas where there is a significant potential for future growth and where the expected return on public dollars invested will be the greatest.

This amendment would make such an investment policy impossible. It would require us to scatter our investments in only those counties that are eligible under accelerated public works standards. Furthermore, there is no apparent rhyme or reason to the accelerated public works standard in terms of measuring need within the Appalachian region.

There are at present 76 Appalachian counties which are ineligible for accelerated public works assistance. This leaves 284 of the counties eligible under that act. In the 284 counties that are eligible for accelerated public works assistance, 30.1 percent of the families have an income of below \$3,000 a year. In the 76 counties which are ineligible, 30.6 percent of the families suffer from such a low living standard.

The present per capita income in the 284 eligible counties is \$1,411. The per capita income in the 76 which are ineligible is \$1,426.

I submit that these differences are so minute as to be nonexistent. Yet this amendment would require us to make a distinction as to where dollars could be spent.

Let me give you an even more revealing set of figures. In one of the counties in the State of Washington which is eligible for accelerated public works, the per capita income is \$1,914. Contrast that to the per capita income in Oconee County in South Carolina which is ineligible for accelerated public works. That per capita income is \$1,094.

Or let us look at Bay County in Michigan which is eligible for accelerated public works and has a per capita income of \$1,719. Then contrast that to Monroe County in eastern Kentucky which is

ineligible for accelerated public works and which has a per capita income of \$763.

I am convinced that the accelerated public works standards are arbitrary, too rigid, and would not truly measure the need in any given section of the country and the application of those standards will certainly thwart any attempt at a regional development program.

I would point out to you that one of Appalachia's greatest problems is its lack of cities and towns. This is a region in which 50 percent of the people are classified as rural as against only 30 percent nationally. One of the main objectives of the Appalachian program is to promote stronger ties between the rural areas and the urban areas of the region.

Knox County, Tenn., and Buncombe County, N.C., are growing urban centers that are surrounded by small rural counties whose economic development will have to be closely tied to these growing urban centers.

In the past the economic problems of Appalachia have been primarily solved by an outmigration of those people who could not find work within the region. They left for other parts of the country—primarily the large cities of the East and Middle West.

I believe that this bill offers an alternative. I believe that the people of Appalachia can find employment within the region but it can only be found in those places which can attract industry. I believe that this bill will permit the people who live in small rural counties to commute to their jobs. They can continue to live where they obviously want to live in the hills and hollows of Appalachia.

Commuting to work has become one of the dominant patterns of American life. Our metropolitan areas are filled with people who spend from 1 to 3 hours a day making the trip back and forth to their business.

In such metropolitan areas that time spent commuting may only take them a distance of 10 to 18 miles each way. With good roads, with other decent facilities, that time in Appalachia could cover far larger distances.

Gentlemen, this is what regionalism is all about in Appalachia. I urge you not to create an arbitrary obstacle that would thwart the achievement of that regional goal.

I could go on and on and give you many other illustrations in which (a) the aid is not an adequate reflection of the need, and (b) we need to attack these problems on an areawide and multi-county basis which combine to make an overall regional program in which the problem, the people, the end result, and the root causes are all considered.

I am not going to tolerate any more all this talk of these people who have a substitute, who have opposed everything and anything in whatever form we have proposed in the 18 years I have been here. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] and I, 15 years ago brought up the Youth Conservation Corps, which finally—and I congratulate him and his associates—got through last

year, over undying opposition of these opponents of this bill. The Water Pollution Control Act was finally passed in spite of their opposition.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. Let me complete my litany.

The area redevelopment bill, every line, every chapter, in the whole bill was opposed and they proposed a substitute. The Area Redevelopment Act was called by the gentleman from Florida the worst piece of legislation that has ever been advocated on the floor of the House.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, inasmuch as he has mentioned my name?

Mr. BLATNIK. No.

What is the issue? The issue is, This is the first most important attack on the problem and will help the people who need it most. It will assist 15.3 million people living in depressed parts of 11 States.

I urge that the bill as reported be adopted without change.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Minnesota, in the first place, it is amazing to me to see the gentleman from Minnesota condemning so vehemently the test that they themselves proposed—and the gentleman was one of the major proponents of the test—of what is a depressed area under area redevelopment and under accelerated public works. Now we are adopting that test on the basis of where there are needs because of unemployment throughout America.

Then we are trying to make a good program out of what is a bad program relating to Appalachia—a good highway program out of what is a bad one in Appalachia.

We are trying to put within proper focus these programs that have long-range effect on unemployment and may do something about it. We opposed accelerated public works for the obvious reason that it failed and it will continue to fail. The record of it proves that it failed. There is no question about it—when it costs an average of more than \$10,000 per man-year to provide one additional job on a temporary basis on a make-work public works project program. That is an utter failure. It was such a bad failure that the Congress did not even see fit to authorize any additional authorization for it last year. Area Redevelopment Act was such a failure in its application that they did not even see fit to appropriate any more money for it. These facts speak for themselves. The test of what is a depressed area is the only thing adopted in the substitute and the program in the substitute is one that has a long-range effect.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Appalachia bill. I represent 14 counties comprising the First

Congressional District of the State of Tennessee.

We are ready to go with the passage of this bill. The highway provision alone, contained therein, will open up a new vista of industrial and tourist development, which will give us an opportunity to help ourselves. Give us the tools and we will do the job.

I urge the passage of this measure.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 presents a comprehensive, long-range plan for Appalachia. The enactment of this bill should provide this mountain region with a basis for economic rehabilitation and growth. At last millions of people in Appalachia will have some reason to hope that they and their children will not live out their lives in poverty and despair. And when I am talking of Appalachia, I am thinking also of those counties of New York State—the counties along its southern border which share many of the problems of the rest of Appalachia.

This bill is needed because Appalachia is a hard core of underdevelopment in this country. It is needed because State and local government efforts in the region have not sufficed.

Despite local bootstrap efforts to overcome unemployment and poverty, unemployment and poverty persist. A low level of educational achievement and a high incidence of public assistance cases persist. An inadequate tax base and a lack of regional coordination have frustrated attempts to solve problems which expand with each year of neglect.

No one State or locality can, by itself, solve the problems of polluted and wasted water resources in Appalachia. No one State or locality can salvage the wasted land, and all the wasted human resources. A coordinated approach is needed.

This approach is provided in this bill. The creation of the Appalachian Regional Commission will furnish a focal point for Appalachian programs and projects. It will be a forum where the States, citizens, and the Federal Government can come together to consider the problems of the region. This is in keeping with our democratic traditions.

Democracy and the national interest will certainly be served by this coordinated regional approach. As the report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission said:

In the future, Appalachia's potential of timberland, fossil energy, and recreational water and wilderness will be required for the satisfaction of our national goals. But further resource activity in the region—if uncoordinated in its timing or its relationship to human and social capital—could repeat the past pattern and make little more than a piecemeal improvement of the Appalachian social and economic substructure.

This statement by the Commission is not to be taken lightly, as the long-continuing problems of Appalachia aptly il-

lustrate. A major, comprehensive effort must be made, and I hope that the legislation we are considering will generate that effort.

In the application of the provisions of this bill, true resource improvement can be visualized. The construction of roads, for example, will open up areas to tourism and allow residents to commute to employment centers. Additional roads will allow schools to be consolidated and thus provide better teaching facilities.

Medical centers will be constructed in areas where they are most needed to build up the health of residents. The construction of additional sewers will help clean up streams and provide a more healthful environment.

Basic improvements are also to be looked for in the survey of water resources and the study of strip and surface mining provided for in this bill. These surveys are necessary first steps in comprehensive rehabilitation of land and water.

Another of the constructive provisions of this bill provides supplementary grants-in-aid to allow communities to participate in existing Federal programs. Too often Appalachian communities have not been able to participate fully in Federal grant-in-aid programs for the construction of hospitals, airports, and other public facilities. They are too poor to provide the required percentage of matching funds necessary to obtain these public facilities, and become poorer because they do not have the facilities. They cannot attract industry and commerce or keep their young people. The downward economic spiral is accelerated.

The provision of supplementary grants-in-aid will help local communities participate in those Federal programs which stimulate the economy.

The carefully studied sections in the bill are intended to help bring the lagging Appalachian region up toward a decent economic level.

I am concerned that, while certain counties of New York State have problems similar to Appalachia, New York State is not participating in the Appalachian program. In the very beginning, the State of New York was invited to participate in the planning of the Appalachian program but declined to do so. Several other Appalachian States did not participate at first but came in later. New York never did.

I think it is unfortunate that the Appalachian section of New York was not included in the original study and bill. However, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY's timely amendment to S. 3 as it was approved by the Senate has opened the door for the inclusion of that part of New York State which is really a part of Appalachia. The southern tier counties of New York that lie adjacent to the northernmost counties of Pennsylvania, which are already included in S. 3, are part of the Appalachian Mountain chain and share many of the characteristics of their neighbors across the State line. Many communities are relatively isolated. Young people are leaving the region.

A high percentage of the families have disturbingly low incomes. As Senator

KENNEDY pointedly remarked in introducing his amendment:

Of the 199,000 families in the 13 counties of the southern tier, more than 23,000—nearly 12 percent—have incomes of under \$2,000 a year, according to the 1960 census. In fact, these New York counties are less free from poverty than many counties now included in S. 3.

Their educational attainments are comparable to those in the rest of Appalachia and far below the average for the United States. Thus, in the 13 New York counties referred to by Senator KENNEDY's amendment, of the men and women 25 years of age and over, only 14.5 percent have completed 4 years of high school, compared with 45 percent for the United States as a whole.

Let me refer to a few of the statements by leaders and other representative citizens of these southern tier counties to illustrate my point and to show how the development programs under this bill might bring about a revival of well-being and progress in this area.

In Salamanca, in Cattaraugus County, just north of Allegany State Park, Mayor Keith L. Reed has reported that about 300 of the town's population of 8,400 now draw unemployment checks. Many more have exhausted their benefits or were not eligible for them in the first place. For the past 10 years the town has been going downhill. The repair yards of the Erie-Lackawanna Railroad, once the economic backbone of the area, have gradually been closed down, and only two furniture factories and some small industries remain. Mayor Reed states flatly:

We need help now. We've got a sewer system to build. Taxes are going up and the number of jobs is going down. I hope the Appalachia program can give us something.

The Appalachia program could provide assistance to build such a sewer.

Two counties to the east, in Steuben County, Mayor Harold A. Hogue of Hornell tells a similar story. Here too, the Erie-Lackawanna shop was shut down, its work shifted to Pennsylvania, leaving a wide gap in employment. Mayor Hogue declared:

We're miles and miles from the main highways. We need help. We need an expressway, sewers, and a water conservation project.

About 80 percent of the funds under the Appalachia Regional Development Act are designated for highway construction, to provide better access to communities just like Mayor Hogue's.

Still further east, in Binghamton in Broome County, Mayor John J. Burns explains that welfare costs in his city have risen to the point of being the costliest item in Binghamton's annual budget of \$15 million. He continues:

What we need is Federal help in retraining those made jobless by automation and the less educated. We also need development of our water resources.

Between the Economic Opportunity Act and the Appalachian program, these needs can be met.

Route 17 runs through this southern tier of counties. If it could be made

into an expressway—and, in my judgment the Appalachian Regional Development Act could be expected to provide the impetus necessary for such an expressway—more industry would be attracted to these counties, as transport to markets becomes easier and faster.

Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly that the State of New York should have taken advantage of the opportunity to participate in a great regional program at its inception. I hope that the amendment providing that the inclusion of these southern tier counties in the Appalachian program be studied by the Appalachian Regional Commission will result in extending the program for the benefit of New York State.

All parts of Appalachia, including its New York counties, should participate in this program. We must raise the economic level of the entire Appalachian region. We can start by passing this bill and demonstrating our belief, as we did when we passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, that this country must do everything possible to wipe out poverty and misery wherever it occurs.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, the needs of the Appalachian region of America are great.

For over 10 years the Members of this Congress and the various administrations which have succeeded each other have looked to this region and have deplored the vast spectacle of an area that is clearly rich in fine workers and great natural resources, falling into poverty, or remaining mired in the poverty into which it had previously fallen.

We have had attempts in the past to provide assistance to the Appalachian area. The Area Redevelopment Act, which I have supported in the past, brought some help. Other acts passed by the Congress brought partial help. But there was never a concentrated effort to bring about the rehabilitation of that area. The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 proposes to make such an effort, and so I shall support it.

This is a bill that brings a broad range of help to the Appalachian region. I shall not attempt to detail the various programs which are proposed, but some comment is certainly in order on their general nature.

We are all well aware that transportation is the lifeblood of any nation. Under provisions of this bill, the construction of highways, both primary and secondary, will move forward at a greatly accelerated pace. The construction of such roads will undoubtedly contribute significantly to the attraction of tourists to this area, which is one of the scenic wonderlands of the world. The mountain barriers of the Appalachian Mountains will no longer be barriers to trade and transportation. Highway routes through these mountains will become not only avenues through which visitors may come to view the natural beauties of the area,

but will also be the avenues along which new commerce may flow, and beside which new industries may grow.

There are also provisions for the health services in the Appalachian region. Too long have too many people of this region suffered the deprivations brought about by ill health. Too long have they lacked the consultant value of excellent clinics in the field of maternal care, child care, mental health, and communicable diseases. Through this bill it is proposed to open new dimensions in health facilities in the Appalachian region, particularly in the field of outpatient treatment. This may be a most significant part of this act.

There are provisions also for land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control. We have, in the past Congress, made bold new steps in the field of conservation. We are proposing new steps in this Congress, and I believe them to be good ones. In the Appalachian region, with its vast range of mountains and hills, we are plagued with the ever-present problem of hillside erosion. It is a problem that has reduced farming productivity and one that has also scarred the beauty of the region. Through a program of land utilization, the control of runoff, and other allied programs, it is now proposed to meet this problem—to reclaim land and to conserve both its use and its beauty for the future. Closely allied to this is the program of timber management, through which it is hoped that the beautiful forests of this region may not only be preserved for future generations, but may be made even more productive than they were in the past when timber was a major industry of the region.

Of enormous significance is that program which proposes to reclaim the coal lands of this region. If you have traveled through this region, as I have so often traveled through my own district, you may see the scarred landscape that strip mining has left in its wake. If you will linger with us in the coal region, you may learn of the mine fires, the mine subsidence, the stream pollution that we live with daily. That an expanded program of reclamation of these coal lands is included in this bill would be sufficient reason for my support. I am pleased to see it coupled with so many other good provisions. Closely tied to this is the water resources program, which will not only control floods, but which will also contribute to the fight against stream pollution.

There are new provisions in the field of vocational education, sewage treatment, as well as important provisions to provide assistance to local communities who cannot raise sufficient local money to take advantage of such programs as the Hill-Burton Act.

For all of these reasons, and for the other sections of this bill I have not mentioned, I am supporting this bill enthusiastically.

I am well aware that this is not a perfect bill. There are amendments which I would like to see included in this bill which would strengthen certain sections which deal with strip mining, and I would like also to see an amendment to provide for needed assistance to people

whose homes have suffered mine subsidence. But to attempt to amend this bill here on the floor would mean the problem of the resolution of these amendments in a House-Senate conference, and this is clearly undesirable at this particular time. Delay in the passage of this bill would only add days, or weeks, or possibly months to the time it would go into effect. There is no reason to delay, so I will support the bill with no amendments in the interest of seeing it passed and made effective now.

It has been said that this is a regional bill. It is indeed. It is not the first, and it will benefit a region that sorely needs benefits. But I hope that all my colleagues will realize that the rebuilding, the reclamation of the Appalachian area will benefit not only Appalachia. Whatever prosperity this brings to our region will redound to the prosperity of all America. It may not be the perfect bill we would like to see written. But it is a good bill, a needed bill, and a bill that is needed today. I will support it vigorously.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding—and may I commend and congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Alabama and his committee for reporting this measure to the House. This is an important bill.

I rise in unqualified and unequivocal support of S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as recommended by the Committee on Public Works.

I know the urgency of this legislation, Mr. Chairman. I know its necessity. I know its need.

I know something of what it means to be caught in the grinding gears of poverty for generation after generation. I know what it means to be deprived of livelihood, to be deprived of opportunity, to be deprived of education, to be deprived of the basic ideal of equal opportunity inherent in a democratic society. I have seen them in the faces of people.

I know the effect of these denials, the effect of this human erosion, because it exists in many of the counties of my district which stretches across Tennessee from the Alabama to the Kentucky borders.

I have seen the face of poverty and it is not pretty.

I have seen men grown old beyond their years because of the economic trap that has condemned them to lives of futility and disillusionment.

I have seen women bent by despair and hopelessness in the desperate struggle to feed their families.

I have seen children denied an education because they had no shoes.

This legislation, Mr. Chairman, is couched in terms of economic develop-

ment, of highway development, of development of natural resources. It embraces an 11-State area that includes 165,000 square miles and more than 15 million people. It involves 8.5 percent of our total population.

It includes a 5-year road construction program to cost \$1.2 billion—\$840 million from the Federal Government and \$340 million from the States.

It includes a program of health center construction.

It includes preparation of a program of water resource development.

It includes an accelerated program of vocational education.

It includes reclamation of areas eroded by strip mining and revival of timber development.

It includes an effort to revitalize the bituminous coal industry.

It includes urban development planning grants and grants to local development units.

This is a program keyed to the community level, a program in which the States will have the primary responsibility for planning through the Appalachian Regional Commission.

It is a program keyed to resource development—a program aimed at creating the climate in which the private sector of the economy can move in and operate in accordance with our free enterprise system to create jobs and opportunities.

It is all these things.

But essentially, it is an investment in human capital—the most economically—the most morally enlightened investment this Nation can make.

Between 1950 and 1960 the Appalachian area lost 640,000 jobs in agriculture and mining operations. Its decline in agriculture was almost twice as rapid as that of the remainder of the country. The decline in mining was 58 times as fast.

The annual per capita income is \$500 lower than the national average. Unemployment averages 50 percent higher than the national rate.

It is an area torn between the old and the new.

It is underdeveloped because of its terrain and the tremendous scope of work involved in development.

It is caught in the backwash of automation because of the displacement of men with machinery in mining and agriculture. Its economy is not diversified to the extent that it can absorb the impact of unemployment.

If the citizens of Appalachia had their per capita income raised to the national average, \$5.2 billion would be added to the country's annual rate of personal income.

Development of this region will mean that the welfare rolls will be reduced and that private payrolls will be increased. Public welfare assistance now totals \$375 million a year in Appalachia. But the toll in the social injustice cannot be measured in dollars and cents—its toll is in the waste of human lives—the waste of human resources.

It is crystal clear that in this bill we have an opportunity to accomplish works which will contribute enormously

to the well-being and the advancement—not only of Appalachia but of our entire country.

The residents of Appalachia itself will be the direct beneficiaries. But their neighbors and their fellow citizens everywhere in this land cannot fail to recognize that they too will share abundantly in the great benefits deriving from a revitalized, prosperous, and progressive Appalachia.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, the whole life of our Nation—economic, social, educational, cultural, and moral—will be enriched and strengthened by the new energy and purpose that will be released through this development program in a region which has had much more than its share of difficulty.

Under the provisions of this proposed act, we will be helping people to help themselves in the truest sense of that phrase.

All of the assistance that would be provided is of the kind that stimulates private initiative and encourages individuals to develop and make fuller use of their God-given capacities.

This program is a complete departure from the welfare approach. Its success, I repeat, will make possible important decreases in welfare program costs.

Federal welfare payments in Appalachia now amount to more than \$375 million annually. Appalachia contains 8.5 percent of the Nation's population but receives almost 12 percent of the Federal public assistance funds. The regional development plan we are considering offers a practical and economical way to turn despondent welfare clients into creative and happy wage earners—and taxpayers.

This program commends itself to all our States because all the Nation will benefit by its implementation.

When one section of the country prospers—all America prospers.

We cannot and must not be provincial in our outlook when America and American people are concerned.

This program merits the enthusiastic support of true advocates of American progress, for it is based squarely on the resource development principle.

The soundness of this approach has been proved over and over again in many actions by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, if I emphasize my support of this program with some feeling, it is because of the awareness I have of the situation through long and close association with courageous people who live daily with the problems of Appalachia.

In the Cumberland of Tennessee, there is now a vigorous stirring of new hope that remoteness and isolation will be banished by the construction of a north-south highway under the Appalachian regional development program.

The developmental highway program has been planned to open up isolated areas and to provide better access for other communities whose growth has long been retarded by the inadequacy of transportation facilities. This is an essential first step in the bringing in of new industry and the encouragement of new settlement, growth, and progress.

The economic resurgence stimulated by the new developmental highways will help to reverse the outmigration trend which has severely penalized many of our Appalachian communities. And this will contribute importantly to the achievement of better balanced national growth and development.

By creating conditions which will enable our smaller communities better to hold their populations—particularly their young people—we open the doors to a happier and healthier life for more American citizens.

By promoting development which will make less developed or underdeveloped communities more accessible and more economically attractive, we attack both the problem of the overgrown cities and the problem of the undergrown small towns and rural areas.

This regional development program is right for the orderly, rational, and healthy growth of America.

In our section of Appalachia, we have great resources in the soil—in the forests on the land—in the minerals under the land—in our streams and lakes—and above all in the hardy people who have occupied this noble land since it was first settled by the pioneers.

There will be other areas of America needing and requiring attention—other Appalachias. The results of this measure may well serve as an inspiration for other similar actions by the Congress. So let us begin by passing this bill now.

Appalachia has a golden future—if we provide the region with the keys to opportunity. This bill contains those keys, Mr. Chairman, and I urge its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the text of the bill, H.R. 4466, as follows: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Resources Development Act of 1965'."

"FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that some areas of the United States, which may be abundant in natural resources and rich in potential, lag behind the rest of the Nation in economic growth and that the people of such areas have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity. It is, therefore, the purpose of this Act to assist these areas in meeting their special problems, to promote their economic development, and to establish a framework for joint Federal and State efforts toward providing the basic facilities essential to their growth and attacking their common problems and meeting their common needs on a coordinated and concerted basis. The public investments made under this Act shall be concentrated in areas where there is the greatest potential for future growth, and where the expected return on public dollars invested will be the greatest. As these areas obtain the needed physical and transportation facilities and develop their human resources, the Congress expects that

such areas will generate diversified industries, and that these areas will then be able to support themselves, through the workings of a strengthened free enterprise economy.

"ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT HIGHWAYS"

"Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to assist in the construction of economic development highways. Such highways, in conjunction with Federal-aid highways and other public highways and roads shall be designed to open up areas with an economic developmental potential where commerce and communication are inhibited by lack of adequate highway access. The provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are applicable to the Federal-aid primary systems and which are not inconsistent with this Act, shall apply to the economic development highways provided for in this section, except that the provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are applicable to the Federal-aid secondary system and which are not inconsistent with this Act shall apply to any economic development highways added to such system. Each development highway not already on the Federal-aid primary system shall be added to such system, except that not to exceed three thousand miles of development highways may be added to the Federal-aid secondary system.

"(b) As soon as feasible after enactment of this Act the State highway department of each State shall submit to the Secretary its recommendations with respect to (1) the general corridor location and termini of economic development highways, within the State, not exceeding a mileage equal to 5 per centum of the total mileage of highways then designated on the Federal-aid primary system within the State, and (2) priorities for construction of the major segments of such highways. Such recommendations shall be accompanied by a certificate of the Governor of the State that the recommendations have been developed after consultation with the State agencies concerned with conservation and development of natural resources, and public health and welfare.

"(c) All economic development highways designated as such pursuant to this section shall serve eligible areas (1) which have an economic developmental potential that can be promoted by adequate highway access, and (2) where commerce, communication, and realization of economic development potential have been inhibited by lack of adequate highway access.

"(d) The Secretary shall have authority to approve in whole or in part the recommendations of the State highway department or to require modifications or revisions thereof. As soon as feasible after enactment of this Act, but in any event not later than January 30, 1966, the Secretary shall designate economic development highway routes in each State having an eligible area meeting the criteria set forth in subsection (c) of this section, and not exceeding ten thousand miles in total length. Funds available for economic development highways shall be used to pay the Federal share of the cost of construction and improvement of such highways. The Federal share payable on account of any such highway project shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of construction, unless the Secretary determines that the State does not have the economic and financial capacity to supply its percentage of such costs and that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, but in no event shall the Federal share payable on account of any project exceed 70 per centum of the cost of construction.

"(e) Sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure on the economic development highways shall be apportioned among the several States by the Secretary on or

before January 1 next preceding the commencement of each fiscal year, in the following manner:

"(1) For the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, June 30, 1967, and June 30, 1968, in the manner provided in section 104(b)(1) of title 23, United States Code, for the apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system.

"(2) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and succeeding fiscal years, in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the economic development highways in each State, as determined and approved in the manner provided in this paragraph bears to the sum of the estimated cost of completing such highways in all of the States. As soon as the highway routes have been designated pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, the Secretary, in the cooperation with the State highway departments, shall make a detailed estimate of the cost of completing the economic development highways as then designated, after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, in accordance with rules and regulations adopted by him and applied uniformly to all of the States. The Secretary shall transmit such estimates to the Senate and the House of Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1967. Upon approval of such estimate by the Congress, the Secretary shall use such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and succeeding fiscal years, unless and until the Congress shall direct a different manner of apportionment.

"(f) To carry out this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the sum of \$400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

"DEMONSTRATION HEALTH FACILITIES"

"Sec. 4. (a) In order to demonstrate the value of adequate health and medical facilities to the economic development of any eligible area, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for the construction and equipment of multicounty demonstration health facilities, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic and treatment centers, and other facilities necessary to health of persons in any eligible area. Grants for such construction (including initial equipment) shall be made in accordance with the applicable provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291-291z) and the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (77 Stat. 282), without regard to any provisions therein relating to appropriation authorization ceiling or to allotments among the States. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States made pursuant to any other provision of law.

"(b) No grant under this section for construction (including initial equipment) shall exceed 80 per centum of the cost of the project. Not to exceed \$82,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 18 shall be available for construction grants under this section.

"TIMBER DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS"

"Sec. 5. (a) In order that any eligible area shall more fully benefit from the timber stands that are one of its prime assets, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to—

"(1) provide technical assistance in the organization and operation, under State law, of private timber development organizations having as their objective the carrying out of timber development programs to improve timber productivity, and quality, and in-

crease returns to landowners through establishment of private nonprofit corporations, which on a self-supporting basis, may provide (A) continuity of management, good cutting practices, and marketing services, (B) physical consolidation of small holdings or administrative consolidation for efficient management under long-term agreement, (C) management of forest lands, donated to the timber development organizations for demonstrating good forest management, on a profitable and taxpaying basis, and (D) establishment of a permanent fund for perpetuation of the work of the corporations to be composed of donations, real or personal, for educational purposes.

"(2) provide not more than one-half of the initial capital requirements of such timber development organizations through loans under the applicable provisions of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 (7 U.S.C. 1926 et seq.). Such loans shall not be used for the construction or acquisition of facilities for manufacturing, processing or marketing forest products.

"(b) Not to exceed \$10,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 18 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

"MINING AREA RESTORATION"

"Sec. 6. (a) In order to further the economic development of any eligible area presently damaged by deleterious mining practices, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to—

"(1) make financial contributions to the State in which such eligible area is located to seal and fill voids in abandoned coal mines in accordance with the provisions of the Act of July 15, 1955 (30 U.S.C. 571 et seq.), without regard to section 2(b) thereof (30 U.S.C. 572(b)) or to any provisions therein limiting assistance to anthracite coal formations, or to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Grants under this paragraph shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act.

"(2) plan and execute projects for extinguishing underground and outcrop mine fires in any eligible area in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 31, 1954 (30 U.S.C. 551 et seq.), without regard to any provisions therein relating to annual appropriation authorization ceilings. Grants under this paragraph shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act.

"(3) expand and accelerate fish and wildlife restoration projects in any eligible area in accordance with the provisions of the Act of September 2, 1937 (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.), and the Act of August 9, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 777 et seq.), without regard to any provisions therein relating to apportionments among the States and to limitations on the availability of funds. The expenses of projects under this paragraph shall be paid solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the apportionments among the States pursuant to any other provisions of law.

"(b) For the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal share of mining area restoration projects carried out under subsection (a) of this section and conducted on lands other than federally owned lands shall not exceed 75 per centum of the total cost thereof.

"(c) The Congress hereby declares its intent to provide for a study of a comprehensive, long-range program for the purpose of reclaiming and rehabilitating strip and surface coal and other mining areas in the United States. To this general end, the Secretary of the Interior shall, in full cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and other appropriate Federal, State, and local departments and agencies, make a survey and study of strip and surface mining operations and

their effects in the United States. The Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the President his recommendations for a long-range comprehensive program for reclamation and rehabilitation of strip and surface mining areas in the United States and for the policies under which the program should be conducted, and the President shall submit these to the Congress, together with his recommendations, not later than July 1, 1967. Such study and recommendations shall include, but not be limited to, a consideration of the following matters—

"(1) the nature and extent of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and the conditions resulting therefrom;

"(2) the ownership of the real property involved in strip and surface mining operations;

"(3) the effectiveness of past action by States or local units of government to remedy the adverse effects of strip and surface mining operations by financial or regulatory measures, and requirements for appropriate State legislation, including adequate enforcement thereof, to provide for proper reclamation and rehabilitation of areas which may be strip and surface mined in the future;

"(4) the public interest in and public benefits from which may result from reclamation, rehabilitation, and appropriate development and use of areas subjected to strip and surface mining operations, including (A) economic development growth, (B) public recreation, (C) public health and safety, (D) water pollution, stream sedimentation, erosion control, and flood control, (E) highway programs, (F) fish and wildlife protection and restoration, (G) scenic values, and (H) forestry and agriculture;

"(5) the appropriate roles of Federal, State, and private interests in the reclamation and rehabilitation of strip and surface mining areas and the relative costs to be borne by each, including specific consideration of (A) the extent, if any, to which strip and surface mine operators are unable to bear the cost of remedial action within the limits imposed by the economics of such mining activity, and (B) the extent to which the prospective value of lands and other natural resources, after remedial work has been completed, would be inadequate to justify the landowners doing the remedial work at their expense; and

"(6) the objectives and the total overall costs of a program for accomplishing the reclamation and rehabilitation of existing strip and surface mining areas in the United States, giving adequate consideration to (A) the economic benefits in relation to costs, (B) the prevention of future devastation of reclaimed and rehabilitated areas, (C) the avoidance of unwarranted financial gain to private owners of improved property, and (D) the types of aid required to accomplish such reclamation and rehabilitation.

"(d) No moneys authorized by this Act shall be expended for the purposes of reclaiming, improving, grading, seeding, or reforestation of strip-mined areas except on lands owned by Federal, State, or local bodies of government, until authorized by law after completion of the study and report to the President as provided in subsection (c) of this section.

"(e) Not to exceed \$43,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 18 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

"WATER RESOURCE STUDY

"Sec. 7. (a) The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to make a study of all authorized projects, and all surveys authorized for projects, for flood control, navigation, and beach erosion control, the construction of which projects will be economically beneficial to any eligible area in the development and efficient utilization

of water and related resources, particularly in regard to the need for an increase in the production of economic goods and services within the eligible area, as a means of expanding economic opportunities and thus enhancing the welfare of its people, and for the purpose of determining priorities of construction of such projects and the need for authorization of new surveys, new projects, or additional work, which will provide such benefits for eligible areas.

"(b) The Secretary shall submit a report of the study to the Congress not later than June 30, 1967, together with his recommendations for priorities of the making of surveys and the construction of projects that will be economically beneficial to eligible areas.

"(c) Not to exceed \$5,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 18 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

"AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING ACT OF 1954

"Sec. 8. (a) Section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 461(a)) is amended by striking the word 'and' at the end of paragraph (7), by substituting for the period at the end of paragraph (8) the phrase '; and', and by adding a new paragraph (9) to read as follows:

"(9) States, local development districts, and other State governmental agencies and instrumentalities authorized to administer or carry out programs or projects under the Resources Development Act of 1965."

"(b) Section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 461(b)) is amended by adding before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ', or to States, local development districts, and other State governmental agencies and instrumentalities in connection with planning for the economic development of eligible areas under the Resources Development Act of 1965'.

"VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FACILITIES

"Sec. 9. (a) In order to provide basic facilities to give the people of any eligible area the training and education they need to obtain employment, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for construction of the school facilities needed to provide vocational education for persons of any eligible area for whom such education is not now adequately available. Such grants shall be made in accordance with the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (77 Stat. 403), without regard to any provisions therein relating to appropriation authorization ceilings or to allotments among the States. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States made pursuant to any other provision of law.

"(b) Not to exceed \$32,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 18 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

"SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

"Sec. 10. (a) In order to provide facilities to assist in the prevention of pollution of the waters in any eligible area and to protect the health and welfare of its citizens, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for the construction of sewage treatment works in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.), without regard to any provisions therein relating to appropriation authorization ceilings or to allotments among the States. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States pursuant to any other provision of law.

"(b) Not to exceed \$12,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 18 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

"MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT

"Sec. 11. No State and no political subdivision of such State shall be eligible to receive benefits under this Act unless the aggregate expenditures of State funds, exclusive of Federal funds, for the benefit of all eligible areas within the State are maintained at a level which does not fall below the average level of such expenditures for its last two full fiscal years preceding the date of enactment of this Act. In computing the aggregate expenditures of State funds and the average level of expenditure for its last two fiscal years, a State's expenditures for participation in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways shall not be included.

"CONSENT OF STATES

"Sec. 12. Nothing contained in this Act shall be interpreted as requiring any State to engage in or accept any program under this Act without its consent.

"PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND PROJECT APPROVAL

"Sec. 13. (a) A program authorized under any section of this Act shall not be implemented until the Secretary administering such program has consulted with the appropriate official or officials concerned with such program as may be designated by the Governor or Governors of the State or States involved and has obtained the recommendations and approval of such official or officials with respect to such program. No project shall be approved for Federal assistance under this Act unless it is approved by such appropriate State official.

"(b) No Federal assistance shall be given under this Act for any project for an area which is not an eligible area on the date such project is finally approved for assistance by the Secretary administering such assistance, except that if such area shall thereafter cease to be an eligible area, this subsection shall not prevent (1) the furnishing of Federal assistance for the completion of such project, or (2) the granting of additional Federal assistance to such area under this Act to complete the construction or equipment of any highway, hospital, health, educational, sewage treatment, or other facility, with respect to which such project has been approved.

"PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA

"Sec. 14. (a) In developing recommendations on the programs and projects to be given assistance under this Act, and in establishing within those recommendations a priority ranking of the requests for Federal assistance, the States shall follow procedures that will insure consideration of the following factors:

"(1) the relationship of the project or class of projects to overall regional development including its location in an area determined by the State to have the greatest potential for growth;

"(2) the population and area to be served by the project or class of projects including the relative per capita income and the unemployment rates in the area;

"(3) the relative financial resources available to the State or political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof which seek to undertake the project;

"(4) the importance of the project or class of projects in relation to other projects or classes of projects which may be in competition for the same funds;

"(5) the prospects that the project for which assistance is sought will improve, on a continuing rather than a temporary basis, the opportunities for employment, the average level of income, or the economic and social development of the area served by the project.

"(b) Nothing in this Act shall authorize any assistance under this Act to be used (1) in relocating establishments from one area to another; (2) to finance the cost of industrial plants, commercial facilities, machinery, or working capital; (3) to finance the cost of facilities for the generation, transmission, or distribution of electric energy; or (4) to finance the cost of facilities for the production, transmission, or distribution of gas (natural, manufactured, or mixed).

"LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS—CERTIFICATION

"SEC. 15. For the purposes of this Act, a 'local development district' shall be an entity certified to the Secretary of Commerce either by the Governor of the State or States in which such entity is located, or by the State officer designated by the appropriate State law to make such certification, as having a charter or authority that includes the economic development of any eligible area, or areas, or parts thereof. Such charter or authority may also include the economic development of areas outside of an eligible area. No entity shall be certified as a local development district for the purposes of this Act unless it is one of the following:

"(1) a nonprofit incorporated body organized or chartered under the law of the State in which it is located;

"(2) a nonprofit agency or instrumentality of a State or local government;

"(3) a nonprofit agency or instrumentality created through an interstate compact; or

"(4) a nonprofit association or combination of such bodies, agencies, and instrumentalities.

"GRANTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS AND FOR RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized—

"(1) to make grants for administrative expenses to local development districts. The amount of any such grant shall not exceed 75 per centum of such expenses attributable to the economic development of eligible areas in any one fiscal year. No grants for administrative expenses shall be made to a local development district for a period in excess of three years beginning on the date the initial grant is made to such development district. The local contributions for administrative expenses may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to space, equipment, and services; and

"(2) either directly or through arrangements with appropriate public or private organizations, to provide funds for investigation, research, studies, and demonstration projects, but not for construction purposes, which will further the purposes of this Act.

"(b) Not to exceed \$11,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 16 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

"ANNUAL REPORT

"SEC. 17. Not later than six months after the close of each fiscal year, each Secretary of an executive department administering any program under this Act shall prepare and submit to the Governor of each State and to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a report on the activities carried out under this Act during such year.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 18. In addition to the appropriations authorized in section 3 for the economic development highways, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the period ending June 30, 1967, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$195,000,000 to carry out this Act.

"APPLICABLE LABOR STANDARDS

"SEC. 19. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the construction, alteration, or repair, including painting and decorating, of projects,

buildings, and works which are financially assisted through the Federal funds authorized under this Act, shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to such labor standards, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176, 64 Stat. 1267, 5 U.S.C. 133—133z-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).

"DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE AREA

"SEC. 20. As used in this Act, the term 'eligible area' shall have the same meaning as is given it in section 3(a) of the Public Works Acceleration Act (76 Stat. 541).

"SEVERABILITY

"SEC. 21. If any provision of this Act, or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 22. This Act shall cease to be in effect on July 1, 1971."

Mr. JONES of Alabama (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, that the amendment be considered as read, and printed, and be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. Moss). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, we are now getting at the heart of the problem, and a square issue is now facing this body. The issue is simply this: Does this body want to enact a long-range, sound program of public works that will have the effect of providing assistance to all depressed areas throughout this Nation—assistance on a sound basis, assistance in those programs which are properly guarded and protected from being pork barrel political-type approaches, programs which, having a long-range effect on employment, might do some good in the effort to combat unemployment where it probably exists throughout America; or, in the alternative—and this is the alternative—is this body going to rubberstamp what the other body did? Is it going to rubberstamp what a commission appointed by the President to deal solely with the problems of one area—portions of 11 States—proposed by way of a program which is not properly drafted, which can be subject to political pork barrel abuse, the like of which we have not seen before even under ARA and APW?

I previously referred to and repeat again, specifically as an example, under the access highway program there can

be built 1,000 miles of highways to any privately owned swimming pool, golf course, ski slide, bathing beach, or what have you, without any standards whatsoever and without any requirement that anyone maintain the highways after they are once built.

Are we going to provide needed, sound assistance to all the areas throughout America, to the 1,400 of such areas in economically depressed areas, or are we going to have assistance on a pork barrel basis, and provide it solely for the Appalachian region?

Are we, as is proposed by the majority and proposed by S. 3, going to provide for socialized medicine by providing for operational costs up to 100 percent for the first 2 years and 50 percent for the next 3 years in the demonstration health facility program, an approach which the committee having jurisdiction over that subject matter refused and turned down only last year?

Those are the basic issues facing this body, as they relate to the Appalachian approach or to the substitute which I am proposing at this time.

Let us discuss the subject and show how the substitute will correct some of the very important shortcomings of the majority proposal. Let us talk about highways for a minute.

Let us talk about the general bill, at the outset. What would the bill do, compared to the substitute? What would S. 3 do, compared to H.R. 4466, the substitute?

First, the substitute would take out the provisions of S. 3 relating to access highways. It would take out the boondoggle approach and put the program under the prescribed primary or secondary standards, which are known and existing standards. It would provide 10,000 miles of highway, nationwide, not duplicating present highways and not improving present highways, but providing highways to open up new areas where needed and not duplicating the presently existing system of highways.

It also would require the local community or the State to maintain those highways. That has been the procedure of highway legislation throughout the history of this country.

Second, it would delete the operation of demonstration health facilities, an amount of \$28 million which I mentioned a moment ago.

It also would provide that the aid be provided for really depressed areas. Some comments were made with respect to the test for determining what are those areas. I will discuss that in just a moment. Those areas would be included all over America, and not just in Appalachia.

It would strike out the boondoggle program relating to agriculture, which is in the majority report, which will do nothing but put into production additional acreage of grazing lands, at 50 acres per farm. That is the approach of S. 3. The substitute would strike it out.

It also would strike out the commission supergovernment concept. That is not needed. The supergovernment commission concept with the Federal veto

power is not needed to accomplish the objectives of this legislation.

If you will look at the substitute measure, I will prove to you that that is the case. If you will look on pages 19, 20, and 21, you will find there that there is a provision for local development districts. In many areas of Appalachia there are in existence development districts. The States in those areas can proclaim the entire Appalachian region in that State as a development district. The Federal Government will provide 75 percent of the first 1 year's operational cost within that region. Those States, as they are proposed, those 11 States, can get together with their districts and have a program planning group act without imposing a layer of super government over the existing agencies in the existing States having a Federal veto. That is the way it should be done. Your existing Government agencies having jurisdiction over every one of these programs would continue to administer it and the States would be the boss of these programs and not the Federal Government with a Federal veto power. So, this substitute does the job as it relates to the Appalachia program and as it relates to applying the good phases of it throughout America.

Now, how about the test mentioned by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], as provided in the APW and ARA bills presently in existence, the same tests that will be applied to depressed areas under the substitute. Certainly the majority here and the gentleman who sponsored the APW could hardly criticize the minority for suggesting that the tests of the depressed areas proposed and actually effectuated in both of those bills and both of those existing acts is not a proper test for this approach. What are these tests? Well, here they are. Under APW those areas—and I am reading from section 3(a) (1)—which the Secretary of Labor designates each month as having been areas of substantial unemployment for at least 9 months in the preceding 12 months. Those areas designated by the said Secretary under the APW as depressed areas.

The area redevelopment formula is well known and established. The counties are known and the number of counties is kept up to date on a quarterly basis. You get the list in your office on a quarterly basis as to what areas are in and what areas are out. Let us take an example of how the minority improved the proposals made by the majority and how it really makes them long-range programs and not just pork barrel favoritism with short-range objectives.

I cite section 3 of the bill dealing with economic development highways. The highways constitute 76 percent of the bill proposed by the majority and they constitute approximately that much in this bill except that this bill applies nationwide. We are not trying to set up a duplicating system of highways, but we are saying that you should build where they are needed, connecting up with existing systems. You do not have to build a whole new system as they are proposing in Appalachia duplicating existing highways.

Second, we say that they must be built to primary and secondary road standards.

Third, we say there should be an allocation limitation to a given State. During the first 2-year period there should be some formula by which these highways are allocated. Under the majority proposal here they say that this is a 5-year program, but nothing in the bill says so. There is nothing to keep 50 percent or 70 percent of the money from going into one State. There is nothing in the bill to prevent it. Our bill says that the mileage shall constitute not to exceed 5 percent of the total mileage of highways existing on the Federal aid primary system as a test for additional mileage. In addition to that, we provide for a test in our highway section providing that they cannot duplicate existing highways. In section 3 of the bill we provide 3,000 of the 10,000 miles nationwide may be built to secondary standards. In addition, what we do is we take the present concept of highway construction, which has proven itself, and we make those same concepts applicable to this development highway program in areas where they are needed and not on a boondoggle approach without standards and without maintenance requirements and trying to build a whole new system duplicating existing systems.

I had a map here earlier showing that in the State of Pennsylvania every single mile of the development highways proposed under the majority proposal, S. 3, is going to be built along duplicating, existing primary highways. This is not going to open up new areas for the development of the economy as is suggested by the majority.

In addition to that we provide for demonstration health facilities, in twice the amount of appropriation, \$82 million. We provide timber development organizations; mining area restoration. We put in water resource study. What is going to happen in Appalachia under the water resource study proposal of the majority? They are going to have to go back and restudy all of these surveys presently underway, programs presently authorized. You are not going to speed up the water resource development at all; you are going to slow it down. But under the proposal of the minority you will speed it up with a proper study relating to existing, authorized programs and the advice of Congress, and whatever else is needed.

We provide amendments to the Housing Act. We provide planning funds to these local development districts. That is included in the minority bill.

We provide vocational education facilities in twice the amount—\$32 million. We provide sewage treatment works in twice the amount—\$12 million.

The consent of the States is required. Grants for demonstration expenses of local development districts are provided.

So what we have done is to take those programs that have been properly drafted and which will have a beneficial effect on a long-range basis in all of the depressed, unemployment areas of America and we have said that this should not be one nation divided; that

we should not set up one region against another, when we know full well that there are going to be depressed areas left out and not included, areas which have an equal if not worse serious unemployment problem. We should not have our Nation divided against itself, region against region against region.

We say support the minority substitute and we will have one nation indivisible with liberty and with equal treatment and antipoverty assistance where needed for all, and not just for Appalachia.

And I say to you that our bill is going to cost substantially less money because the estimates which are in the Record, show that Appalachia alone will cost \$4 billion before you are through with it.

Second, new regions that are being talked about and apparently committed in the other body, according to the record, will cost an additional \$6 billion. So let no one say that our proposal would cost more money. On the face of it it will cost nearly \$100 million less. Our program calls for a 2-year period an amount of \$995 million as compared with \$1,092 million in the majority bill. And this is for one region. This is for only 2 years in the majority proposal. And the new regions coming up are going to increase that cost to a \$10 billion figure.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us not kid ourselves. This is the first of such programs. And you are going to have on the floor of this House, probably sometime next month, another layer of assistance to these areas. Let us do the job now. Let us do the job right. Let us apply it to all depressed areas in America. Let us not stack one program on top of another program, and on top of another program, and at the same time not do the job. So I say that the substitute, H.R. 4466, is the answer, and I think it should be adopted.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Florida for the careful thought he has given to this subject, and to the distinct contributions made during the debate on this measure, S. 3.

The substitute bill offered as an amendment is a constructive proposal which is both fair and equitable as far as the entire Nation is concerned. It is a clear response to the argument that opposition to the Appalachia bill is obstructionist and negative.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida has added to the knowledge and understanding of this broad subject, and this House and the Nation have benefited from the presentation he has made on the debate on this legislation.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, this bill which comes before us, the Appalachian regional development bill, is the product of 5 long years of careful, meticulous, methodic study on the part of the States, the Governors of the States and their appointed representatives on the Appalachian Commission.

Following those 5 long years of study in which more than 400 people participated in the preparation of the reports, the Public Works Committees of this Congress devoted the better part of last year and the early part of this year to a careful item-by-item consideration of this matter, drafting and perfecting a bill designed specifically to cure the particular evils that have dragged this great highland region of our Nation behind the national average.

Now, at this late date, after all these volumes of testimony, after all the years and months of toil and thoughtful contribution on the part of the bipartisan group of Governors of these States, after the labors of this committee last year and the labors of the committee this year have been completed and the bill has been heard in the other body and passed by a margin of almost 3 to 1, at this late date the minority comes up with a scattergun approach. The minority substitute would have us take these basic programs that were designed specifically to cure the evils which have caused a drag upon Appalachia, and just divide them up and scatter them throughout the country in a willy-nilly or a sort of scattergun approach.

Mr. Chairman, this reminds me of a situation in which a man in a community might be desperately ill. He might have consulted a physician and the physician after carefully examining him and based upon his long years of practice would have prescribed certain treatments, certain drugs, certain medication designed for the particular cure of the specific malady of the ill man. Yet someone in the community might come and say, "Well, look here, we have got 10 or 15 or 20 fairly sick people throughout this community—some of them have high blood pressure, some of them have low blood pressure, some of them have lumbago and some of them have the flu and some have chickenpox—so let us take this medication that is designed for this man, as prescribed for his ills, and let us just divide this medicine up and give some of it to all of these other sick people in the community."

Mr. Chairman, that would be just about as scientific as the approach proposed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] that would divide up the programs which were designed to cure the particular maladies and evils of this coal mining, timber producing area and send them willy-nilly throughout the whole country under the premise that it is going to do everybody a little bit of good.

Mr. Chairman, let us consider how this approach would be accepted if applied to other bills. The first bill to be heard yesterday on the Consent Calendar was one modifying the Lake Tarpon project in Florida. The original authorizing legislation for that project allowed some \$1.2 million, if I am not mistaken, of Federal funds for that worthy project. If someone of this House had come up and offered to amend that project so as to divide up the \$1.2 million among all the watersheds of the country that did not have total development, on the ground that we might get one spoonful of dirt moved in each of these watersheds and thus, presumably, do everybody a little bit of good, I wonder what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] would have thought if that approach had been taken on that bill?

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

Mr. WRIGHT. No, not at this point.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is being a little facetious and has mentioned my name.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman from Florida has had the floor on at least two lengthy occasions today and I did not ask the gentleman to yield to me during his 30-minute speech or during his 15-minute speech. I realize that the comparison is somewhat facetious, but I ask the gentleman just to consider how he might feel if some Member should attempt to amend one of his own projects in the same way he is attempting to amend the Appalachian project.

I wonder what our colleagues from Florida would think if the Four Rivers Basin project of Florida, for which, if I remember correctly, we authorized money to the tune of some \$60 million, had been subject to that approach by somebody in this House who might have said "Let us take that \$60 million and amend the bill, strike out where it says Four Rivers Basin in Florida, and divide that \$60 million up all over the country and give a little bit to each group that needs water development and improvement." With that much money we perhaps could have moved a whole shovelful of dirt in each watershed, and by the same reasoning, could have done everybody a little bit of good.

I wonder what would be the reaction of the gentleman from Florida when the Cross-Florida Barge Canal was authorized to the tune of some \$200 million, if someone on the floor of the House had moved to amend that bill said "Let us use this for canals all over the country; we can build 2 miles of canal in each State of the Union, and in that way we will be giving everybody a little bit of good."

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure if any Member of the House rose and said any of those projects were pork barrel the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], would rise in indignation to refute such a charge.

Mr. WRIGHT. I share the certainty of the Speaker's assertion.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman from Texas in his very appropriate remarks has not mentioned the granddaddy of them all, the one referred to by the gentleman from Florida several times as a reclamation program. It is described in the authorizing legislation as the central and southern Florida flood control and drainage project, with an estimated cost of \$263 million.

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

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

Mr. YOUNGER. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Texas, but I cannot correlate his present remarks with his bill to reduce the national debt 1 percent a year. Where does that come in?

Mr. WRIGHT. The bill to reduce the national debt by 1 percent a year was introduced by me some 6 or 7 years ago, and I am still waiting for a hearing on that bill before the appropriate committee. I would say, however, in specific connection with reduction in debt that this particular bill, the Appalachian regional development bill, is designed to make taxpayers out of people who heretofore have been tax liabilities. To that extent, it might have some bearing on the Federal debt. It is designed with the specific motive of helping this particular region which in history and justice is entitled to our consideration, a region which has helped to pay for the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, which has helped to pay for the reclamation program in 17 Western States, which has helped to pay the \$7 billion which we paid in wheat subsidies in the last 4 years, and which has not shared in those programs. I say it is time we address ourselves to this crucial problem in this crucial region in which 8.5 percent of the population has received only 4.9 percent of the Federal tax appropriations.

The Members from the Appalachian region did not come before us when we had programs exclusively affecting the other regions of America and say "We want to divide up that money and share it with all the country." They did not do that when those programs affected California or when those programs would enure to the benefit of Florida or any of the rest of our areas. Did the Members from Appalachia come before us during consideration of any of those programs and want to add an amendment to divide it up all willy-nilly on a scattergun basis, on the theory that maybe it will do everybody a little bit of good? They did not do that. They deserve better treatment than that at this time in the House.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a giveaway program; this is not boondoggling, in spite of the glib insinuations cast around and the occasional use of the term "pork

barrel," which I believe must be defined by some as applying to everything which does not benefit one's own district. In spite of those terms so loosely tossed around, this bill is built upon the premise of helping to provide only the basic structure of roads, communications, and vocational schools necessary to permit that region to pull itself up by its own bootstraps.

The purpose of this bill is not to give a job to everybody, although some 50,000 man-years of work will be provided in the road program to bring prosperity to this remote region. The purpose is not to provide public jobs. The purpose is to provide stimulation for the private sector to take over. It is not the same basic approach as that of the Accelerated Public Works or the Area Redevelopment Act, or that of the poverty program which sought to alleviate personal need. It is an Appalachia-made program designed for the needs of this particular area. It has come to the Congress for that purpose. It is difficult for me to believe that the minority would support that substitute if it were the only bill before us.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I recognize the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure my distinguished colleague from Texas, having been on the committee a long time, for we came to the Congress together and served on this committee during the entire period, must have felt rather facetious relating to the local public work projects, for most of the projects are available throughout America to any community that can meet the requirements. I am sure he was not directing his remarks to the billion-dollar Trinity River program in his home community. What we say in our approach is that when you are building highways to help unemployment they should be available to all areas to meet the standards of employment, and they should be highways built to certain standards and they should be maintained, and they should not be built to swimming pools or ski slides, but rather the public should have a long-range employment effect. That is what we are saying. I am sure the gentleman was talking with his tongue in his cheek.

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. I will not yield, as the gentleman did not yield earlier.

Yesterday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] invoked history and histrionics, as he was trying to make the point that this bill is not discriminatory and preferential. Today he invokes humor and sarcasm. No matter how he slices it, this bill is preferential.

To those who were not on the floor yesterday, I quote to you from the record of our hearings available at either door, for you to read at page 42 and make a mental note of this, for you will have to answer for this in the future.

When the administration witness, the man who probably is going to be charged with the administration of this impor-

tant legislation, was asked about this he said:

Yes, sir. I think we ought to speak frankly. The name of the Appalachian game is preferential treatment.

That is why you have histrionics, that is why you have history invoked. That is why you have an attempt to dismiss the preferential charge with humor and sarcasm.

The reason this legislation is preferential is that it is taking Federal tax dollars and building roads, building vocational schools, building libraries, building hospitals and operating hospitals, and building sewage plants and other community facilities in these communities, not just in poor communities in Appalachia but prosperous industrial communities, the Pittsburghs, the Knoxville, the Spartanburgs, and the Huntsvilles.

You are taking Federal tax dollars and building up those communities to lure new industry to those areas. The new industry that comes to those areas has to come from other places in direct and unfair competition with communities all over this country, communities in my district and in your district, where the chambers of commerce and local and State organizations are breaking their backs to get more industry and to create a more favorable economic climate.

That is why we say this is unfair. That is why the official in charge of operating this thing admits that the name of the game, and this is a great game, is preferential treatment. That is why I have referred to this legislation in my additional views as essentially an act of piracy—job piracy and industrial piracy.

This is why I support the Republican substitute under the provisions of which all disadvantaged areas in the Nation would be equally assisted.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe very little needs to be added to what has been said by the gentleman from Texas in response to the arguments for the substitute being proposed here today. It seems noteworthy that of the membership of the committee on the other side of the aisle that only five of the members of the committee chose to associate themselves in the sponsorship of this substitute. I think the others of the opposition recognized the basic inconsistencies that are inherent in the position which is taken by the supporters of this substitute.

Here are a group of Members of this body who have been very critical of the program of accelerated public works from the very start, who have been very critical of the idea of having an ARA or of designating depressed areas in the first place. Yet, they want us to substitute for this carefully prepared piece of legislation a hodgepodge that is based in its entirety upon the concept of depressed areas within counties all over the country, and on the accelerated public works designation of eligible areas for accelerated public works. They want to go back to the very program that they have derided so continuously and opposed on the floor of this House.

I personally supported the accelerated public works program as did most of us in this Chamber. I supported area redevelopment. I thought the program had great promise for the future and I think it did a great deal more good than the gentlemen on the other side are prepared to admit. Also I think the majorities that were registered last November may be some measure of what the people of the United States think about these programs and their successful operation.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Do I properly understand from what the gentleman said a while ago that the committee did study this problem and had an opportunity to choose between the majority version and the substitute proposal, and that that was acted upon in committee?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The substitute was offered in the committee. The substitute did not even get unanimous support on the other side. As a matter of fact, if you will look at the report on page 75, you will find only five members of the committee from the other side endorsed this substitute. Yet, they are asking us to replace this major piece of legislation with that substitute here today.

Now what we have in the Appalachia bill is an attempt on the part of the Congress and on the part of this administration to use a rifle and to use it with effectiveness in a portion of this country that has lagged in certain basic requirements for growth for many, many years. And above all other deficiencies, the highway network is the major deficiency. That is recognized in this legislation and we put the major emphasis in our bill upon correction of that shortcoming in the Appalachia region.

Now instead of using a rifle and zeroing in on the basic shortcomings of the Appalachian region, the gentlemen on the other side would like for us to take a pop gun and take the ammunition and fire all over the country and ignore the basic structural weaknesses that are present in the Appalachian region which have prevented it from competing successfully with other parts of the country in terms of industrial growth.

We say to you that President Kennedy in supporting this legislation at the outset, our late and great beloved President, President Kennedy, in giving it his blessing from the start, and the great man who today leads this Nation as President, President Johnson, have both come to the very heart of the matter in telling us that we must get at the cause for the lag in growth in this area; that we must strike directly at that cause by correcting these basic deficiencies in the highway system that exist down there, and by improving the public facilities that must be upgraded if we are going to have a land of opportunity in Appalachia.

That is what we are trying to do in this bill. That is what a majority of the committee and several members on the other side of the committee agreed with us should be done. That is what we hope you will do by voting down the substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. I would say to my good colleague from Oklahoma that I do not care to get into an argument, but we had a good friend in Oklahoma by the name of Senator Kerr, and I heard him say at one time that he was against any conspiracy in the world that he was not in on.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I believe he used the word "combine."

Mr. BELCHER. My understanding is that all the Republicans who were not in on this bill voted against it and all the Republicans who were in on it voted for it. Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would say that the difference between the Republicans and the Democrats may be highlighted by that, then, because the Democrats supported this bill unanimously in the committee.

Mr. BELCHER. As I understand it, the gentleman from Oklahoma supports it, although none of his 17 counties that are on relief are in on it; is that correct?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is correct in that, but I would like to say to the gentleman, with all respect, if he wishes to ascribe that motive to his party's members, as to their reason for supporting this bill, he is at liberty to do it. I would not do it. We thought to a man on the Democratic side of the committee that this was good legislation, and we are very proud to support it unanimously.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to say that I approached this legislation with an open mind. I had no prejudice. I read the Senate committee report. I read the debate on the other side of the Capitol.

I noted, with some considerable interest, how my Republican colleagues on the other side of the Capitol voted. There was some Republican support. There were some ranking members of the Republican Party on the other side of the Capitol who did support this legislation.

However, when I had an opportunity to examine S. 3 and see what transpired in the committee—the lack of adequate hearings, the complete rejection of any perfecting amendments offered by the minority, and, as a matter of fact, the complete rejection of any amendment to the bill approved by the other body—I began to have some questions about the merit of the bill before us.

I believe it is a legitimate question to ask whether we here should purely rubber stamp without change, without deviation, a piece of legislation approved on the other side of the Capitol. It seems to me we have enough ability and sufficient talent to improve a piece of legislation which comes to us from the other side of the Capitol.

After reading the minority views, which begin on page 33, and the additional views, which appear subsequent, I have become absolutely convinced that

this legislation is basically unsound and that the substitute is a far preferable piece of legislation.

My good friend the gentleman from Texas, in very clever ridicule, pointed his finger and said that this bill, S. 3, was drafted for the purpose of hitting at a specific problem in a certain geographic area, that it was a specific medical remedy and had applicability only to this particular area of the country. As he said that—and it sounded rather persuasive—I wondered when these additional counties in Alabama, New York, and Ohio became so ill that they had to get this particular, this specific medicine, this political prescription.

These few counties in these States have been added rather recently, and it might have something to do with politics and only politics. Yes, this bill is not tailored to any particular area. It is legislation that is a one-shot proposition for one area with the promise that we are to have one, two, three, or perhaps four more additional similar proposals which will cover other geographical regions.

I rather doubt that the basic provisions in those subsequent bills affecting other geographic areas will be any different. I doubt whether those other proposals which will add more and more and more in dollar expenditures will do anything different to those areas than this bill will do to this one.

S. 3 is full of paradoxes. We have counties included here that under no recognized criteria are eligible for any aid on the basis of being distressed economically or otherwise.

Another paradox of this legislation is that we complicate further, not resolve, the problems of agriculture. I have read and reread the President's speech on agriculture. He deplores what is happening to us. Costs to the taxpayers are going up and our farmers are not getting adequate benefits. American agriculture is being strangled by bureaucratic redtape. Still there are provisions in this legislation which just add to and compound the problem that we are trying to solve in a rather inadequate way in the field of agriculture.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GERALD R. FORD (at the request of Mr. CRAMER) was given permission to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. What also bothers me about this legislation is that we are asked to approve of certain provisions in this bill that on their own, coming from the committee which has basic jurisdiction, would not get approval in this body and certainly could not get approval from the Congress as a whole.

As I look at the flexibility that is included in this legislation, flexibility as to geography, flexibility as to the formula for the granting of aid or the qualification of those areas, I have a sneaking suspicion that there may be something other than merit involved in the legislation. It may be a product of politics, as has been so ably set forth in the minority views.

I wish to compliment, by the way, the members of the minority on this com-

mittee, those that wrote the minority views and those that wrote the additional views. I think this is an excellent job that they have done, and any unbiased and unprejudiced person who took the time and made the effort to examine the majority and the minority views could only come to the conclusion that this bill is unsound and is unworthy of our consideration.

One of the points that have been well brought out and one which I think is fundamental is that this bill is discriminatory. In addition, this bill, even on its own, within the confines of its own pages, will cost more than the substitute. In addition to that, if you add this bill for this region to another bill for another region and another bill for a following region and another bill for a still further region, the cost of the majority viewpoint will skyrocket.

So I say that on the basis of economy the substitute is the bill which we on our side ought to vote for and the bill on our side that we should support. Yes, the substitute cleans up the legislation recommended by the majority. Our bill is a one-shot proposition. I think it will cost less and it will retain those constructive programs that have been recommended by the majority.

The substitute deletes those programs that cannot be justified on the basis of any hearings, any factual information and fundamentally, perhaps even more important, the substitute proposal uses the existing administrative facilities in the Federal Government; it uses the administrative agencies in the State governments and utilizes, as we advocate, the administrative organizations on the local government level. If we believe in what we say on our side we should support the substitute. The substitute is a partnership between the Federal Government, the State government, and local governments, and I believe very strongly that we ought to support the substitute recommended by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, the suggestion was made by the gentleman from Texas that this is a program tailored to Appalachia. I wonder what examples could be cited that would indicate that development roads can be tailored to one area and not another area throughout America. I wonder what examples could be cited that sewage treatment works have application solely to the Appalachian region or that water resource studies have application solely to the Appalachia region? Also, the same with respect to timber development, demonstration health facilities and all these programs that presently have nationwide application. How in the world can anybody legitimately argue that because they are limited in application in their bill that they should not have equal application or even better application nationwide as provided in the substitute, when they are mostly existing programs, in being, nationwide in application and are just being increased in this proposal?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And if the majority comes up with other proposals for other regions you will have skyrocketing costs.

And so, when we look at the administrative side, the dollar side and the overall approach it seems to me that we ought to vote for the substitute.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMER) there were—ayes 65, noes 152.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read.

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I would not object I will say to the gentleman from Alabama—if adequate assurance is given that the corrective amendments that we believe are meritorious on our side will be given an adequate opportunity to be considered; that is, that a motion to cut off debate will not be made. Otherwise, I will have to object to considering the bill as read in order to protect our rights.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I do not know who is going to be the judge as to how long an adequate time would be. I believe the gentleman knows that I will object to prolonged discussion and unnecessary discussion. But, certainly, as long as the time is reasonable, of course, I am not going to object.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, the minority has some 13 or 14 amendments at the Clerk's desk. My interest in this is to make certain that opportunity is available to offer any of those amendments desired by the minority and that there will be no effort to cut off such amendments. With that assurance, I would not object, but without it I would have to object.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What does the gentleman mean by "cut off"?

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman can move to cut off debate at any time.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman knows the rules, that any Member can offer an amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman can cut off the debate on the amendments and on the entire bill if he wishes to do so by a vote. The only protection we have is through refusing to agree to having the bill considered as read.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I could not prevent a member of the committee from making such a request. However, certainly, I will do everything I can to see that ample time is permitted for a discussion of the amendments.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have been involved in these types of procedures for some time and there have been many instances in which the minority was cut off. Without adequate assurance, I would be constrained to object.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Those who have dealt with me know that I will assure the gentleman of reasonable time on each amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, may I make a suggestion to the gentleman from Alabama? Why do we not read just a paragraph or two and have an amendment or two until we might be able to see just what the schedule may be.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the Appalachian region of the United States, while abundant in natural resources and rich in potential, lags behind the rest of the Nation in its economic growth and that its people have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity. The region's uneven past development, with its historical reliance on a few basic industries and a marginal agriculture, has failed to provide the economic base that is a vital prerequisite for vigorous, self-sustaining growth. The State and local governments and the people of the region understand their problems and have been working and will continue to work purposefully toward their solution. The Congress recognizes the comprehensive report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission documenting these findings and concludes that regionwide development is feasible, desirable, and urgently needed. It is, therefore, the purpose of this Act to assist the region in meeting its special problems, to promote its economic development, and to establish a framework for joint Federal and State efforts toward providing the basic facilities essential to its growth and attacking its common problems and meeting its common needs on a coordinated and concerted regional basis. The public investments made in the region under this Act shall be concentrated in areas where there is a significant potential for future growth, and where the expected return on public dollars invested will be the greatest. The States will be responsible for recommending local and State projects, within their borders, which will receive assistance under this Act. As the region obtains the needed physical and transportation facilities and develops its human resources, the Congress expects that the region will generate a diversified industry, and that the region will then be able to support itself, through the workings of a strengthened free enterprise economy.

TITLE I—THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Membership and voting

SEC. 101. (a) There is hereby established an Appalachian Regional Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of one Federal member, hereinafter referred to as the "Federal Cochairman", appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and one member from each participating State in the Appalachian region. The Federal Cochairman shall be one of the two Cochairmen of the Commission. Each State member may be the Governor, or his designee, or such other person as may be provided by the law of the State which he represents. The State members of the Commission shall elect a Cochairman of the Commission from among their number.

(b) Except as provided in section 105, decisions by the Commission shall require the affirmative vote of the Federal Cochairman and of a majority of the State members (ex-

clusive of members representing States delinquent under section 105). In matters coming before the Commission, the Federal Cochairman shall, to the extent practicable, consult with the Federal departments and agencies having an interest in the subject matter.

(c) Each State member shall have an alternate, appointed by the Governor or as otherwise may be provided by the law of the State which he represents. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an alternate for the Federal Cochairman. An alternate shall vote in the event of the absence, death, disability, removal, or resignation of the State or Federal representative for which he is an alternate.

(d) The Federal Cochairman shall be compensated by the Federal Government at level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. His alternate shall be compensated by the Federal Government at not to exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS-18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and when not actively serving as an alternate for the Federal Cochairman shall perform such functions and duties as are delegated to him by the Federal Cochairman. Each State member and his alternate shall be compensated by the State which they represent at the rate established by the law of such State.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: On page 3, lines 21 and 22, strike out "the Federal Cochairman and of a majority of the State members" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "a majority of the members of the Commission".

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset it is not going to be the intention on our side to delay this legislation inordinately. I would expect we will be able to complete voting on the measure, so far as our side is concerned, by tomorrow.

With reference to the specific amendment at hand, this deals with one of the issues we think is paramount in this legislation, and I address myself to those who pride themselves on believing that the States should be the ones to make the decisions relating to this program, those who believe in State's rights, if you please.

In this instance, as the bill is presently drafted, the Federal representative, as stated in the minority views, has an absolute veto over any program and over any project. This Commission is made up of 11 members from the States and 1 Federal representative. The affirmative vote of the Federal representative is required for any project, let alone any proposed program.

This is unprecedented, as it relates to the operation of interstate commissions. We have gone the full circle now in dealing with interstate commissions.

When I first came to Congress 11 years ago they would not permit a Federal representative to serve on such commissions when these interstate compacts were proposed. The members of the Committee on the Judiciary will remember that. Subsequently, Federal members were permitted to serve on the commission, and participate in making decisions with the State. Then the New

England compact came before the House, which gave the Federal representative a vote in addition to being a member.

Now we have gone the full turn, and we find the proposition that the Federal representative not only has a vote, not only will be a member of the 12-member Commission, but will have absolute, unquestioned veto power, even if 11 State members of the Commission say otherwise, on a given program or a given project.

Admittedly, and this argument is apt to be made, only with individual State consent can programs and projects be approved and go into effect. But suppose 11 States want a highway located between certain terminal points on a given location—11 States vote "Yes." The Federal representative can vote "No." It does not matter how badly the States want it or what the merits are, the Federal representative's decision is final and absolute. This is what the bill says on page 3, line 20:

Except as provided in section 105—

This deals with delinquency of dues for paying of administrative costs—

decisions by the Commission shall require the affirmative vote of the Federal Cochairman—

They start out by making him Cochairman, then they give him complete control by giving him a veto power—and of a majority of the State members.

What does our amendment do? Our amendment puts this Commission in proper focus. It permits the Federal representative to have the same vote, as a Commission member, as do the State members. Who can oppose that, who believes each State ought to have an equal voice on this program? You are going to be outvoted 11 to 1 otherwise by the Federal representative if he chooses to veto and say "No."

That relates to every program in the bill. That relates to your demonstration hospital facilities, which presently are handled under the Hill-Burton Act. The States decide the priority. They decide when a hospital is deserving and is good enough to get top priority. Under S. 3, the Federal representative may say, "I do not agree with that. I do not think that hospital should be located where you say it should, that it should have the equipment you—the State—say it should have." Veto. It is almost as bad as the Security Council in the U. N., where Russia has the veto.

We, in our substitute bill, are not setting up a Commission where the Federal representative has an absolute veto no matter what the merits, no matter how favorably the entire State membership may act on this legislation. What our amendment does is state that a majority of the members of the Commission should control, that an affirmative vote shall be required giving the Federal representative an equal but not a superior vote.

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

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and hope that the Committee of the Whole will do the same thing that

the Committee on Public Works did when it was presented in the Committee, and that is, vote it down and vote it down decisively. The pending amendment would reduce the voting power of the Federal Cochairman and actually destroy, I think, almost completely the effectiveness of the Federal Government in serving as an arbitrator and serving as an effective cochairman of the commission, that has to agree on the policies that have to be followed. This commission is not an operating agency, it is basically a policymaking agency. You have to remember when you evaluate the role of the Federal Government in it that we are talking about a program in which the Federal Government is going to put up from 50 to 80 percent of the money. The gentleman from Florida would like to reduce the voting strength of the Federal Government in determining how that 50 to 80 percent of the money is going to be spent from the 50 percent which we have today in the bill as it now reads to about 4.5 percent. That certainly would be inequitable in protecting the Federal Government's interest.

If we adopt the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Florida there would be absolutely nothing to prevent a group of the States, six or seven of the States, from getting together and looking at their own interests rather than the overall interests of the entire Appalachian region, and setting up the policies and setting up the programs to channel practically all of the money into their area.

Now the Federal cochairman sitting there with the veto which he has in this bill prevents that from taking place and assures equity between the States. I am quite sure that the gentleman from Florida is not always against the principle of having the Federal Government having a veto either because just a few minutes ago he asked us to adopt a substitute. The substitute is the bill, H.R. 4466, which says on page 4, describing the new development highways which he proposes that we set up and spend \$800 million on—he says the Secretary, and he is talking about the Secretary of Commerce, shall have authority to approve in whole or in part the recommendations of the State highway department or to require modifications or revisions thereof.

Now if that is not a veto that goes just as far as anything that is in this bill, I would like to see something that is. The gentleman from Florida is in favor of a veto when he proposes a program like his development highway program. He recognizes that it would not work practically and protect the interest of the States unless the Federal Government putting up most of the money had the right to say no when a proposal was advanced that did not coincide with the national interest.

That is what the bill, as it is presently written, provides for. You have a veto insofar as the State is concerned. You have a double veto in the fact that any Governor can veto a program operating within his own State.

Then you have the Federal Government sitting there with its Federal Cochairman with the right to veto a pro-

gram or a policy determination if he feels it is not in the national interest.

That assures a working partnership that recognizes both National and State interests. With this working double partnership, we submit it is possible to correct the basic deficiencies in the Appalachia region and to supply the basis for solid growth in the future.

Do not destroy that effective working relationship that is created by this bill by adopting the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Florida.

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

Mr. Chairman, if there is one part of this bill that disturbs me, and there are many parts, it is this Federal czar operation that we are talking about. Unless this amendment is adopted, I foresee, looking down the road 1 year, 2 years or 10 years—five, six, seven and possibly eight regions of this type around the country with a Federal czar over each region and the States that are participating in each region will be under the sole jurisdiction of this czar. In a program as broad in scope as this, covering medical care, schools, roads and so forth in which there are duplicating programs already in existence in this area and on which admittedly there must be some coordination between these programs, you are going to have a Federal czar who has a veto power over the States that are a part of this area organization and then I think we will have gone a long way down the road to Federal control and doing away with States rights and the rights of local communities. I would think this would be the last thing the Members of Congress would want to do. Certainly, I could never support any legislation regardless of its merits, when that legislation contains as dangerous a provision as this. I think we certainly ought to look at this one real hard—forget the merits, forget your opinion as to the contents of the bill—but without this amendment I believe this provision will come back to haunt us in future years and we will regret the day that we set up these Federal czars around the country.

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

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

Mr. CRAMER. Reference was made to the position of the minority on H.R. 4466. I am sure the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] fully knows that the wording with regard to highways in the section is precisely the same as is in existence under present law. I am sure the gentleman further knows that if there is a program in America under which the State-Federal partnership—and I stress "partnership"—has worked and worked admirably, it has been the highway program.

The language used in the substitute is precisely that of the existing law.

The substitute also struck out the veto power of the Federal czar.

I believe the gentleman is absolutely right in pinpointing, as we have attempted to do, that this is one of the major weaknesses, permitting the Fed-

eral Government to have an absolute veto power over all programs of all kinds, relating to priorities, relating to where a given hospital or a given sewage disposal plant is to be constructed. There is to be an absolute veto power in the hands of one man.

This is a duplication. This is a second layer. Naturally, there must be approval of the various agencies under which these programs are administered, but they also want a veto power in the Commission by a Federal czar with an absolute right in the Federal Government, and that will go a long way toward destroying States rights.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Another thing that disturbed me was the implication in the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] that States may not be able to get together under this program. He said that six or seven States might decide they want to go one way and could vote as a majority to do so. I am not ready to believe that the States involved in an organization of this type, interested in the development of an area—as is said, the Appalachian area—would do anything like that. We have seen the Governors of the various States get together many times.

Are you going to tell us that some States will go their own way, will work politically to try to get a majority to go one way, and that a minority will have to take what the majority decides; and, to prevent such from occurring, you want to have a Federal czar? He is going to say, "I am sorry, but we have a difference of opinion here. Majority vote no longer prevails." We will have one man. He will tell us whether it is any good. If he thinks it is, that is all right, but if he does not, the view of the Federal czar will prevail. I believe that is wrong.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If the gentleman is practical, I believe he will realize that this possibility would be present if we do not preserve the right of the Federal Cochairman, just as we have preserved the right of the Federal Government in our highway program to prevent a State from putting a Federal highway where the Federal Government does not want it. The gentleman from Florida recognized that in his development highway program.

Mr. CEDERBERG. There is a lot of difference between the highway program, which has interconnections with various States and is interstate in operation. That has nothing to do with a sewage disposal plant or a vocational school. Those are local in nature.

It is far more dangerous to have a Federal czar who can say, "You cannot do this, or must do it my way," rather than to have the States among themselves decide how it must be done.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMER) there were—ayes 66, noes 118.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Functions of the Commission

Sec. 102. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Commission shall—

(1) develop, on a continuing basis, comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs and establish priorities thereunder, giving due consideration to other Federal, State, and local planning in the region;

(2) conduct and sponsor investigations, research, and studies, including an inventory and analysis of the resources of the region, and, in cooperation with Federal, State, and local agencies, sponsor demonstration projects designed to foster regional productivity and growth;

(3) review and study, in cooperation with the agency involved, Federal, State, and local public and private programs and, where appropriate, recommend modifications or additions which will increase their effectiveness in the region;

(4) formulate and recommend, where appropriate, interstate compacts and other forms of interstate cooperation, and work with State and local agencies in developing appropriate model legislation;

(5) encourage the formation of local development districts;

(6) encourage private investment in industrial, commercial, and recreational projects;

(7) serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for Appalachian programs;

(8) provide a forum for consideration of problems of the region and proposed solutions and establish and utilize, as appropriate, citizens and special advisory councils and public conferences; and

(9) advise the Secretary of Commerce on applications for grants for administrative expenses to local development districts.

Recommendations

Sec. 103. The Commission may, from time to time, make recommendations to the President and to the State Governors and appropriate local officials with respect to—

(1) the expenditure of funds by Federal, State, and local departments and agencies in the region in the fields of natural resources, agriculture, education, training, health and welfare, and other fields related to the purposes of this Act; and

(2) such additional Federal, State, and local legislation or administrative actions as the Commission deems necessary to further the purposes of this Act.

Liaison between Federal Government and the Commission

Sec. 104. The President shall provide effective and continuing liaison between the Federal Government and the Commission and a coordinated review within the Federal Government of the plans and recommendations submitted by the Commission pursuant to sections 102 and 103.

Administrative expenses of the Commission

Sec. 105. (a) For the period ending on June 30 of the second full Federal fiscal year following the date of enactment of this Act, the administrative expenses of the Commission shall be paid by the Federal Government. Thereafter, such expenses shall be paid equally by the Federal Government and the States in the region. The share to be paid by each State shall be determined by the Commission. The Federal Cochairman shall not participate or vote in such determination. No assistance authorized by this Act shall be furnished to any State or to any political subdivision or any resident of any State, nor shall the State member of the Commission participate or vote in any determination by the Commission while such State is delinquent in payment of its share of such expenses.

(b) Not to exceed \$2,200,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

Administrative powers of Commission

SEC. 106. To carry out its duties under this Act, the Commission is authorized to—

(1) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the conduct of its business and the performance of its functions;

(2) appoint and fix the compensation of an executive director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions, except that such compensation shall not exceed the salary of the alternate to the Federal Cochairman on the Commission as provided in section 101. No member, alternate, officer, or employee of the Commission, other than the Federal Cochairman on the Commission, his staff, and his alternate and Federal employees detailed to the Commission under paragraph (3) shall be deemed a Federal employee for any purpose;

(3) request the head of any Federal department or agency (who is hereby so authorized) to detail to temporary duty with the Commission such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as the Commission may need for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status;

(4) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or local government or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;

(5) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating State government for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for, or continue in, another governmental retirement or employee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel. The Civil Service Commission of the United States is authorized to contract with the Commission for continued coverage of Commission employees, who at date of Commission employment are Federal employees, in the retirement program and other employee benefit programs of the Federal Government.

(6) accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible.

(7) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation.

(8) maintain a temporary office in the District of Columbia and establish a permanent office at such a central and appropriate location as it may select and field offices at such other places as it may deem appropriate.

(9) take such other actions and incur such other expenses as may be necessary or appropriate.

Information

SEC. 107. In order to obtain information needed to carry out its duties, the Commission shall—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable, a Cochairman of the Commission, or any member of the Commission designated by the Commission for the purpose, being hereby authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the Commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath;

(2) arrange for the head of any Federal, State, or local department or agency (who is hereby so authorized to the extent not otherwise prohibited by law) to furnish to the Commission such information as may be

available to or procurable by such department or agency; and

(3) keep accurate and complete records of its doings and transactions which shall be made available for public inspection, and for the purpose of audit and examination by the Comptroller General or his duly authorized representatives.

Personal financial interests

Sec. 108. (a) Except as permitted by subsection (b) hereof, no State member or alternate and no officer or employee of the Commission shall participate personally and substantially as member, alternate, officer, or employee, through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or otherwise, in any proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, or other particular matter in which, to his knowledge, he, his spouse, minor child, partner, organization (other than a State or political subdivision thereof) in which he is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee, or any person or organization with whom he is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee, or any person or organization with whom he is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective employment, has a financial interest. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

(b) Subsection (a) hereof shall not apply if the State member, alternate, officer, or employee first advises the Commission of the nature and circumstances of the proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, or other particular matter and makes full disclosure of the financial interest and receives in advance a written determination made by the Commission that the interest is not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of the services which the Commission may expect from such State member, alternate, officer, or employee.

(c) No State member or alternate shall receive any salary, or any contribution to or supplementation of salary for his services on the Commission from any source other than his State. No person detailed to serve the Commission under authority of paragraph (4) of section 106 shall receive any salary or any contribution to or supplementation of salary for his services on the Commission from any source other than the State, local, or intergovernmental department or agency from which he was detailed or from the Commission. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(d) Notwithstanding any other subsection of this section, the Federal Cochairman and his alternate on the Commission and any Federal officers or employees detailed to duty with it pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 106 shall not be subject to any such subsection but shall remain subject to sections 202 through 209 of title 18, United States Code.

(e) The Commission may, in its discretion, declare void and rescind any contract, loan, or grant of or by the Commission in relation to which it finds that there has been a violation of subsection (a) or (c) of this section, or any of the provisions of sections 202 through 209, title 18, United States Code.

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

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, has the gentle-

man had a discussion with the minority leader with regard to any ground rules relating to debate on amendments that would justify making the motion?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I suppose that I can make that request in every section of the bill. There is no disposition on this side to cut off debate.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is my general impression that we are doing real well timewise. There is no disposition on our part to filibuster or create any time problems. If we could just continue and get some of these amendments out of the way, I think we will make some good progress.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title I? If not, the Clerk will read title II.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—SPECIAL APPALACHIAN PROGRAMS

Part A—New programs

Appalachian Development Highway System

Sec. 201. (a) The Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to assist in the construction of an Appalachian development highway system serving the Appalachian region (the length of which shall not exceed two thousand three hundred and fifty miles. In addition thereto, there are authorized to be constructed not in excess of one thousand miles of local access roads, that will serve specific recreational, residential, commercial, industrial, or other like facilities or will facilitate a school consolidation program). The system, in conjunction with the Interstate System and other Federal-aid highways in the region will provide a highway system which will open up an area or areas with a developmental potential where commerce and communication have been inhibited by lack of adequate access. The provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are applicable to Federal-aid primary highways, and which the Secretary determines are not inconsistent with this Act, shall apply to the Appalachian development highway system, and the local access roads.

(b) As soon as feasible, the Commission shall submit to the Secretary its recommendations with respect to (1) the general corridor location and terminal of the development highways, (2) the designation of local access roads to be constructed, (3) priorities for construction of the local access roads and of the major segments of the development highways, and (4) other criteria for the program authorized by this section. Before any State member participates in or votes on such recommendations, he shall have obtained the recommendations of the State highway department of the State which he represents.

(c) The Secretary shall have authority to approve in whole or in part such recommendations or to require modifications or revisions thereof. In no event shall the Secretary approve any recommendations for any construction which would require for its

completion the expenditure of Federal funds (other than funds available under title 23, United States Code) in excess of the appropriation authorizations in subsection (g). On its completion each development highway not already on the Federal-aid primary system shall be added to such system and shall be required to be maintained by the State.

(d) In the construction of highways and roads authorized under this section, the States may give special preference to the use of mineral resource materials indigenous to the Appalachian region.

(e) For the purposes of research and development in the use of coal and coal products in highway construction and maintenance, the Secretary is authorized to require each participating State, to the maximum extent possible, to use coal derivatives in the construction of not to exceed 10 per centum of the roads authorized under this Act.

(f) Federal assistance to any construction project under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the costs of such project, unless the Secretary determines, pursuant to the recommendation of the Commission, that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, but in no event shall such Federal assistance exceed 70 per centum of such costs.

(g) To carry out this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$840,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Alabama (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman wish to amend his motion to make it relate to section 201? I have no objection to that request but not to the request with respect to the title.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I amend my request to apply to section 201.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BALDWIN

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to title II, section 201, which applies to several different paragraphs in the title, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN:

On page 13, line 13, strike out the parenthesis.

On page 13, strike out the sentence beginning on line 15.

On page 14, lines 3 and 4, strike out "and the local access roads".

On page 14, line 8, strike out "(2)" and all that follows down through and including "(4)" in line 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(2) priorities for construction of the major segments of the development highways, and (3)".

On page 15, line 21, strike out "\$840,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$805,000,000".

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, the sense of this amendment is simply to strike out the access roads paragraph of

section 201. Section 201 does two things. The major portion of it is to authorize a system of development roads which will cost \$805 million. My amendment does not affect those. It leaves them in the bill intact. But in addition to that section 201 authorizes an additional 1,000 miles of local access roads, the Federal contribution to which will be \$35 million. My amendment would eliminate those local access roads. I would like to read the description of local access roads on page 13, line 15, where it says:

In addition thereto, there are authorized to be constructed not in excess of one thousand miles of local access roads, that will serve specific recreational, residential, commercial, industrial, or other like facilities or will facilitate a school consolidation program.

That means that local access roads can be constructed to serve a specific subdivision built by a contractor for his personal profit. One road can be constructed to serve a specific resort built by a resort owner for his personal profit. These local access roads can be constructed to serve a particular recreational area built by a speculator for his personal profit. In the history of the roadbuilding program of the United States of America the basis upon which we have provided Federal assistance is that roads will serve a group of people or an area and therefore the Federal-Interstate Highway System serves a large number of people and the Federal-State primary and secondary aid system serves areas and groups of people; the Federal urban road system serves areas and groups of people. But this is the first time that I know of where we have stated that we will authorize Federal funds to build a specific local access road to serve a particular industry built for profit by the owner of that industry or a particular subdivision built for profit by the owner of that subdivision or a particular resort built for profit by the owner of that resort.

This particular provision of \$35 million—and all my amendment strikes is \$35 million; it leaves the whole development road system of \$805 million—would be an open invitation to people who for profit would try to get sufficient political control at the State level and maneuver the allocation of Federal road funds for the construction of a specific road to serve their specific profitmaking enterprise. I do not believe Federal funds should be used for such a purpose.

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

This is another of the amendments which the gentlemen of the minority offered in the committee. Like the others, this one was decisively rejected.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would abolish the system of access roads, one of the most important features of this bill. If we are to provide any real help for this Appalachian region, then we will have to preserve intact this 1,000 miles of access roads.

Local access roads are as essential to the primary highway system as the veins are to the arteries of the body. We might just as well sever the veins from the arteries as to require that no access roads can be constructed in connection with the arterial highways.

Absent a system of access roads leading into these highways, the lifeblood of commerce and industry which we hope to stimulate for this region could not flow over those highways and, therefore, they would be virtually useless.

Access roads are to the main highways what the branches are to the trunk of a tree. The trunk of a tree alone cannot bear fruit. It merely provides the sap and sustenance for the branches. If you sever the branches from the tree, the trunk of the tree cannot bear fruit. If we sever from the main arterial highway system we are creating the branches which constitute these access roads to reach into the hitherto remote, isolated areas and open them up for profitable commercial development, then the fruits of growth and development which we would provide for in this bill can never be realized.

Now, Mr. Chairman, certain unwarranted references have been made throughout the course of this discussion. Some references have been made to the effect that these access roads are going to enhance and enrich local promoters and allow people to gain private profit. Perhaps they may. Every highway that has ever been built has enhanced land values. Every highway that we could ever construct would serve some commercial purpose or would serve some industrial purpose and, perhaps, it will make it possible for someone to open up a profitable industry in an area where this now cannot be done. What is wrong with that? That is the purpose of the bill. The entire purpose of the bill is to open up these areas which have heretofore remained so isolated, so remote, so inaccessible, that industry was discouraged from coming in and providing these well springs of development from which prosperity could flow.

We want people to come in and provide private development. We want private funds to be invested in this region because that and that alone will provide the dynamics to create the jobs in order to allow Appalachia to take its rightful place in the prosperity of the mid-20th century.

However, Mr. Chairman, if we were to sever this entire program of local access roads simply on the apprehension that some private individual may gain a profit, then we would have to rewrite the entire road program of the Nation. We would have to cut out the farm-to-market roads, we would have to cut out the timber development roads in the Western States, the Federal timber regions, and we would have to change the entire structure of the highway system.

Of course, it is going to open up areas for profitable private investment, and that is exactly what we are trying to do. We want private investment to come into this area and thereby create jobs.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not also true that with reference to these access roads just as in the case of other roads you have to have matching funds from the State and the local government, and the veto by the State is there just the same

as we have the Federal veto in order to prevent any type of abuse in this program?

Mr. WRIGHT. Precisely. Certainly, I trust the Governors of these States not to abuse this program or to permit it to be abused in any such fashion as the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] has suggested.

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

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

Mr. COLLIER. If this is as important as the gentleman portrays it, if it is as vital as the veins are to the arteries, how come this is only 5 percent of the total amount involved here?

Mr. WRIGHT. Because the main arterial highways are so much more costly than the access roads. These would be comparable to our secondary roads in the rural areas. When we develop the main highway system, the arterial roads become comparable to our primary road systems.

Mr. COLLIER. There are systems in those areas currently existing, are there not?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, there are roads which are really comparable roads. That is why 84 percent of the funds contained in this bill will be devoted to the building of roads.

We feel that is what is necessary to open up the territory so that private capital can go in and develop the area.

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

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. BALDWIN), Mr. WRIGHT was permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

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

Mr. BALDWIN. The gentleman from Texas mentioned that he trusts the Governors of the States will exercise proper care in allocating these funds. Is it not a fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] is author of an article that appeared in a nationwide magazine pointing out the wide discrepancy and the many misuses of Federal funds that were contracted by States in the highway program?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is correct, but I do not think we can cut out the road building program because it has been occasionally abused. I think we should have more guarantee against abuses. I do not believe it is going to be the purpose of any of the Governors to abuse this section.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. It is true there have been many cases brought out, not only in the Congress, but before the whole public, with reference to the misuse of funds, but the Public Works Investigating Subcommittee is taking care of that matter.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that investigating subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], has done a remarkable job.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the section to which I referred when I indicated I thought certain sections of this bill were open to grave abuse by local favoritism, the building of public facilities programs that were not up to any standard. They do not require any maintenance, totally without precedent relating to our highway program. That is why the motion is offered to strike it out.

And here is the second reason, and here is what they said when they came to our committee last year: "We will build 500 miles of access highways for \$50 million." That is how well they had outlined the access program. They came before our committee this year and said: "We can build a thousand miles of access roads for the same amount of money, \$50 million." The fact of the matter is they do not know how much it is going to cost, they do not know where they are going to build these highways, obviously. This is future development and planning. The States have not submitted estimates with regard to where these are going to be built, and how many miles within a given State, or exactly what type of development they have in mind that these access highways will serve.

This is the section where you are going to provide 70 percent, \$35 million, Federal matching money, to build driveways, if you please, not highways, to your privately owned motels, hotels, public beaches, bathing beaches, ski installations, golf courses, or anything else within this definition of the bill where they will serve specific residential, commercial, industrial, or recreational facilities.

In the record of our testimony this is precisely what they intend to do.

If you want to try to get some of the critical area out of this bill, if you want to guarantee against some abuses, at least strike this section so they will have to meet some standards, and they have to be maintained. This is an opportunity to act responsibly in this area.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: On page 14, strike out line 24, and on page 15 strike out lines 1 and 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "ment highway and each local access road not already on either the Federal-aid primary system or the Federal-aid secondary system shall be added to either of such systems and shall be required to be maintained by the State."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that very simply requires the States or the local governing agencies, which is the requirement under all present law relating to highways under title III, first, to build these highways to reasonable standards, and second, having built them to reasonable standards, to maintain them. That is all this amendment does.

How in the world can anybody oppose that amendment who wants to spend Federal money, 70 percent of the cost of

construction, if you are determined to build these highways to these motels, ski slides, and swimming pools? If you are determined to build them, at least require them to be maintained.

Secondly, it requires that they be built to some established and reasonable standard. That is all this amendment does. I think this is a challenge to this body relating to acting responsibly on this legislation.

Every Member of this body that wants to do something beneficial for Appalachia and help develop Appalachia should wholeheartedly support this amendment because this will guarantee that when these highways are built they will be maintained. This will mean they are not going to pot in 6 months, with potholes, with no one having the responsibility to maintain them or build them to decent standards in the first place. That is all this does. It does it by adding the phrase, "each development highway and each local access road not already on either the Federal-aid primary system or the Federal-aid secondary system shall be added to either of such systems and shall be required to be maintained by the State."

That is the present law relating to present Federal-aid highways. We have never acted so irresponsibly in this body as to provide 70 percent Federal money for highway development without, first, requiring that they be built to reasonable standards; and, second, requiring that they be maintained.

This is where we are going to find out whether the same approach is going to be made on the floor of the House that was made in the committee, whether the orders that came down relating to action on the floor of the House are the same as happened in the committee, "Let's not cross a 't' or dot an 'i.' No matter how right our opponents may be, let us vote the Senate bill up, vote it out, right or wrong, good or bad, whether it does the job or does not do the job, whether it is reasonable or unreasonable. Let us do that so that we do not even have to go to conference."

This is the place to make the decision. Are we going to rubberstamp what was done in the other body? Are we going to answer to the orders of others outside of this body, or consider this amendment on its merits?

This gives more flexibility, which is a word used considerably in this debate, more flexibility to even the development highways, because this permits those development highways to be built either to primary or secondary standards, either one, which is not the case in S. 3, that is before us.

I say the merits of this amendment should be unquestioned, and I say this should be adopted on its merits. This is the time to find out.

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

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

Amendment of S. 3 to provide for maintenance of local access roads which are not on a Federal-aid highway system would be superfluous.

The Secretary of Commerce clearly is authorized, under the present language

of S. 3 to require the State highway departments to maintain Appalachian local access roads even though they are not located on a Federal-aid highway system. Accordingly, no purpose would be served by the proposed amendment.

Section 201(a) of S. 3 provides in part:

The provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are applicable to Federal-aid primary highways, and which the Secretary determines are not inconsistent with this Act, shall apply to the Appalachian development highway system and the local access roads.

Section 116(a) of title 23, United States Code, provides:

It shall be the duty of the State highway department to maintain, or cause to be maintained, any project constructed under the provisions of this chapter or constructed under the provisions of prior acts. The State's obligation to the United States to maintain any such project shall cease when it no longer constitutes a part of a Federal-aid system.

Since section 116(a) of title 23 requires the States to maintain Federal-aid primary highways, the Secretary may determine under section 201(a) of S. 3 that the maintenance requirement shall also be applied to local access roads authorized by S. 3.

The second sentence of section 116(a) quoted above relates to the conditions under which a State's obligation to maintain a Federal-aid highway terminates. It does not control the question whether, under S. 3, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to require maintenance of Appalachian local access roads.

Section 201(b) of S. 3 directs the Appalachian Regional Commission to submit to the Secretary of Commerce its recommendations with respect to several specified matters and with respect to other criteria for the Appalachian highway program. Under section 201 (c) the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to approve these recommendations in whole or in part or to require modifications or revisions.

Such criteria clearly may include a requirement for maintenance of local access roads.

The hearings and report of the Committee on Public Works also evidence a clear intent to require the maintenance of these roads. For example, the Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation testified that maintenance would be required, and the report states the committee's understanding that the Bureau of Public Roads will obtain maintenance agreements from each of the States concerned.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania has not intentionally desired to mislead this body. Again I say it is rather surprising, when the language of the bill is so explicit and beyond question, that he takes the position to the effect that maintenance in the first instance and standards to be applied in the building of access roads in the second instance are provided in this legislation.

The legislation contains no such provisions or requirements.

In addition to that, if the Secretary says he intends despite that, that maintenance requirements be put into effect, why in the world would they object to that if we are saying what the Secretary says that he intends to do anyway. The point is the requirement is specifically what the other body eliminated by its amendment relating to access roads. The other body took it out and that is the point I have been trying to make. The other body took the requirement of maintenance out. And we have it by their amendment which appears on page 13. They took out of the authorized Federal-aid highway systems 1,000 miles relating to access roads. By taking it out of any Federal system, there was no requirement for maintenance under the basic law. Here is what the law says that is presently in existence.

Title 23, section 116 (a):

The State's obligation to the United States to maintain any such project shall cease when it no longer constitutes a part of a Federal-aid system.

The act itself says that access highways shall not be a part of any Federal-aid system. How could it be any more clear?

The present law provides no maintenance unless the roads are a part of the Federal-aid system. This is not a part of the system. The bill provides it shall not be a part of the system. How could anyone possibly argue to the contrary?

All we are seeking to do is to make sure that what the majority says they believe is being done, will be done, by putting specific language in the bill.

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CRAMER and Mr. JONES of Alabama.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 47, noes 128.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 15, line 19, strike out "70" and insert in lieu thereof "90".

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, first I would like to commend the committee for having brought forward this piece of legislation. I am going to support it because I think it is the first time since the Appalachia problem has been discussed that Congress has taken positive action toward meeting the needs of this area. I commend the members for all of the items included in this bill. One of the things I think they have failed to take into consideration is the economic condition of the area itself.

Now, in 1934 when a survey was made by a commission appointed by the then President of the United States to determine the needs of the area of Appalachia, that commission came back with a re-

port and said that the first thing this area needed was roads. This is 31 years later, and the committee has determined that is still the primary requisite in this area to make it a real part of the United States. I have not asked for one penny more here. I have just said that if the committee believes what it has said in its report, that is, that this is the real pocket of unemployment, that this is the real poor area of the United States, then I ask that they give to this area the opportunity to build its highways under the same terms and conditions that we give to California, that we give to Texas, that we give to Florida, and ask them on this interstate system which is going to be built for the Federal Government to contribute 90 percent of the cost of the highways.

Now, we are going to try and we are trying in this area to build our highways, but every State that is involved in Appalachia is strapped at the present time. I notice here one of my colleagues from this area, from the State of West Virginia. His State at the present time and for the past number of years has been and is doing its best to try to improve its highway system. We are not asking for a penny more than is in this bill. We are just saying that if the Federal Government will only help us, let them help us the same way that they have done with the real rich States in the United States.

It is just this simple. Everybody that has supported this piece of legislation says that the purpose is to help these areas. These States are destitute. If they were not, you would not be here with this piece of legislation. I commend the other body for coming up with a provision giving us 70 percent; but if 70 percent is good enough for us poor folks why not do what you do for the rich States in the Union? The Public Works Committee came forward with their bill for the Interstate System and provided 90 percent of the money. That is what my amendment does. It allows the Federal Government to contribute 90 percent for the construction of these highways. If you do that, if you adopt my amendment and allow them to put 90 percent of the money into the highways, you will do more than any other one thing in the bill to help this area become a real part of the United States.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as has been repeatedly stated on the floor this bill comes to us at the direction and behest of the members of the Commission representing the several States. Eighty-four percent of the money provided in this bill is for development roads and trails and access roads. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] were adopted, it would increase the cost approximately \$160 million. It would seem that a disproportionate amount would be in the highway section of the bill and I think it would visit harm on the entire bill if the amendment were adopted. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not a fact that the States in the Appalachian region are now getting 90 percent participation on the Interstate System and will continue to get 90 percent money on the Interstate System under the existing law and existing programs? This is merely an additional portion of road construction being allocated to those States on very generous terms.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from Oklahoma is correct. The 90-percent formula would still be employed on the Interstate System and 50 percent on the primary system.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 2.

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

There was no objection.

HORTON BILLS FOR CIVIL SERVICE RETIREES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to announce before my colleagues in Congress that I have introduced today two bills providing needed improvements in the civil service retirement system. In a very real sense, the beneficiaries of these legislative proposals are not only the retired members of this Nation's civil service, their dependents and survivors but also America at large because strengthening the retirement system protects and preserves a fundamental formula of our democracy, namely, a capable and competent career civil service.

ANNUITY INCREASE

The first bill I am sponsoring affords an increased annuity. The increase

would amount to 10 percent in each annuity up to \$3,000 a year and 5 percent for the portion of an annuity above that amount.

I believe this proposal should have a priority status in all of our considerations for the needs of retired civil workers and their families. We have allowed the situation to drift to a depressing degree.

Since 1955, the official Consumer Price Index has reflected a 15-percent climb in the cost of living. However, the only general annuity amendment in that period was the 5-percent increase in 1962. Thus, retiree and survivor annuitants have been left behind by 10 percent.

It is incumbent on Congress to restore this lost purchasing power, especially for those who need it most. These are the people below the \$3,000 line, which Congress already accepts as qualifying for poverty programs. For this reason, my measure makes the 10-percent increase applicable to annuities up to \$3,000.

Further, all annuitants are entitled to additional assistance in the face of this statistically shown living-cost increase. Therefore, the bill I am offering also contains the 5-percent increase provision for annuity amounts above \$3,000.

SURVIVOR BENEFITS

Mr. Speaker, the second bill I have the honor to offer also is of special importance to the retirement system for civil employees of the U.S. Government.

This measure is intended to end discrimination in survivor benefits. It is in two parts:

First. It requires the recomputation of annuities for all persons who retired before October 11, 1962, and who elected to provide survivor annuities, so as to give them the benefit of the improved formula which has been authorized since.

Second. It provides the recomputation of all survivor annuities for the spouses of employees who retired before October 11, 1962, in order to increase them to 55 percent of the annuities paid these retired employees at the time of death.

The need for this legislative enactment is made manifest by comparing the contrasting situations of persons who have retired from Federal service. Many who retired prior to 1956 still suffer annuity reductions as high as 25 percent in order to provide survivor benefits for their spouses. Yet, those retiring more recently can provide similar benefits for a deduction of only 2½ percent.

Further, the survivor of an employee who retired before October 11, 1962, cannot receive more than half of the annuity paid to his or her spouse, but for those whose spouse retired after that date the survivor annuity is 10 percent higher.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, those who have devoted their lives to the defense of democracy are not found just in the military. There is a proud history of selfless service among this Nation's civil employees.

I believe it is reasonable and just, therefore, that we in Congress take the legislative steps to insure that retirement from a career of civil service be in keeping with the contributions these employees made during their working years.

THE NATIONAL INTEREST AND GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, when one starts speaking of geographic distribution of Government contracts, raising questions on the equitableness of present policies, he runs the risk of being criticized as parochial in his views.

However, when the simple facts point out one State receives 38 percent of the prime contracts and grants awarded for research and development, when three States combine to receive over 50 percent of these contracts, the Nation is running a risk, the national interest is being adversely affected.

If this is the fact then I feel compelled to speak out as forcibly as I can. Why and how is the national interest being affected? Approximately \$15 billion will be spent next year on research and development by the Federal Government. This is more than 15 percent of the national budget. When such sums are spent then it naturally follows there will be many effects aside from the new knowledge gained.

The economy of the areas of the selected parts of the Nation are bound to be affected. It should be pointed out this effect will be a long lasting one for the reason that production follows research and development. This could well mean certain sections will prosper while others experience pangs of economic starvation.

Equally important in the national interest is the effect this geographic distribution is having on our educational system. Dr. Elvis Stahr, president of Indiana University, states it bluntly:

The result of current Federal policy has been almost inevitably a brain drain on most areas.

He is speaking of the immediate effect but there is a long range effect which we must begin considering now. An authoritative report by an analyst of the National Science Foundation warns of an approaching faculty gap in our colleges and universities in the areas of science, mathematics, and engineering. The vast majority of research associates in science and engineering are now supported by the Federal Government through research grants and fellowships.

If the Federal effort is concentrated in only a few areas of the country we shall overlook the great potential—the great talent—the natural and human resources of other areas of the country.

PRISON SENTENCES FOR ILLEGAL GUN USE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask this Congress to stop the harassment of the legitimate gun owner—and instead to open war on the illegal use of firearms by the criminal preying on society.

I introduced legislation today to set a 25-year mandatory Federal sentence for anyone guilty of using or carrying a firearm during the commission of a robbery, assault, murder, rape, burglary, or kidnapping. We in Congress can swiftly enact a model program of crime control for our own crime-ridden home base of the District of Columbia, and one bill pertains solely to it. The second invokes the authority of the interstate commerce clause and pertains to the Nation as a whole.

The criminal, Mr. Speaker, is the cause of the problem facing our Nation today—not the sportsman, the gun collector, the decent law-abiding citizen who happens to own one or more guns. And it is this problem that we should attack.

There are pending before Congress proposals calling for registration of all guns, and I tell my colleagues now that this is a completely ineffectual way to strike at the problem of illegal gun use. I see little need to further harass the legitimate gun owner when the problem is caused by the criminal, most of whom are repeat offenders often using stolen weapons to commit a crime.

Mr. Speaker, no man in his right mind can expect a criminal planning a robbery with a stolen gun to register the weapon with Federal authorities, or to be alarmed because he has not done so.

We, in Congress, are being asked to legislate in the field of gun registration with little information to justify the need for such a sweeping proposal. We should know, before we pile unworkable and unnecessary restrictions on the decent citizen, the nature of the criminal causing the problem.

Neither our fine Federal Bureau of Investigation, nor our own District of Columbia Police Department, can tell me how many persons arrested or convicted for armed robbery were using stolen weapons. Neither can they tell me how many of these criminals are repeat offenders. The District police has no funds to undertake such a study, and the FBI, only last year, began studying and reporting the profile of known repeaters by the type of crime.

I realize fully the reluctance of Congress to invade the field generally left to the States to prosecute and punish for crimes of violence.

But the problem of outlaw gun use is nationwide, and the States have failed to deal with it effectively. The Federal Government sets mandatory sentences for trafficking in narcotics, and the illegal use of guns by criminals touches far more of our citizens than dope.

Here in the District of Columbia, as over the Nation, the serious problem of illegal gun use has been severely aggravated by extreme laxity on that part of the courts in meting out punishment to violators. The time has come to meet this problem head on, and to take from

the courts the power to turn loose on society the second and third offenders to continue preying on our citizens. My bills leave the courts no discretion in sentencing the guilty, and I think this legislation will go a long way in solving a growing problem.

How many times have we read of the ex-convict with a long string of arrests and convictions for armed robbery finally killing an innocent businessman in the course of another crime? How many times have we read of a criminal free on bond while awaiting trial being caught in the act of committing a similar offense?

How many times, Mr. Speaker, have we sat idly by and watched the courts repeatedly turn loose these vultures to continue preying on society, while the hue and cry mounts against those of us who happen to like to hunt, and who happen to like to own guns, and who abide by all of the laws of our society?

Passage of this legislation will stop the hysterical cries to unduly penalize the law-abiding citizens through imposition of rigid and unworkable restrictions on sale, registration, or taxation of firearms, when the heart of the problem is to find

a way to protect these same good citizens from the criminal in our midst.

I have no quarrel, Mr. Speaker, with those who wish to place needed and workable restrictions on the easy availability of firearms to the mentally incompetent, the criminal, or the unsupervised teenager. I have no quarrel with those who wish to prohibit our Nation becoming the world's dumping ground for surplus arms that are generally worthless and more often than not, extremely dangerous for the purchaser to use.

But I shall vigorously oppose any effort to impose sweeping restrictions upon the law-abiding citizen, while this Congress and the respective States blandly ignore the cause of our Nation's most serious problem. I urge my colleagues to join with me in this effort, and call their attention to the following information.

The District of Columbia Police Department furnished the statistics on the type of weapons used in major crime here, and the limited information on the nature of the criminal is from the most recent issue of the FBI's uniform crime report:

Weapons used in homicides and aggravated assaults and robbery

MURDER

Fiscal year	Total	Revolvers or pistols		Rifles		Shotguns		Knives	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1952.....	59	19	32.2	2	3.4			9	15.2
1953.....	68	15	22.0			2	2.9	20	29.4
1954.....	73	17	23.3			2	2.7	24	32.9
1955.....	44	11	25.0					12	27.3
1956.....	55	18	32.7			3	5.5	15	27.3
1957.....	63	18	28.6	1	1.6	4	6.3	15	23.8
1958.....	77	20	26.0	3	3.9	1	1.3	27	35.1
1959.....	69	20	29.0	1	1.4	2	2.9	21	30.4
1960.....	72	18	25.0	2	2.8	5	6.9	21	29.2
1961.....	82	28	34.1	1	1.2	2	2.4	19	23.2
1962.....	85	24	28.2	2	2.4	4	4.7	16	18.8
1963.....	83	21	25.3	2	2.4	4	4.7	21	25.3
1964.....	104	37	35.6	3	2.9	1	1.0	29	27.9

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT

Fiscal year	Total	Revolvers or pistols		Rifles		Shotguns		Knives	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1952.....	4,547	265	5.8	3	0.7	14	0.3	1,552	34.1
1953.....	4,598	281	6.1	6	.1	17	.4	1,542	33.5
1954.....	4,431	215	4.9	16	.4	35	.8	1,485	33.5
1955.....	4,550	228	5.0	16	.4	30	.7	1,420	31.2
1956.....	2,824	239	8.5	9	.3	31	1.1	1,435	50.8
1957.....	2,545	223	8.8	21	.8	27	1.1	1,312	51.5
1958.....	2,791	259	9.3	23	.8	23	.8	1,204	43.1
1959.....	2,505	277	11.1	17	.7	27	1.1	1,086	43.4
1960.....	3,067	295	9.6	26	.8	41	1.3	1,213	39.5
1961.....	2,900	302	10.4	21	.7	34	1.2	1,278	44.0
1962.....	2,956	393	13.3	23	.8	39	1.3	1,218	41.2
1963.....	2,998	415	13.8	21	.7	31	1.0	1,161	38.7
1964.....	2,754	467	17.0	20	.7	27	1.0	1,082	39.3

NOTE.—During fiscal year 1964 pistols were used in 482, or 18.3 percent, of the 2,631 robberies; shotguns, 17; and rifles, 8.

In 1963 the FBI initiated a statistical program utilizing these criminal identification records for the purpose of providing an analysis of criminal and prosecutive history of known offenders. Law enforcement agencies—local, State and Federal—submit to the Identification Division of the FBI criminal fingerprint cards on persons arrested. Submissions are not made uniformly by all law enforcement agencies on all charges. Generally, the practice is to submit a criminal fingerprint card on all serious offenses, felonies and certain misdemeanors. On the Federal level, nearly all arrested persons are fingerprinted by the Federal investigative agencies, U.S. marshals and the Bureau of Prisons.

Through this positive means of identification the criminal history of an offender becomes known. It is limited to the degree,

of course, that the offender is detected, arrested and fingerprint cards submitted. At the present time the criminal history and other characteristics of offenders who are being handled in the Federal criminal administration of justice are being stored in automatic data processing equipment. Each of the fingerprint files of these known offenders in the Identification Division is being "flushed," which establishes a method of following up on these offenders as to future criminal involvement which can be added over time.

During the year 1963, some 56,126 individual records were processed in the above manner. They are for the most part persons arrested on a Federal charge in 1963, parolees, probationers or persons who violated the latter leniency, commitments to Federal institutions, some District of Columbia offenders,

and a number of serious State and local violators being sought by the FBI under the Fugitive Felon Act. Excluded from this process were military criminal fingerprint submissions and chronic arrests for immigration violations.

Some preliminary analyses of this new information of these offenders are set forth herein. Of the 56,126 individual offenders who were actively handled in 1963, 75 percent had two or more arrests and 25 percent a single charge. Only 7 percent were female. By race, 73 percent were white, 25 percent Negro and 2 percent other races. A distribution by age in 1963 and age at first known arrest for these 56,126 offenders is shown below:

Percent distribution by age

Age	1963	At 1st arrest
Under 20.....	7.7	38.4
20 to 24.....	20.9	27.7
25 to 29.....	17.8	13.3
30 to 39.....	27.5	12.9
40 to 49.....	16.3	5.2
50 to 59.....	7.2	1.9
60 and over.....	2.6	.6

In reviewing the above, keep in mind that both policy and practice not to fingerprint juvenile offenders influences the above distribution. Of the more than 266,000 arrests accumulated by these offenders during the course of their criminal careers, 74 percent were local or State violations and 26 percent Federal violations.

The vast majority of these offenders, 75 percent with two or more charges, had an average criminal career—span of years from first to latest arrest—of 10 years. During this period these offenders were arrested an average of 4.5 times. According to these criminal histories, 52 percent had received leniency in the form of probation, suspended sentence, parole or conditional release. This, of course, is the criminal experience of the repeater who failed the confidence entrusted in the form of certain treatment. For the purposes of this study, probation, suspended sentence, parole and conditional release are referred to as "leniency." It goes without saying that probation and parole are special forms of treatment of criminals, but since they represent a lesser punitive action than incarceration, the term "leniency" is used here to point up this characteristic. Of those granted leniency, 68 percent received it once, 20 percent twice, and 12 percent three or more times. As a group these offenders who received leniency averaged three new arrests after the first leniency action. Their career criminal record averaged 12 years and 6 arrests. From the standpoint of mobility, 54 percent of these offenders confined their activity to one State, 25 percent were arrested in two States, 10 percent in three States, and 11 percent in four or more States. The mobility problem from jurisdiction to jurisdiction within a State, and particularly within a metropolitan area, is undoubtedly far greater.

The tabulation captioned "Profile of Known Repeaters by Type of Crime" is an initial attempt to reveal some profile characteristics of criminal types. The sole test for selection and inclusion in one of the criminal groups was an arrest for such a crime during the course of a person's criminal career. It was not limited to arrests for specific crimes in 1963. Thus, there is some duplication of offenders in certain categories in that the same person may have been arrested for burglary and robbery and so would appear in both categories. Generally, criminals do not confine their activity to a single type of criminal act. Average age at first charge and age at arrest for the first indicated charge has a tendency to be higher than in reality due to the lack of fingerprint

cards on juvenile arrests. Nonetheless, the table demonstrates the average experience for this group of offenders known to the Federal process through criminal fingerprint records during the year 1963. It also sheds some light on the chronic offender, local and Federal. The fact that three-fourths of the arrests of these offenders were for local charges and that most of the Federal charges are likewise local violations supports this contention.

The average age for these offenders (table A) in 1963 ranged from 43 years for the gambler to almost 29 years for those persons who during the course of their criminal career have been arrested for auto theft. Average age for first arrest for auto theft was 23 years, robbery 25 years, and gambling 36 years. All of these offenders show a much lower average age for first arrests for any offense, beginning with 19 in auto theft to 29 years for gambling and Federal liquor law violators.

Average criminal careers for these offenders, i.e., span of years from first to latest arrest, was highest for gambling, 14 years, followed by robbery and the assaultive crimes of murder and felonious assault, 13 years. Auto thieves, who are generally younger, had the shortest average span of 9 years but during that time accumulated, on the average, six arrests. The robber was high with nine arrests in 13 years, the burglar eight in 12 years, narcotics offenders eight arrests in 11 years, and the Federal liquor law violator four arrests in 11 years. When these charges are examined in relationship to the offenses which make up the Crime Index the robber contributed four such offenses out of

the total of nine charges, the burglar four of eight, the auto thief three, and assaultive-type offender three. Only one of the four arrests charged to the Federal liquor law violator fell in the Crime Index or serious crime category. These, of course, are only those crimes known to have been committed by these offenders through detection, arrest, and submission of fingerprint data.

Repeating the same type of crime had its highest level among narcotics violators, 48 percent having two or more narcotic arrests. The liquor law violator repeated in 39 percent of the individual records, bogus check offenders 38 percent, gamblers 37 percent, burglars 37 percent, auto thieves 33 percent, and the robber 25 percent.

The term "leniency" as explained above, in table A refers to known instances where an offender received probation or suspended sentence, parole, or conditional release. The frequency of leniency action is counted for any charge during the course of the criminal career of the offenders. Two-thirds of those offenders who had been arrested for robbery, burglary, auto theft, or bogus checks received leniency during their criminal career. The gambler had the lowest percentage of leniency, followed by the assaultive-type offender. Leniency action for the indicated charges of serious assault and murder, and sex offenses had the lowest percentage. Leniency was received on gambling charges only in 15 percent of the total; however, the lightness of the sentence usually connected with this offense would account for this. On the other hand leniency for auto theft charges was 46 percent and for narcotic offenses 36 percent.

available, without shooting from the hip, is the man to be praised and congratulated.

Such a man is our President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, who has not reacted to the extremists over the situation in South Vietnam. His steadied and studied judgment is what we have had, and what we needed. Thank goodness for President Johnson, for he is standing the test in Vietnam.

An excellent editorial in the February 27, 1965, issue of the Jacksonville Journal points up the test of President Johnson's skill in this critical time, and I insert it below in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE BIG TEST

Rejection of feelers for negotiated settlement of the Vietnam fighting by President Johnson comes as no easy task, but as a decision of great importance to the entire Western World as well as the United States.

The administration will be criticized by many who feel that we are engaged in a fruitless, bloody endeavor that can only lead to an all-out war with the Communists or, at the very best, a costly stalemate.

The end, of course, is too far in the future and the events which will lead to that end are too involved now for anyone to foresee what it will be. Nevertheless, it appears that President Johnson is determined to continue our efforts to aid the South Vietnamese regardless of their seeming indifference, ineptitude, and general confusion.

The real test has descended upon Lyndon B. Johnson after 14 months as President—the bitter that he has to take along with the sweet of public acclaim and congressional obedience. Up to now he has had going for him comparative quiet in foreign affairs and only the domestic issues drew top priority.

These domestic issues called for skillful manipulation with Congress and a thorough understanding of pure political application to the problems before him. This was right down Mr. Johnson's alley. His long years in Washington, his acute sensitivity to the types of politicians he had to deal with and his knowledge of the machinery of Government gave him the upper hand in solving these problems.

Lyndon Johnson got a big break in his moratorium, his period of foreign inactivity, and he used it to command an overwhelming election victory for a presidential term of his own.

He must have known it couldn't last and it didn't.

The Vietnam problem has become compounded and so complex that no one can rightfully say which step is the bona fide step to make. If the United States pulls out of Vietnam she is not only subject to the ultimate communistic takeover of Asia, but she loses tremendous face doing it. If she stays, there is the big chance of World War III or many, many more casualties.

President Johnson is no longer sparring around with congressional friends and political foes. He is at last in the ring with the No. 1 challenger. In his first foreign affairs dilemma, he has drawn a stem-winder.

The way he handles the situation will not only affect the Vietnam crisis, it will affect his leadership both here and abroad.

Mr. Johnson is prudently, we believe, walking carefully. This country and the free world cannot afford a misstep.

VIETNAM

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

TABLE A.—Profile of known repeaters by type of crime

	Murder and serious assault	Robbery	Burglary	Auto theft	Narcotics	Gambling	Bogus checks	Sex offenses	Federal liquor violators
Average age 1963.....	36	34	32	29	34	43	35	35	40
Average age first arrest for charge indicated.....	27	25	23	23	28	36	29	26	34
Average age at first arrest.....	22	20	20	19	22	29	23	21	29
Average criminal career (years).....	13	13	12	9	11	14	11	12	11
Average arrests during criminal career.....	8	9	8	6	8	6	7	8	4
Crime Index arrests.....	3	4	4	3	2	1	2	3	1
Frequency of arrest on indicated charge (percent):									
1.....	81	75	63	67	52	63	62	86	61
2.....	14	18	21	21	21	18	20	11	20
3 or more.....	5	7	16	12	27	19	18	3	19
Frequency of leniency action on any charge (percent):									
1.....	32	34	35	39	35	30	36	33	41
2.....	15	18	18	17	15	9	17	16	12
3 or more.....	9	14	13	11	10	6	13	12	6
Total.....	56	66	66	67	60	45	66	61	59
Leniency on indicated charge (percent).....	14	22	24	46	36	15	38	15	51
Average arrests after first leniency.....	5	6	5	4	5	4	5	6	2
Mobility:									
Arrests in 1 State (percent).....	39	33	31	28	53	60	32	37	69
2 States.....	31	28	30	31	27	24	25	28	22
3 States.....	14	16	17	17	10	8	16	14	6
4 States or more.....	16	23	22	24	10	8	27	21	3

After the first leniency action, these known offenders were arrested on new charges during the course of their criminal career ranging from a high of six for the robber and sex offender to two new charges for the Federal liquor law violator. The mobility of these criminal types is apparent from the number of States in which arrests were recorded during their criminal history. The robber, auto thief, burglar, and bogus check offender show high mobility. The gambler and the Federal liquor law violator on the other hand are mostly local types; that is, restrict their activity to one State.

This new statistical program on the careers in crime is in the development stage and it is anticipated that more definitive information will be made available in future issues of this publication, as well as other periodicals.

PRAISE FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, anyone can shoot from the hip. Especially a politician. Most of us are prone to react quickly, and sometimes violently, in defense of what we believe is a good cause. It is a lot easier to shoot now and ask questions later, just so we can be recorded on the right side.

The man who will take his time and make a decision based on all the facts

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the National Broadcasting Co. program "Meet the Press" on January 31, 1965, had a discussion which I believe is most useful in analyzing the complex situation in Vietnam. The guest on that Sunday was Prof. Bernard Fall. The panel consisted of Robert Goralski, NBC News; Marguerite Higgins, Newsday; Peter Lisagor, Chicago Daily News; and Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent panel member and producer. The moderator was Ned Brooks.

Dr. Fall is a well-known expert on southeast Asian affairs and has written two very well received books on the subject: "Street Without Joy," and "Two Vietnams." Dr. Fall, a professor of international relations at Howard University, brings insight and knowledge to the problem of Vietnam. I call the attention of my colleagues to the following transcript of "Meet the Press":

[From "Meet the Press," Jan. 31, 1965]

MEET THE PRESS

Mr. Brooks. This is Ned Brooks, inviting you to "Meet the Press." Our guest today on "Meet the Press" is recognized as an outstanding authority on Vietnam and southeast Asia. Dr. Bernard Fall. He has traveled widely in North and South Vietnam, and he has interviewed many Communist officials including North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh. Dr. Fall served in the French underground and the French Army. He is the author of several books on Vietnam. Also he is professor of international relations at Howard University in Washington, D.C. We will have the first question now from Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent member of the "Meet the Press" panel.

Mr. SPIVAK. Dr. Fall, in the past you have spoken and written of American illusions about Vietnam. What do you consider our major illusions are?

Dr. FALL. I will say that the major illusion in the past was that an insurgency is mainly a military operation, or let us say counterinsurgency is merely a military counteroperation. As it turns out, insurgency is mainly an operation designed to take over a country's control, not simply defeat its military forces.

The second illusion has been that the defeats in Vietnam, as they have occurred over the past 5 years, can be ascribed to any particular group, whether it is the Buddhists or the students or let's say incapable Vietnamese military leaders. That too is an illusion. The faults, the mistakes go far deeper than that.

Mr. SPIVAK. You have also said that policymakers during the past 8 to 10 years have made "monstrous errors in judgment in Vietnam." What were some of the monstrous errors—were they just illusions or were they specific errors?

Dr. FALL. Some were simply and purely the failure to recognize what the problem really and truly was. For example, you can go back to the French period. I recall reading official statements that the French were winning the war at a particular point, and the French were far from winning it. In 1954 there was the illusion that the French Navarre plan would succeed. By the time Navarre became commander in chief, the French Army was on the ropes. Later on, one of the greater illusions, I recall, was to depict Diem as a Churchill in southeast Asia, as a man deeply interested in democracy. Diem was a dictator, and Diem failed to recognize precisely that one of his problems was lack

of contact and progressive loss of contact with his own people. And lastly we came down to the military illusions, again, of the 1961-62 period. You will recall, for example, the statement of October 2, 1963, that the American troops could be withdrawn by 1965 and that in fact 1,000 troops could be sent home. Well, far from sending home 1,000 troops, in the meantime the Military Establishment, the American commitment in Vietnam had to be increased practically by 50 percent. And far from the situation improving—and it hadn't improved even then when the statement was made; in fact it was far worse than it had ever been before—the situation of course has greatly deteriorated.

Mr. SPIVAK. Former Vice President Nixon the other day said if our strategy in South Vietnam is not changed, we will be thrown out in a matter of months, certainly within the year. Is that an illusion, or is that an error of judgment?

Dr. FALL. There is a very interesting parallel between Mr. Nixon's statement last week and Mr. Nixon's statement in February 1954, when he also made a statement saying that the only way to win Vietnam is to commit the United States fully in the war, at that time on the side of the French. I don't think that the United States has to be thrown out within 3 or 4 months or for that matter within a year. I would say the United States has the wherewithal to stay in Vietnam if she so desires. The whole point is, of course, what is the price tag?

Mr. SPIVAK. He also said "Our security requires the United States to end the war in Vietnam by winning it." Do you agree with that?

Dr. FALL. I don't know from what basis of information Mr. Nixon speaks. He is now a private person just as I am a private person. Obviously no country likes to lose a war. Whether the American security is involved in Vietnam is a matter of discussion. Quite a few people inside Government disagree on whether Vietnam is essential to the United States directly in the same sense, let's say, as Hawaii is essential, I understand. As you know, there are some people who speak of "back to Waikiki" if Vietnam is lost, and others say Vietnam is more or less expendable.

Mr. SPIVAK. What is your judgment? Do you think our interests are involved in this?

Dr. FALL. I would say American interests are involved. Whether vital or not, I don't think so.

Mr. SPIVAK. You don't evidently hold to the domino theory, that is if we lose South Vietnam we may finally have to fight in the Philippines or possibly Hawaii?

Dr. FALL. As I said before, I don't think we have to lose South Vietnam any more than we have to lose Europe because we lost Czechoslovakia. Whether the domino—the domino theory could have been invoked for that matter when we lost China. I would say that the United States has the wherewithal in southeast Asia to contain communism on a basis that's acceptable to the West and without the loss of effective strength.

Mr. LISAGOR. Dr. Fall, you have said just now that you think the United States has the wherewithal to stay in Vietnam. You have said in other places that you think the credibility of the American counterinsurgency is involved in Vietnam. If we have the wherewithal and if the credibility of our counterinsurgency is involved, why should we not stay in Vietnam?

Dr. FALL. Because a counterinsurgency operation can become terribly expensive. This has happened before, for example. The British had the wherewithal to stay in Cyprus, and they fought for 5 years with 40,000 troops against 300 Greeks, then decided to call it quits.

The French were staying in Algeria and fought on for 8 years and were not losing militarily but decided that politically it was better to pull out.

Mr. LISAGOR. But the British stayed on the northwest frontier in India for scores of years and didn't withdraw. Isn't our interest involved so deeply in South Vietnam today insofar as it contains Chinese Communist expansion, that we might well consider staying there, and also isn't it true that the war isn't terribly expensive, relatively speaking?

Dr. FALL. Exactly, relatively speaking. Surely. Everybody points to the 300 casualties dead or 1,500 wounded, and they say "This is very easy. This is less than what we lose in car accidents in American military camps in the States."

The hard fact is, it commits right now about one-fourth of the total cadre, officer cadre, lieutenants, majors, for example, of the U.S. ground forces, in Vietnam. This is from a speech by Lt. Gen. Creighton Abrams, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. It is expensive. It commits an American amount of aid expenditure which is almost one-third of the total aid budget, more or less. So it is an expensive war.

This kind of small war tends to grow on you literally, and this is one of them. So the judgment has to be made by the U.S. Government, and I am sure it will be made by the President, whether holding on, as we say is not in fact more expensive than arriving at the diplomatic solution—at a solution which will not mean "selling out" the Western interests in Vietnam.

Miss HIGGINS. Dr. Fall, you mentioned Algeria and France and her decision to get out before she was militarily beaten. Are you saying that America in Vietnam is a colonial power as France was in Algeria?

Dr. FALL. Absolutely not.

Miss HIGGINS. There is a difference that can be made then to the Vietcong, and our position is not as politically assailable as that of France?

Dr. FALL. The trouble is, whether you and I know that the United States—and we do know it—that the United States is no colonial power in southeast Asia or for that matter anywhere else, is totally irrelevant to the Communist propaganda cadre, the "can-bo" on the ground, who points at the American officer, at the American noncom, who is there and says, "You see, your troops are again, your government troops are again commanded by those Americans, just like they were when the French officers were there."

This is, of course, one of the troubles, and this is recognized.

Miss HIGGINS. What would the Vietcong and the Communist propaganda say if America broke its pledged word in Vietnam, and do you think that any other ally to whom we pledged defense and help would trust us if we broke our pledges in Vietnam?

Dr. FALL. The question is not breaking an American pledge. The question is arriving at the situation which will save Vietnam. For example, if the United States were to arrive at such a saving of Vietnam by using as a diplomatic argument the American Forces, such as the 7th Fleet, the Pacific Air Force, et cetera, this is not breaking a pledge to Vietnam. The President has said that the United States is in Vietnam at the request of the Vietnamese people. As you well know, one of the problems may well arise where a proper neutralist government comes to power in Vietnam, like Kong-Le in Laos, who from one day as pro-American turned into proneutralist, and asks the United States to get out. Then what?

Miss HIGGINS. Then you are saying that you don't believe we can break our word, and if we find a solution, it has to be within a framework of having kept our pledges, correct?

Dr. FALL. I think the United States is keeping its pledge right now.

Miss HIGGINS. The Russians have announced a very important official visit to

Hanoi. Is that news that should cheer us or depress us?

Dr. FALL. I wish there were a simple answer to that. Personally I would say that the very importance of the Russian mission—is not that Kossygin, the Prime Minister goes, but some of the specialists in certain fields, such as rocket forces for example, such as air transport, such as Russian foreign aid. It seems to me that the Russians have reentered southeast Asia. As you know after the Laos crisis there was a certain feeling in the West that the Russians had decided to call it quits, at least on the southeast Asia mainland and perhaps would concentrate on India and Indonesia, just like the United States might decide to concentrate for her aid on some key countries. Apparently as of yesterday, we are facing a reentry of the Russians into the field. Two versions are likely. Either the Russians have decided that the Chinese might be close to winning and can't afford to let China go away with that victory—or vice versa, the Russians have decided that the commitment may become far bigger and rather than be dragged into a war on China's side, step in to facilitate perhaps a meeting between the Communist side and the U.S. side.

Miss HIGGINS. You are one of the few Westerners who have visited North Vietnam. As you know, many of the Vietcong deserters who come over to our side say they come over because even the peasantry in turmoil-ridden South Vietnam is better off than the peasantry in North Vietnam. What is your observation, what is the state of the economy? Is it as bad as they paint it?

Dr. FALL. As you know, I have been to North Vietnam even before the Communists took over, so I have a basis for comparison in the case. The country obviously is dreary. To give you an example there are probably 50 automobiles in a city of 600,000 people, like Hanoi. But one thing, the North Vietnamese sell one thing that we can't beat, and that is peace. Obviously, yes, they are behind the rebellion in South Vietnam. On the other hand in North Vietnam a peasant doesn't get napalm. He works hard but he stays alive.

Point 2, the North Vietnamese have built up a respectable industrial establishment. Like most Communist countries they try hard, and at least they have the wherewithal to do it well.

Point 3, the Communists have a large army. They have a large army and above all, right now, they think they are winning.

Miss HIGGINS. But what about whether a peasant in Vietnam, as the deserters to our side say, is often hungry, is that possibly true?

Dr. FALL. That is—they are likely to have short rations, but the fact the man is a deserter shows he is not one of the hard core.

Mr. GORALSKI. Dr. Fall, you said earlier that we can win in Vietnam. How do we do it? If you were in a position of responsibility in this country, if you were determining foreign policy, what would you do in Vietnam to win that war?

Dr. FALL. This is obviously—we always arrive at the professor who thinks he has all the solutions. In all seriousness, I think that the United States has in southeast Asia the combination of American—the mix of American forces available makes an American posture, defense posture in there credible. The United States is doing badly—let's not kid ourselves—on the ground inside South Vietnam. All the mythology is by now just about gone. We know it. But the Communists in North Vietnam still risk two things, (a) an American massive bombardment which would knock out those industries—and this is the only thing that they really did do in the last 10 years—and (b) the immediate Chinese Communist counter-invasion of North Vietnam which would occur in all likelihood. In other words, North Vietnam would be reduced to the state of North Korea. North Vietnam is not—I repeat, definitely not—and probably the Kossygin visit shows this—a totally helpless

Chinese satellite. The North Vietnamese did not fight the French for 30 years and the Americans now for 10 just for the joy of selling out to Peiping.

Mr. GORALSKI. You don't believe that escalating the war would be helpful at all at this stage?

Dr. FALL. This already has been proved. The U.S. massive bombardment operation in North Korea called Operation Strangle was an utter failure against Communist communication lines. The French Operation Vulture in 1954, which was designed to knock out Communist communications against Dienbienphu was a failure. There is no such thing as bombing supply lines in the jungle.

Mr. SPIVAK. Dr. Fall, I am not quite clear as to what you are getting at in the advice you are giving here. You say that the United States can wipe out industry in North Vietnam, I believe you said, in 24 hours. You say that the North Vietnamese are scared to death of having the Chinese Communists come in. What objection then is there for us to use the force we have to hit them as hard as we can, which is what Nixon and others want to do?

Dr. FALL. Because it is militarily meaningless. This is exactly it. All we would do is knock out factories which the Communists did not have in 1954 when they defeated the French, and all we would get in return is probably 14 Communist divisions down our necks in South Vietnam.

In other words, the fear of the bombardment, the fear of Chinese pressure, and, of course, vice versa, of American pressure, is useful in diplomatic confrontation to even out the stakes.

Militarily it is nonsense. Just look at the bridge of Ban-Ban—incidentally, at which I was shot at in 1953—which the Communists rebuilt or bypassed inside 3 days. This is a typical example of what you can do with massive airpower in a counterinsurgency operation.

Mr. SPIVAK. Do you say that neither side can win, or that we can go on and spend a lot of money there and that we can't win; the best we can do is to hold our own there?

Dr. FALL. That is exactly it. Neither side can win. This is going to be one of those guerrilla standoffs, of which we have several on record. I come back once more to Algeria—again, I repeat, it is not the colonial comparison; it is a tactical comparison. The Algerians knew—and I was, in 1963, in Algeria—that they couldn't lick the French militarily. There wasn't going to be a Dienbienphu. And vice versa, the French also knew they weren't going to be able to wipe out the Algerians. It was out of that standoff that a negotiation came.

Mr. SPIVAK. But Dr. Fall, we know in this country, for example, we can't wipe out crime, and yet we have to have police departments to fight it, and we have to go right on fighting it all the time. This is about the situation that we are in there. We feel we have to continue fighting whether or not we can win, even if it is just to keep things stable. Don't you go along with that theory?

Dr. FALL. I go along with the theory on crime, not on counterinsurgency, for the good reason that, yes, the United States fights crime, but not at the price of martial law in the cities. Martial law is rather considered an extreme in anticrime fighting. In other words, yes, if South Vietnam were, by sheer miracle—and this would take a long time—if South Vietnam tomorrow morning were at a sort of guerrilla standoff with the Communists, then after peace, after some sort of settlement had been arrived at, counterinsurgency in the sound sense of civic action of local improvements will come in its own.

Mr. SPIVAK. Dr. Fall, as a Frenchman aren't you thinking a little too much of French defeats and not of American power?

Dr. FALL. You may recall that I used the British standoff in Cyprus. I could add the British standoff also in Palestine. Counterinsurgency operations have been lost—the

Germans in Russia lost a counterinsurgency operation. There were 49 separate insurgency wars since 1900, and the winning side has, in many cases, been the guerrilla, for various reasons.

Mr. LISAGOR. Dr. Fall, to clarify what you have said, are you now saying that there can be no winner and there can be no loser in Vietnam, that the most we can do is to have a standoff there or outlast the Communists? Is that what you are saying?

Dr. FALL. That is substantially correct, yes.

Mr. LISAGOR. Well, one of the penalties of an expert, it seems to me, is that he is always having his views quoted back at him. You have said that you wouldn't bet that the United States can win in South Vietnam or save it from a Communist takeover. You have said that the cutting off of weapons supply from the north will do very little good, and you also say that if we strike north, the Communists are likely—the Chinese Communists are likely to enter the fray. Under these conditions what kind of a deal do you see in the making, except the deal of total surrender, or giving up, under conditions that the Communists may impose?

Dr. FALL. Well, the whole point is—I will come back to what I just said before, and what you quoted is right there in line with this—that the American ability of striking at North Vietnam, in case of a resumption of any kind of insurgency after a settlement has been attained—just like in Korea, the American capability of retaliation is not the two American divisions on the 38th parallel, it is the overall American defensive posture in the Pacific. That is the same thing in Vietnam.

Mr. LISAGOR. But I think you said to Mr. Spivak that you thought a bombardment of North Vietnam would be militarily meaningless.

Dr. FALL. That is correct. In other words, as soon as the United States—let me make this quite clear—as soon as the United States bombs North Vietnam, there goes the baby with the bath. The North Vietnamese lose whatever was worth gaining in that fight. In other words, to win South Vietnam for the North Vietnamese unless they are totally irrational—and so far they have not been in 30 years—would simply mean losing the last chance of making this a net gain. To get South Vietnam at the price of every North Vietnamese city being totally flattened, even though this is militarily meaningless, makes it, of course, politically hopeless.

Mr. LISAGOR. What you are saying is that the threat should be posed but not the action, is that it? In other words, we should try to blackmail North Vietnam without following through if that becomes necessary?

Dr. FALL. We, (a) yes, we should blackmail North Vietnam, (b) I would feel, obviously, that if the threat has to be carried out, we must realize that its carrying out will not change substantially the military problem. Any more than in Korea—than it did in Korea. In other words, we must realize, as—I think it was the President, or was it the Secretary of State, who said it might then become a 10-year operation, still with the same result, perhaps.

Miss HIGGINS. But is there any such thing in Asia as a short guerrilla war?

Dr. FALL. Some of the guerrilla wars like in Malaya, for example, lasted 13 years at the ratio of 350,000 troops, on the British side, 85,000 of whom were British, against 8,000 guerrillas. In other words, the British were fighting at 35 to 1, and it took them 13 years. In Vietnam right now, the Western forces, the United States advisers, plus Vietnamese, fight at four and a half to five to one. It is generally accepted that to break even—not to win, to break even—in a revolutionary warfare operation, it takes a 10 to 15 to 1 superiority. In other words, right now, brutally spoken, we don't have the wherewithal on the ground to break

even. So the holding operation under those circumstances is going to be a long, bleeding operation.

Miss HIGGINS. Do the Vietcong, to make it perfectly clear, have the capacity to force the military decision in Vietnam?

Dr. FALL. Not of the Dienbienphu type, no. The Vietcong as we just said before, the Vietcong, like the Algerian FLN, for that matter, or Mr. Grivas, Colonel Grivas on Cyprus, could hold on for 10 or 15 years.

Miss HIGGINS. Then the only way that they could "win" would be for us to willingly give up for political reasons?

Dr. FALL. No, there is a second alternative which I mentioned before, and I think you mentioned it in your interesting column today, the fact is that some of the South Vietnamese leaders may pull a Kong-Le on us. They may literally, just from one government to the next, finally come up and say, "Well, thank you very much, United States, this is where the kissing stops," and the United States is then caught. So these two alternatives exist: Defeat, or—in other words, long-range bleeding—or the inside overthrow.

Mr. BROOKS. We have about 2 minutes.

Mr. GORALSKI. Dr. Fall, there are a lot of people who believe that South Vietnam is not a military problem, it is a political problem, stability within South Vietnam. Do you think that political stability is possible, given the situation today?

Dr. FALL. No.

Mr. GORALSKI. How is it going to be achieved? Who is going to come out on top?

Dr. FALL. There we come back to the old story of instant democracy. There is no such thing in the area. On the other hand there is such a thing as basic democracy. We keep forgetting that it was Mr. Diem who after 30 years—40 years of elected village chiefs, abolished elected village chiefs in June 1956. This is a perfect example of what I mean. In other words, in Vietnam we have to come back, finally, and acknowledge the fact that we have to start from scratch, if we want to stay in at all. You are right, it is a civilian operation.

Mr. GORALSKI. Some people say, good or bad, Ngo Dinh Diem, whether he was an autocratic dictator or a George Washington of Asia, that we probably would be in a better position today had he not been overthrown in November 1963, and the whole family was back in power. What do you say to that?

Dr. FALL. By the time Mr. Diem was murdered we had lost about the control of two-thirds of the population of Vietnam. The only thing that Mr. Diem did for us—he plastered over. The facade was kept up, that is right. In Saigon we didn't have any uprisings. The fact is we had lost over 8,000 village chiefs in Vietnam by that time. The fact is that of the 8,000 strategic hamlets only 1,500 were viable by the time he died. This, neither the Buddhists in Saigon nor the CIA did it. It is what Diem did to himself.

Mr. SPIVAK. Dr. Fall, from your knowledge of the present situation in South Vietnam, do you think it is possible to get a stable government there now?

Dr. FALL. No sir.

Mr. SPIVAK. Not at all, not even a military dictatorship?

Dr. FALL. Military dictatorship is usually a very poor substitute for stability. It just establishes, perhaps, for one time, the facade of stability. Remember there are neutralist military dictatorships.

Mr. SPIVAK. Dr. Fall, I hate to quote you to yourself, but in a recent current history article you wrote, "It should be obvious by now that, in the present state of affairs in South Vietnam, everything is Communist infiltrated." Does that apply to the government, too?

Dr. FALL. Correct.

Mr. BROOKS. I am afraid we are going to have to call that the question and the answer

because we have run out of time. Thank you very much for being with us, Dr. Fall.

MEDICARE AND ELDERCARE, CONFUSED DOMESTIC ISSUE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, the most confused domestic issue in national politics today is the subject of medicare and eldercare. Neither of these labels disclose the actual contents of the packages being proposed by the administration and by the American Medical Association.

It is easy to hear opinions for or against each proposal but it is difficult

to find a concise, factual analysis and comparison of the bill popularly known as medicare—H.R. 1—and the plan more recently introduced known as eldercare—H.R. 3727 and H.R. 3728.

At my request, and for the benefit of myself and my constituents, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has prepared an objective analysis and comparison of these two plans.

I realize that what may emerge from the Ways and Means Committee of the House may be somewhat different from either of these bills. I am convinced, however, that this analysis and comparison widely disseminated can eliminate such confusion in the minds of many people.

Furthermore, I believe consideration of this information will assist those in and out of Congress in evaluating the specific legislation to be recommended by the Ways and Means Committee:

COMPARISON OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED LAW WITH THE AMENDMENTS TO IT PROPOSED BY THE ELDERCARE ACT OF 1965

EXISTING LAW

H.R. 3727 (CONGRESSMAN HERLONG); H.R. 3728
(CONGRESSMAN CURTIS) AND OTHERS

A. Brief summary

Permits States to include in their plans under title I a program of medical assistance for the aged (MAA); that is, to provide medical vendor payments (payments directly to the suppliers of medical services) for aged persons who are not old-age assistance recipients, but whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical services. The State plan for medical assistance for the aged may specify medical services of broad scope and duration provided that both institutional (hospitals, etc.) and noninstitutional (outpatient clinics, etc.) services are included.

There is no dollar ceiling, the overall amount of Federal participation is governed by the extent of the State programs. The Federal share varies from 50 percent (for States with per capita income equal to or above the national average) up to 80 percent for lower per capita income States.

Adds a new section to title I which would authorize a State, at its option, to provide MAA in the form of premium payments for guaranteed renewable private health insurance. Such coverage would have to be made available to all aged residents in the State. As to MAA recipients, there would be State and Federal participation in the full cost of the payment. As to individuals above the MAA maximum income limit, there would be part payment by the individual, in such proportions (based on his income) as the State agency may determine, up to such higher level as the State agency may consider appropriate. Above this level all the premiums would be paid by the individual. Certification of income under oath shall be accepted as conclusive for eligibility purposes. Increases Federal participation in State MAA expenditures by 5 percent as to that portion in the form of health insurance coverage under the new section.

Modifies MAA income and resources test to one of income alone. Exempts from prohibition against enrollment fees and premium charges the assistance provided under the health insurance coverage above. Provides that a statement of income under oath shall be accepted by State agency as conclusive for eligibility purposes.

B. Eligibility for assistance

To be eligible an individual—
(1) must have attained age 65;
(2) must not be a recipient of old-age assistance;
(3) must have income and resources, as determined by the State, insufficient to meet all of the cost of the medical services outlined below. The State plan must provide reasonable standards, consistent with the objectives of the program, for determining eligibility and the extent of assistance.

- (1) same as existing law;
- (2) same as existing law;

(3) modified so that assistance would be provided in behalf of individuals whose income (rather than income and resources) is insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical services.

C. Scope of benefits

Same as existing law.

The State plan for medical assistance for the aged may specify medical services of any scope and duration, provided that both institutional and noninstitutional services are included. Federal participation is restricted to vendor medical payments: i.e., payments made by the States directly to the doctor, hospital, etc., providing medical services on behalf of the recipient.

The Federal Government shares in the expense of providing the following kinds of medical services:

- 1. Inpatient hospital services;

COMPARISON OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED LAW WITH THE AMENDMENTS TO IT PROPOSED BY THE ELDERCARE ACT OF 1965—Continued

H.R. 3727 (CONGRESSMAN HERLONG); H.R. 3728 (CONGRESSMAN CURTIS) AND OTHERS

EXISTING LAW

C. Scope of benefits—Continued

2. Skilled nursing home services;
3. Physicians' services;
4. Outpatient hospital (or clinic services);
5. Home health care services;
6. Private duty nursing services;
7. Physical therapy and related services;
8. Dental services;
9. Laboratory and X-ray services;
10. Prescribed drugs, eyeglasses, dentures, and prosthetic devices;
11. Diagnostic, screening, and preventive services; and
12. Any other medical care or remedial care recognized under State law.

The Federal Government does not share in the expense of providing medical services to inmates of public institutions (other than medical institutions), to patients in mental or tuberculosis institutions or to patients in medical institutions as a result of a diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis after 42 days of care.

D. Matching formula

Federal share: Federal payments reimburse the States for a portion of their expenditures under approved plans for medical assistance for the aged according to an equalization formula which ranges from 50 to 80 percent depending upon the per capita income of the States as related to the national per capita income. States at or above national average get a 50-percent Federal share.

Federal medical percentages applicable for July 1, 1963, through June 30, 1965

Percentage	Percentage
Alabama.....	78.29
Alaska.....	50.00
Arizona.....	58.75
Arkansas.....	80.00
California.....	50.00
Colorado.....	50.00
Connecticut.....	50.00
Delaware.....	50.00
District of Columbia.....	50.00
Florida.....	60.69
Georgia.....	73.69
Guam.....	50.00
Hawaii.....	50.00
Idaho.....	67.43
Illinois.....	50.00
Indiana.....	52.06
Iowa.....	57.63
Kansas.....	56.63
Kentucky.....	75.27
Louisiana.....	73.46
Maine.....	65.65
Maryland.....	50.00
Massachusetts.....	50.00
Michigan.....	50.00
Minnesota.....	56.42
Mississippi.....	80.00
Missouri.....	50.45
Montana.....	59.69
Nebraska.....	55.10
Nevada.....	50.00
New Hampshire.....	56.38
New Jersey.....	50.00
New Mexico.....	66.55
New York.....	50.00
North Carolina.....	74.99
North Dakota.....	73.03
Ohio.....	50.00
Oklahoma.....	65.65
Oregon.....	50.00
Pennsylvania.....	50.00
Puerto Rico.....	50.00
Rhode Island.....	50.90
South Carolina.....	80.00
South Dakota.....	67.87
Tennessee.....	75.53
Texas.....	61.45
Utah.....	62.28
Vermont.....	64.75
Virgin Islands.....	50.00
Virginia.....	65.05
Washington.....	50.00
West Virginia.....	71.76
Wisconsin.....	52.50
Wyoming.....	50.00

Removes exclusion from Federal matching as to aged individuals who are patients in institutions for tuberculosis or mental diseases, or who have been diagnosed as having tuberculosis or psychosis and, as a result, are patients in a medical institution.

Same as existing law except that as to amounts expended on MAA in the form of private health insurance coverage under the new section the Federal medical matching percentage will be increased by 5 percent. For such health insurance expenditures Federal matching will run from 52½ percent to 84 percent as noted below:

COMPARISON OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED LAW WITH THE AMENDMENTS TO IT PROPOSED BY THE ELDERCARE ACT OF 1965—Continued

H.R. 3727 (CONGRESSMAN HERLONG); H.R. 3728 (CONGRESSMAN CURTIS) AND OTHERS

EXISTING LAW

Federal medical percentages applicable for July 1, 1963, through June 30, 1965—Continued

Percentage	Percentage
Nebraska.....	55.10
Nevada.....	50.00
New Hampshire.....	56.38
New Jersey.....	50.00
New Mexico.....	66.55
New York.....	50.00
North Carolina.....	74.99
North Dakota.....	73.03
Ohio.....	50.00
Oklahoma.....	65.65
Oregon.....	50.00
Pennsylvania.....	50.00
Puerto Rico.....	50.00
Rhode Island.....	50.90
South Carolina.....	80.00
South Dakota.....	67.87
Tennessee.....	75.53
Texas.....	61.45
Utah.....	62.28
Vermont.....	64.75
Virgin Islands.....	50.00
Virginia.....	65.05
Washington.....	50.00
West Virginia.....	71.76
Wisconsin.....	52.50
Wyoming.....	50.00

(27 F.R. 9230)

Seventy-five percent Federal matching is authorized for certain rehabilitation services for aged recipients and for the training of welfare personnel.

The Federal Government pays 50 percent of administrative costs.

Pass along provision: No provision in existing law to insure that public assistance recipients receive higher payments because of legislation liberalizing the Federal matching formula.

E. State plan requirements

In order to be eligible for Federal participation, the State must provide medical assistance for the aged according to a plan submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and approved by him, which meets the requirements set out in the law. The State plan provisions are generally the same as those required for the other public assistance programs with the following exceptions:

A State plan—

1. Must not require a premium enrollment fee, or similar charge, as a condition of eligibility.
2. Must not impose property liens during the lifetime of the individual receiving benefits (except pursuant to court judgment on account of benefits incorrectly paid) and any recovery provisions under the plan must be limited to the estate of the individual after his death and the death of his surviving spouse.

Same as existing law.

Same as existing law.

The following changes are made in MAA State plan requirements:

1. Provides an exception with respect to assistance furnished in the form of health insurance coverage under the new section.
2. Same as existing law.

COMPARISON OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED LAW WITH THE AMENDMENTS TO IT PROPOSED BY THE ELDERCARE ACT OF 1965—Continued

H.R. 3727 (CONGRESSMAN HERLONG); H.R. 3728 (CONGRESSMAN CURTIS) AND OTHERS

EXISTING LAW

E. State plan requirements—Continued

3. Must not impose a citizenship requirement which would exclude a citizen of the United States or a requirement which excludes a resident of the State.

4. Must also provide, to the extent required by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for inclusion of residents of the State who are absent therefrom.

5. Include reasonable standards consistent with the objectives of this title for determining eligibility for, and the extent of, assistance; and

6. If a State has both a program for old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged it must be administered by a single State agency.

F. Use of private health insurance

Includes in the amounts subject to Federal matching the expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof.

3. Same as existing law.

4. Same as existing law.

5. Modified provision so that State plan must include reasonable income standards and that a statement of income under oath shall be accepted by the State agency (subject to penalties for fraud) as conclusive.

6. Provides that the State could designate one State agency to administer the portion of the State plan that relates to old-age assistance, and a separate State agency to administer the portion relating to medical assistance for the aged.

Amend the provisions which describe the purposes of appropriations to include encouragement for "each State to provide medical assistance for all aged individuals through the utilization of insurance provided by private insurance carriers."

Adds a new section under which a State with an MAA program would be authorized, in its discretion, to provide the MAA in the form of premium payments for health insurance coverage under voluntary private health insurance plans in addition to providing the assistance in the manner authorized under existing law. A State wishing to participate in the program would be required to enter into contracts or other arrangements with private insurance carriers as it deems appropriate.

The contracts would have to: (1) be guaranteed renewable; (2) provide benefits which, together with MAA benefits authorized in existing law, include both institutional and noninstitutional care; (3) establish enrollment periods not less often than once a year; and (4) contain such other provisions as the State agency determines are necessary to carry out the purposes of the program.

If a State provides an MAA program in the form of health insurance coverage, the same coverage would have to be available to all individuals who reside in the State and who are 65 or over.

Provides that premiums for coverage of any individual under an insurance plan would be paid by the State agency with the following two exceptions. The State agency could establish a maximum income level at least equal to the highest level at which an individual may qualify under the MAA program in the State. If the individual's income is above this level, the premiums would be paid in part by the individual and in part by the State agency in proportions based on the individual's income as the State agency may determine up to a higher income level as the State agency determines to be appropriate. If the individual's income is above the higher level, he would be required to pay the premium in full.

For the purposes of the section "Income" would include gross income as defined under the Internal Revenue and in addition any interest, rents, annuities, and other retirement payments from any source which are not includible in gross income as so defined.

Each individual covered under an insurance plan under the program would be required to certify his income to the State agency in a manner and at such times (but at least once a year) as the State agency may require. The State agency would be required to accept the certification as conclusive. The certification would be subject to the penalties for fraud under the Social Security Act.

HEALTH INSURANCE PROVISIONS OF H.R. 1 AND S. 1, 89TH CONGRESS (KING-ANDERSON BILL)

I. GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Under social security (old-age and survivors insurance) and railroad retirement administrative mechanisms, provides (1) hospital, posthospital extended care (skilled nursing home), home health, and outpatient diagnostic services to persons 65 or over eligible to receive (or receiving) social security or railroad retirement benefits, financed by an increase in taxes for workers and employers under these systems; (2) similar benefits out of Federal general revenue for certain uninsured individuals 65 or over.

In addition includes a complementary private health coverage provision which authorizes the establishment of associations of insurance carriers (two or more carriers) whose purpose is to make available to individuals 65 and over, on a nonprofit basis and at a reasonable cost, a health benefits plan which will protect them against the cost of health services which are not covered under the social security hospital insurance program.

II. HOSPITAL INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT ELIGIBLES AND THE UNINSURED

A. Scope of benefits: Benefits would consist of payments to health facilities and organizations for services rendered to eligible individuals. Such payments may be made for the following kinds of services:

1. Inpatient hospital care for 60 days per benefit period¹ subject to deductible of an amount equal to the national average per diem rate for such services for 1 day.

2. Posthospital extended care (skilled nursing facility services) up to 60 days in a benefit period after transfer from a hospital in an institution which has a transfer agreement with a hospital that provides for timely transfer of patients together with appropriate medical and other information.

3. Home health services up to 240 visits a year (120 visits in 1966).

4. Outpatient diagnostic services—no durational limit but subject to a deductible each 30-day period equal to one-half that for inpatient hospital care.

Effective dates: Hospital, home health, and outpatient diagnostic services would be first available on July 1, 1966, while posthospital extended care benefits would not be available until the following January.

B. Eligibility for benefits:

1. All persons who—

(a) are age 65 or over; and

(b) are eligible to receive (or receiving) social security or railroad retirement benefits.

2. All persons not insured under social security or railroad retirement who either—

(a) have reached age 65 before 1968; or

(b) have reached age 65 after 1967 if they have three quarters of coverage for each year elapsing after 1965 and before the year they reach age 65.

The operation of this provision is illustrated by the following table.

¹ A period of consecutive days beginning with the first day an individual is furnished with hospital or nursing home services and ending after he has been out of the hospital or nursing home for 90 days. The 90 days need not be consecutive but must occur within a period of not more than 180 consecutive days.

Quarters of coverage required for old-age and survivors insurance cash benefits as compared to hospital insurance

Year attains age 65	Men		Women	
	OASI	Hospital insurance	OASI	Hospital insurance
1967	16	0	13	0
1968	17	6	14	6
1969	18	9	15	9
1970	19	12	16	12
1971	20	15	17	15
1972	21	18	18	(1)
1973	22	21		
1974	23	(1)		

¹ Same as OASI.

Excluded from (2) would be nonresidents or resident aliens with less than 10 years in the United States, members of certain subversive organizations, persons convicted of certain subversive crimes, and persons eligible for benefits (whether or not they had actually elected benefits) under the Federal employee or retired Federal employee health plans.

III. FINANCING

1. In order to finance health benefits for social security eligibles (and for the 7-percent benefit increase in cash benefits which the bill also provides) there would be an increase in the tax rate on employers and employees, the self-employed and in the maximum taxable earnings base. The wage base, now \$4,800, would be increased to \$5,600, effective January 1, 1966.

The contribution schedule of existing law is noted in parentheses in the following table showing the increases provided:

Federal Insurance Contributions Tax Act
(In percent)

Year	Employer	Employee	Self-employed
1966-67	4.25 (4.125)	4.25 (4.125)	6.4 (6.2)
1968-70	5.0 (4.625)	5.0 (4.625)	7.5 (6.9)
1971 and after	5.2 (4.625)	5.2 (4.625)	7.8 (6.9)

From tax revenues an allocation of 0.60 percent of employer-employee taxable wages the first year (1966); 0.76 percent of taxable wages in 1967 and 1968; and 0.90 percent of taxable wages in 1969 and subsequent years would be made to a separate Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund from which all health benefits and administrative expenses therefor would be paid. Similar allocations of self-employment tax revenue would be made of 0.45, 0.57, and 0.675 percent, respectively.

Under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act an increase in social security tax results in a comparable increase in the railroad retirement tax.

(2) For ineligibles under social security and railroad retirement there would be an authorization of appropriation out of general revenues.

IV. COMPLEMENTARY PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

The bill provides complementary private health coverage by authorizing the establishment of associations of insurance carriers (two or more carriers) whose purpose is to make available to individuals 65 and over, on a nonprofit basis and at a reasonable cost, health benefit plans which will protect them against the cost of health services which are not covered under the social security hospital insurance program.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall approve any such plan if (1) it furnishes reasonable assurance that it will provide for physician's services which amount, on the average, to not less than 75 percent of the cost of physician's services for aged persons 65 years or older; (2) the

terms and conditions of the plan are uniform except (subject to limitations by the Secretary) that there may be variations in different areas of any State or the United States (a) in the premiums and benefits to reflect differences in health care costs, and (b) in the timing of annual enrollment periods to minimize adverse selection; (3) the operation of the association is nonprofit and, on dissolution, any assets remaining, after payment of all obligations, will be paid over to the United States; (4) the association will adhere to such limitations on the amount claimed for administrative and other expenses in connection with the plan as the Secretary may prescribe in order to hold such expenses within reasonable limits; and (5) any additional health benefits for sale in connection with an approved plan will be offered in a manner which enables prospective subscribers clearly to distinguish between the two plans.

The plan must be approved, without change, by the State insurance agencies in a majority of the States or in States with a majority of the population of the United States. If it is offered for sale in States other than those who have approved it without change, this must be done only with such modifications as may be necessary to meet the special requirements of such State insurance agency as are deemed reasonable by the Secretary.

The Sherman (Anti-Trust) Act (other than so much thereof as relates to any agreements to boycott, coerce, or intimidate or any act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation), the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the antitrust laws of any State shall not apply to the operations of such associations who are concerned exclusively with offering for sale, selling, or administering any approved plan.

If, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, the Secretary finds an association has not complied substantially with the above requirements, the antitrust law exemptions will not be operative. Any carrier which falsely represents that it is selling an approved plan shall be fined not more than \$10,000. Any denial of approval of a plan (or subsequent withdrawal of approval) by the Secretary shall be subject to judicial review.

ORDER CLOSING VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES SHOULD BE RESCINDED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Republican members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation are urging President Johnson to rescind his order closing 11 Veterans' Administration hospitals, 4 domiciliaries, and 17 regional offices.

As a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and on behalf of my colleagues and Senator SCOTT, I wish to submit a resolution that has been adopted today:

RESOLUTION REGARDING VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL CLOSING

Whereas the present administration has issued orders to close 11 Veterans' Administration hospitals, 4 domiciliaries and 17 regional offices prior to June 30, 1965; and

Whereas more than 6,000 hospital and domiciliary beds will be eliminated and more

than 6,000 Federal employees will be affected by the closings; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has admitted that the \$23,500,000 estimated savings will not in fact be saved but will in part pay for nursing care beds authorized by Congress; and

Whereas it was the intent of Congress as expressed in Public Law 88-450 that the 4,000 authorized nursing care beds were to be in addition to the hospital and domiciliary beds already being operated; and

Whereas the administration is reducing beds presently devoted to the active medical care of veterans to accommodate the nursing care beds which Congress intended to be supplemental to the beds currently being operated; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has been unable to adequately justify its reasons for closing these facilities; and

Whereas the President of the United States informed the Congress that the stated goal of the Great Society is "to improve the quality of life for all" and he also stated "we must strengthen our Nation's health facilities and services"; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration itself has termed its domiciliary as an institution which provides a home—bed, board, and incidental medical care—for men who are so disabled that they cannot support themselves; and

Whereas the elimination of 3,000 domiciliary beds devoted to the care and treatment of indigent war veterans, a majority of whom are chronically ill and unemployed, is inconsistent with the stated goals of the Great Society; and

Whereas despite the President's alleged concern for the plight of the poverty-stricken residents of Appalachia, his closing order will eliminate 139 sorely needed Federal jobs from the city of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., located in the heart of Appalachia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Republican members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation, do deplore and condemn this callous and wanton disregard of the needs of the Nation's sick, needy, and aging veteran as reflected in the administration's order closing 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States be urged to reconsider this ill-advised action and rescind the order closing these facilities so that the Nation's veterans may continue to receive the high quality of medical care and services that their sacrifices on behalf of our national security have earned.

HUGH SCOTT, U.S. SENATE; JAMES G.

FULTON, 27th District; JOHN P. SAYLOR, 22d District; WILLARD S. CURTIN, 5th District; HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, 17th District; JOSEPH M. MCDADE, 10th District; G. ROBERT WATKINS, 7th District; ROBERT J. CORBETT, 18th District; PAUL B. DAGUE, 9th District; JOHN C. KUNKEL, 16th District; J. IRVING WHALLEY, 12th District; RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, 13th District; ALBERT W. JOHNSON, 23d District.

LEGISLATION TO ELIMINATE TAX ON INCOME FROM E-BONDS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill of benefit to the little man whose heart is in the right place, who wants to help his country and

provide a degree of security for his old age, and who chooses investment in Government E-bonds as a means of accomplishing these ends. My bill would exempt from income tax the interest from E bonds, provided they are held at least until their maturity and further provided that the income tax has not been paid on them annually.

Unwittingly perhaps, we have abused this ordinary citizen who has responded to the appeals to his patriotism and bought these familiar Government obligations. Large investors do not go into E-bonds; as a matter of fact we limit the amount that can be bought in any year. The Treasury Department tells me that 60 percent of these bonds are sold through payroll savings plans.

Since 1940 the dollar has lost 55 cents through erosion of its purchasing power, and 43 cents since 1945. In the past 10 years the loss has been 14 cents. But that is not bad enough, paying back depreciated dollars for whole ones invested. When the inevitable emergency arises and the long-held bonds are cashed, the accumulated income dissipates under the impact of the accumulated income tax. Had he been more sophisticated, the little bondholder could have bought municipal bonds and avoided the tax bite. But with E bonds, we pay him back in deteriorated currency, and normally tax all his income at once.

It is in the Government's interest to sell as many of these E-bonds as it can. It is in the Government's interest to have the purchasers hold them until maturity. It is also in the Government's interest to treat the little purchaser fairly so that he will value the Government's word and honor its obligations. My bill should help on all these counts. Its cost in lost revenue is estimated at \$100 million, which is small compared to the excise tax cuts which are being considered to reduce the burden on purchasers of many items, including luxuries. I realize that there no longer seems to be a public policy of encouraging thrift, but even those officials whose careers are built on public borrowing should see the desirability of encouraging the purchasers of Government bonds.

LEGISLATION TO ASSIST TAXPAYERS BECAUSE SUFFICIENT FUNDS WERE NOT WITHHELD FROM THEIR PAYCHECKS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to assist the thousands of taxpayers who, through no fault of their own, now find themselves in a most difficult position because sufficient funds were not withheld from their paychecks during the past year to meet their Federal income tax obligations.

As the April 15 deadline for filing Federal tax returns nears, I fully expect that

every Member of this great body will be receiving a considerable amount of protest mail from unsuspecting constituents who have discovered that they owe much more in Federal income taxes than anticipated.

The bulk of the letters would not be from what I refer to as the hard-core tax complainers who want all the many services provided by the Federal Government, but do not want to pay their share for them. They will be from solid, upstanding citizens—your neighbors and mine—who recognize their obligations and are conscientious about meeting them.

The much-publicized recent tax cut was passed because many of us felt that it would prove to be the stimulant needed to "beef up" the economy. Since the President gave Congress his assurance that he would make every effort to reduce Federal spending, an assurance that we demanded before we would give our approval to the measure, I voted for the bill because I could envision the good that would undoubtedly come from it.

However, at that time, many of us warned that there should not be an immediate drastic cut in the withholding rate. We said, and rightly so, that the cuts should be gradual and that the American public should be fully informed as to the procedure being followed and the probable result. Unfortunately, perhaps because of the then-pending presidential election, this advice was not heeded. Now, it is the innocent taxpayer who is suffering the consequences.

As we all know, the full reduction in the withholding tax rate was put into effect immediately whereas the tax cut itself was not handled in the same manner, but rather in two stages. What has resulted is that Mr. Average Taxpayer, accustomed either to getting a small refund or of paying a few dollars to meet his total tax obligation, now finds that he will have to pay several hundred dollars to the Internal Revenue Service because of the underwithholding.

It is not just a few people who will find themselves in this hole. The situation is so widespread that many finance companies are placing large advertisements in the newspapers in an effort to attract to their place of business the many individuals who will be borrowing funds to meet their tax obligation.

Clearly, if something can be done to assist these people, we should do it. The measure that I have introduced will give these taxpayers temporary relief by permitting them to defer payment of one-half of their remaining 1964 tax obligation until April 15, 1966. Because of the ever-increasing Federal expenditures, the occasion seldom arises in which we can give American taxpayers a break. Here is our opportunity. They deserve this break, and I believe that we should give it to them.

CLEVELAND IMMIGRATION HEARINGS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 20, 1965, I provided an opportunity for interested organizations and individuals in Greater Cleveland to express their views on the major issues related to pending immigration legislation. A public hearing was held in the Cleveland Federal Building to which I invited public officials, the leaders of the major religious faiths, the officers of interested organizations, and the public at large. To assist in crystalizing the major issues involved, I prepared a 10-point questionnaire which was mailed in advance to all individuals requesting an opportunity to appear at the hearing.

In addition, copies of the questionnaire were mailed in advance to the following elements of community leadership requesting cooperation in the survey:

First. The press, including foreign language and weekly community newspaper editors.

Second. Immigration committees of two bar associations.

Third. Leaders of organized labor.

Fourth. Selected leaders of the business community.

Fifth. Leaders of nationality organizations.

Sixth. Women's organizations.

Seventh. Selected individuals based upon their publicly expressed interest in immigration.

Mr. Speaker, I point out that none of this activity was at Government expense. The public hearing in Cleveland was intended to provide me with the views of my constituents and those of recognized leaders in the greater Cleveland community on this vital public issue. All costs involved, including mailing, printing, and the expenses of my staff members who accompanied me to Cleveland were borne by me personally.

The results of that hearing and the enthusiastic response to the questionnaire are both revealing and encouraging. Returns of the questionnaire have now exceeded 90 percent and the results are confirmatory of the testimony taken in the public hearing of February 20, 1965.

In my judgment, greater Cleveland is reflective of the majority of the metropolitan centers of our country. It represents a cross section of the people who have built our country and whose hopes, ideals, and aspirations sustain us in these troubled times.

The results of the questionnaire survey pointed at the major issues are as follows:

The first question was whether there should be a limit to the number of immigrants we admit each year. This is pertinent because under the present law and the pending proposal of the administration, there is no limit set on the number of immigrants to be admitted—89 percent held there should be a limit set while 11 percent held no limit should be set.

The second question was whether the present rate of 300,000 immigrant admissions a year was about right, too high, or too low. This is pertinent because there is disagreement on how many immigrants we should admit each

year and many people hesitate to estimate how many we can assimilate at this advanced stage of our national development—55 percent held that the present rate is about right, 13 percent felt it was too high and 32 percent held it was too low.

The third question was whether Congress should set the limit by law on the number of immigrants we admit. This is pertinent because as I have said previously neither the present law nor the pending administration proposals sets a limit. Further, Congress is responsible for regulating immigration into the United States and thereby has responsibility for quantitative as well as qualitative controls—79 percent held that Congress should set a limit by law on immigration admission while 21 percent felt Congress should not set a limit by law.

The fourth question was whether the President should be delegated authority to decide the limit and how visas should be distributed between countries and classes of aliens. This is pertinent because the pending administration proposal calls for a delegation of this authority from the Congress to the President—64 percent held that Congress should not delegate that authority while 36 percent felt Congress should so delegate. Among the 36-percent group there were a number who qualified their answer with such statements as, "to meet emergencies only," or, "to cut down when unemployment is high," and similar qualifiers.

The fifth question was a multiple choice type, between preferences which should regulate issuance of visas. Five choices were offered with the request they be marked 1 to 5 based on priority to be given. This is pertinent because there is disagreement as to what criteria should be used to determine how visas should be allocated among the various classes of aliens applying for admission. Here 67 percent held that relatives of U.S. citizens should have first preference while only 10 percent felt Communist oppressed should have first preference while only 10 percent felt skilled workers should have first preference. The other choices, relatives of aliens living in the United States, and semiskilled workers were not rated as a first preference by any of the respondents. Further details on the breakdown of this multiple-choice question are appended to my remarks.

The sixth question was whether the individual receiving the questionnaire was aware that nonquota immigrant visas had doubled quota immigrant visas during the past 10 years. This is pertinent because of the public confusion on quota immigration and the popular but false belief that the quota system regulated immigration into the United States—63 percent stated they were not aware of the fact that nonquota immigration has doubled quota immigration while 37 percent said they were aware of this fact.

The seventh question was whether the national origins quota system should be repealed or retained in law. This is per-

tinent because President Johnson has called for repeal as the basic and overriding purpose of his message to Congress for immigration reform—88 percent held for repeal and 12 percent for retention of the national origins quota system.

The eighth question was whether we should continue open and unrestricted immigration by natives of countries of the Western Hemisphere or whether they should be treated like all other alien applicants for admission. This is pertinent for several reasons. First there is the basic question of discrimination. When the quota system was adopted 40 years ago, natives of countries of the Western Hemisphere were made nonquota; that is, except from the quota system based upon national origin. This exemption was based strictly on the accident of place of birth just as the limit set for quota countries is today criticized because of the controlling factor of accident of place of birth. President Johnson has called upon Congress to remove from the law those factors which prejudice an applicant for admission based upon the place where he was born or how he spells his name. Further, nonquota immigration from the Western Hemisphere has been averaging 110,000 admissions a year for the past 10 years, with the prospect that this figure will continue to rise in the years ahead—91 percent held that natives of countries of the Western Hemisphere who seek admission should be treated like all other alien applicants, while 9 percent favored a continuation of the present nonquota privileges. However, almost half of the 9 percent favoring a continuation of nonquota status qualified their reply by stating some special arrangement should be made for Canada.

The ninth question was whether there should be a limit to the number of refugees we admit each year. This is pertinent because the administration proposal calls for broad authority from Congress to admit refugees under a questionable "parole" status, with no indication as to how many will be admitted and who specifically would qualify as a refugee. Further, there appears to be some reasonable concern that bona fide refugees might get lost in the maze of administrative determinations forecast by calm observers should Congress grant to the Attorney General this broad authority on refugee admissions—84 percent held that there should be a limit set on the number of refugees we admit while 16 percent favored no limit.

The 10th question was whether Congress should provide safeguards in law to prevent immigrants from competing for jobs which American workers can fill. This is pertinent because of present unemployment, our job retraining programs to help native Americans meet the demands of automation and the expressed concerns of rank-and-file workers, many among the unemployed, that newly arrived immigrants will compete with them for employment opportunities. Further, there are the concerns of native Americans who are now preparing them-

selves for skilled occupations and who will have their first real chance to compete on an equal basis for the better paying jobs—57 percent felt Congress should provide safeguards to prevent job competition from newly arrived immigrants, while 43 percent held that Congress should not provide such safeguards.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that immigration reform is an emotionally charged public issue. The advocates of far-reaching reforms, though well intended, are frequently blind to the realities which Congress must face up to in meeting its obligation to regulate immigration into the United States. Moreover, I have found that very few of the reformers have a full grasp of the implications of the reforms they advocate. Similarly, opponents of any reform in the present program, though well intended, are frequently blind to the need to correct abuses and inequities which have "termed" their way into the program over a period of years. Moreover, I have found that very few, if any, of the advocates of status quo have any clear conception of the manner in which their opposition to change is being used to prevent Congress from establishing an immigration policy based upon the governing directives of clear-cut law.

To illustrate my point, I offer these rather elementary examples:

Those who oppose the national origins quota system have been molded into advocates of open and largely unrestricted immigration. I do not charge they are aware of their predicament, I only state the reality of their position.

Those who advocate maintaining the national origins quota system have been molded into opponents of reasonable efforts to establish a selective immigration policy with both quantitative and qualitative controls, under directives of law which recognize the practical demands of life in the United States in the 1960's. The irony is that those who fight for a status quo in the immigration field are in fact fighting for an extension of nonquota immigration which means a policy of open and unrestricted immigration. I do not charge that all advocates of the status quo are aware of their predicament, I only state the reality of their position.

Mr. Speaker, because of the interest expressed by many Members of Congress in the questionnaire I utilized to canvass opinion on the major issues related to pending immigration legislation, I include a copy of the form used together with a tabulation of the replies thereto:

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CLEVELAND HEARINGS

1. Should there be a limit to the number of immigrants we admit each year? Yes, 89 percent. No, 11 percent.
2. We are now admitting approximately 300,000 immigrants each year. Do you think this number is: About right, 55 percent; too high, 13 percent; too low, 32 percent.
3. Should Congress set the limit by law on the number of immigrants we admit? Yes, 79 percent. No, 21 percent.
4. Should the President be delegated authority to decide the limit and how visas are to be distributed between countries and classes of aliens? Yes, 36 percent. No, 64 percent.

5. Approximately 1 million alien applicants for admission are now pending. Among these, whom do you feel should have preference (list in order of priority, 1 to 5):

[In percent]

Choice	1st preference	2d preference	3d preference	4th preference	5th preference
Relatives of U.S. citizens.....	67	29	6	0	0
Skilled workers.....	10	30	30	33	0
Relatives of aliens living in United States.....	0	18	34	31	19
Semiskilled workers.....	0	4	7	22	70
Victims of Communist persecution.....	23	19	23	14	11
Total.....	100	100	100	100	100

6. Were you aware that during the last 10 years nonquota immigrant visas (1,774,367) have doubled quota immigrant visas (948,344)? Yes, 37 percent. No, 63 percent.

7. Do you favor repeal, 88 percent, or retention, 12 percent, of the national origins quota system?

8. Should natives of countries of the Western Hemisphere who wish to immigrate to the United States:

(a) Have open, unrestricted admission? 9 percent.

(b) Be treated like all other alien applicants for admission? 91 percent.

9. Should there be a limit to the number of refugees we admit each year? Yes, 84 percent. No, 16 percent.

10. Should Congress provide safeguards in law to prevent immigrants from competing for jobs which American workers can fill? Yes, 57 percent. No, 43 percent.

Name.....
Address.....

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLOREY. I want to compliment the gentleman on the very full and illuminating statement with regard to the subject of immigration. I recognize that the gentleman as chairman of the important Subcommittee on Immigration has an extremely important task before him in this session of the Congress. I would like to ask the gentleman with respect to the subject of hearings on legislation because I know that I and other Members are getting a great deal of mail on the subject. What is the schedule with regard to the hearings on the administration bill or other legislation on the subject of immigration?

Mr. FEIGHAN. In the latter part of January or early February, I took the floor and made an announcement that hearings would commence on February 16. But I was unable to have the hearings because the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], scheduled hearings for the full committee on the subject of the presidential inability, and I had to wait until there was an opportunity to hold hearings which would not interfere with the full committee. So that the first hearing is scheduled for tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in the committee room of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The first witness will be the Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach. We hope to proceed as expeditiously as possible with witnesses from the executive departments, from the operating level and then to organizations, voluntary agencies, and the public. Of course, we will have to have these hear-

ings completed and we will probably have to set up a schedule which will require people to present their statements but to analyze them briefly so that we will be able to interrogate them and so eventually get these hearings concluded.

Mr. McCLOREY. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to inquire why the gentleman has to incur personal expenses in connection with this questionnaire and travel? I did not understand exactly what it was, but I understood the gentleman to say that he had to incur personal expenses which, it seems to me, is unfortunate if that is the case.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I was interested in securing the views of my constituents and those of leadership elements of Greater Cleveland on the 10 major issues involved in pending immigration legislation. Accordingly I felt I should cover the costs involved from my personal funds.

Mr. McCLOREY. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, today, March 2, 1965, is the 100th anniversary of 2 of the 20 standing committees of the House of Representatives—the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Banking and Currency. On March 2, 1865, just before the close of the Civil War, the House separated the appropriating and banking and currency duties from its oldest committee—the Committee on Ways and Means—and assigned them to the two new committees. While the occasion would not of itself engage the general attention of the House or the country, and while whatever is said here will quickly pass beyond recall, a 100th birthday is nonetheless something of a milestone. I therefore thought the occasion sufficient to permit a brief intrusion to make some fragmentary public notes about it, with perhaps some quick glimpses of background and highlights from the past.

The Committee on Appropriations is a comparative youngster to its progenitor, the Committee on Ways and Means, which dates from the beginning in 1789

as a select committee and from 1802 as a standing committee. And it is considerably younger than most of the other standing committees of the House.

THE EARLY PRACTICE

In the very earliest days of the House there was recognition of the need for compartmentalization of the labors. Select committees were the usual organ through which investigations were made and legislation drawn and brought to the House, but with the inevitable increase in business the tendency was to a system of standing committees. The early reluctance to standing committees was evidently rooted in a general distrust of an entrenching influence; a select committee expired upon discharge of the particular assignment.

Until the Committee on Appropriations was created in 1865, all "general" appropriation bills were controlled in the House by the Committee on Ways and Means—also in charge of revenue measures and some other classes of substantive legislation. The rivers and harbors bill, first enacted as a separate bill in 1826, was outside the main appropriation pattern; it was not regarded as a "general" bill during this period and was then handled by the Committee on Commerce. It was made a general bill in 1879, and while it continued to be prepared in the legislative committee the rule required the bill to be submitted to the Committee on Appropriations for recommendation.

MULTIPLICITY OF BILLS

In the first years, a single general appropriation bill met the needs. The first bill, in 1789, appropriated \$639,000 and covered 13 lines of the printed statutes. Five years later, in 1794, the Army was supplied in a separate bill, then the Navy in 1799, and so on until in 1865 there were 10 bills passed over to the new Committee on Appropriations, not counting the deficiency bill or bills—again, in addition to the rivers and harbors bill. Today, there are 12 general bills in addition to supplemental and deficiencies as required.

THE MONEY POWER

By all accounts, and understandably, the Committee on Ways and Means was the most powerful committee in Congress. It had initial jurisdiction of the two cardinal powers of taxation and appropriation. Public money is the motive power of government, the substance without which not even the smallest or most elementary function of government can find expression. The power of the purse is the one certain, undeniable, and continuous weapon at the disposal of the Congress for effective control of the branches of government. As one noted man wrote in the last century:

If our Republic were blotted from the earth and from the memory of mankind, and if no record of its history survived, except a copy of our revenue laws and our appropriation bills for a single year, the political philosopher would be able from these materials alone to reconstruct a large part of our history, and sketch with considerable accuracy the character and spirit of our institutions.

CREATION OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

But if in 1860 the Committee on Ways and Means was invested with great power

and influence it was, by all accounts, also heavily laden with work. Reports relate the resistance of the committee to suggestions that its work be divided. The advent of civil war brought unprecedented additional work. It was said the committee labored days and nights, weekdays, and Sundays. Near the war's end, the need for a separate committee on appropriations could apparently no longer be denied.

Accordingly, on March 2, 1865, in the closing days of the 2d session of the 38th Congress, the House adopted a resolution creating the Committee on Appropriations. The new committee—six Republicans and three Democrats—was appointed on December 11, 1865, in the 1st session of the 39th Congress, and first reported the general appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1867. By 1920, the number had grown to 21. It was changed that year to 35 and gradually increased to 50 by 1951 where it has since remained—30 majority, 20 minority, the largest in Congress; currently, the division is 34 majority, 16 minority.

One almost immediately notes several striking things about the debate that day here on the floor. Here was fundamental relocation of the custody of perhaps the mightiest of all legislative powers. Yet an air of quiet resignation seemed to prevail.

Most of the leading lights of the House who spoke on the measure expressed doubts about the wisdom of separating the expenditure function from the revenue function. Thaddeus Stevens, then chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and Republican leader in the House—and destined to become the first chairman of Appropriations—thought the proposition of doubtful propriety; that the twin subjects of income and outgo seemed to be very properly connected. But he also seemed indifferent to the change and said as much.

Garfield, later to become Appropriations chairman and President of the United States, favored the change. His expressed interest was one of economy; that the change would afford opportunity to more thoroughly examine the details and the necessity for the requests for appropriations. Another Member wanted the proposition modified to require the Appropriations Committee to submit its recommendations to the Committee on Ways and Means; otherwise, he said, "there might be a year when the appropriations would exceed very largely the amount provided to carry on the Government."

But the plea of an overburdening load of work prevailed—as indeed seemed foreordained. It was as though to say, "It is not logical but it must be done." Remarkably, the change was adopted without even a record vote.

In presenting the resolution on the proposition, Mr. Cox of Ohio had this to say:

The proposed Committee on Appropriations have, under this amendment, the examination of the estimates of the departments, and exclusively the consideration of all appropriations. I need not dilate upon the importance of having hereafter one committee to investigate with nicest heed all matters connected with economy. The tendency of

the time is to extravagance in private and in public. We require of this new committee their whole labor in the restraint of extravagant and illegal appropriations.

THE GROWTH OF EXPENDITURES

Some partial measure of the enormous multiplication of burdens arising from the Civil War can be gleaned from the trend of expenditures. For several years prior to the onset, expenditures had ranged in the 60 millions of dollars; in fiscal 1860, the total was \$63,130,598. They reached the high point of \$1,297,555,224 in fiscal 1865 and receded sharply to \$520,809,417 in fiscal 1866.

In the first year for which the new Committee on Appropriations reported the general bills, fiscal 1867, total expenditures of the Government were \$357,542,675. In the ensuing 100 years the lowest expenditure level was \$236,964,327—in fiscal 1878. Subsequently, the general trend of appropriations has been ever upward. The Spanish-American War period marked the high point for the remainder of the century; in fiscal 1899, expenditures reached \$605,072,179, but by 1902 had dropped back to \$485,234,249. From there on, as the country grew and the Government embraced more functions and endeavors, expenditures gradually rose. With the onset of World War I, expenditures again crossed the billion-dollar line in fiscal 1917, reached a war peak of \$18,514,879,955 in fiscal 1919, and receded by fiscal 1927 to the lowest subsequent level; namely, \$2,974,029,674.

In the pending budget for fiscal 1966, administrative budget expenditures are tentatively projected at the record level of \$99,687,000,000; including so-called trust funds, such as social security, the tentative consolidated cash budget expenditure estimate for 1966 is \$127,400,000,000.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Just a few words about the men who have guided the committee. Twenty-four men including the present incumbent, served as chairman; five of them served terms of broken continuity. The late Honorable Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, served as chairman nearly 19 years, almost twice as long as did "Uncle Joe" Cannon, of Illinois, who ranks second in that respect with 10 years. The Honorable John Taber, of New York, holds the distinction of longest service on the committee—40 years, consecutive, beginning with his entry upon service in the House.

Like all mortals, these men were possessed of both virtues and shortcomings. It may fairly be said that some were more illustrious than others. Several went on to higher or other important offices. One became President. Three achieved the speakership of the House. Three went to the other body. One became Governor of his State. The list of distinctions is long. Interesting biographical sketches of 21 of the men are in House Document No. 299 of the 77th Congress.

THE FIRST STORMY 20 YEARS

Ironically, the new Committee on Appropriations, created to relieve the overload of burdens upon the Committee on Ways and Means, itself soon began to

experience a mountainous load—in a sense probably some was self-imposed. And it required little time to become thoroughly unpopular.

Woodrow Wilson described the Congress in the decades following the Civil War as "the central and predominant power of the system." The new Committee on Appropriations in this period was led by strong men, especially such as Stevens, Garfield, Randall, and Cannon of Illinois.

The new committee was diligent in its business. The record suggests that it took seriously the mandate to devote its efforts to restraint of extravagant and illegal appropriations. In fiscal 1867, the national debt was \$2,650,168,000—\$71 per capita. There followed 26 years of an almost unbroken record of reduction in the debt. There was a surplus every year and by fiscal 1893, the debt was down to \$961,431,000—about \$14 per person.

But the genesis of the committee's unpopularity was not bottomed solely on bare economy in appropriations. The disposition to graft legislation on appropriation bills long preceded the creation of the Committee on Appropriations; there was much complaint that this practice impinged on the work of the legislative committees for many years before 1865. But it may be that the practice was intensified after that date.

It was charged that the Committee on Appropriations had legislated in the very first appropriation bill it reported.

To complaints that the committee had changed laws in the appropriation bills in 1876, Chairman Randall compiled a "Statement showing in brief synopsis instances of independent legislation upon appropriation laws during the years 1865-75." It was an extensive list involving virtually every bill.

Then, in 1876, substantially the present form of the "Holman rule"—so-called from the name of its author, Chairman Holman—was adopted and employed from 1876 to 1885. All authorities seem to agree that the committee's construction of, and practices under, this rule, admitting germane legislation on the appropriation bills if it retrenched expenditures, fanned the flames of jealousy, sowed the seeds of resentment, and helped lay the groundwork for the soon-to-come contest for division of the Committee on Appropriations.

Writing only 14 years after the committee was formed, Garfield elucidated the problem. He said the practice, "involving a great mass of general legislation", had so overloaded the committee as to prevent sufficient attention to the appropriations proper. And he prophetically remarked that continuance of the rule would likely result in a dispersal of the bills to several committees, thereby precluding consideration and disposition of the appropriations business in accord with any general and comprehensive plan. The handwriting was already on the wall.

In House Document No. 246 of the 87th Congress, "History of the House of Representatives," page 158 et cetera, Galloway recites a number of restrictive fiscal developments of the period which, doubtless, also fostered resentment and opposition in the executive departments.

Executive discretion was severely circumscribed by more detailed itemization of appropriations in the annual bills. Power to transfer funds between objects and purposes—a matter of executive-legislative contention from the earliest days—was repealed. Unexpended balances—often obscured or held incognito for later use—were returned to the Treasury. Contract obligations by the agencies in excess of appropriations were forbidden. The departments often chafed and not infrequently resorted to the ancient practice of deficiency spending to force the hand of the House.

The great contest to divide the Committee on Appropriations began only 12 years after it was formed. When the rivers and harbors appropriation bill was prepared by the Committee on Commerce in 1877, instead of referring it to the Committee on Appropriations as the rule required, a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill without reference to Appropriations prevailed. This was the beginning of the break-up.

In 1880, appropriations for agriculture and forestry, previously a part of the legislative appropriation bill, were separated from Appropriations and assigned to the legislative Committee on Agriculture which first reported them in a general appropriation bill for fiscal 1881.

The final dismemberment came with the adoption, on December 18, 1885, in the 1st session of the 49th Congress, of rules changes transferring six more general appropriation bills to the applicable legislative committees.

The realignment left only 6 of the 14 general bills with the Committee on Appropriations, namely, fortifications; legislative, executive, and judicial; pensions; sundry civil; District of Columbia; and deficiency. The other 8 bills were in custody of seven legislative committees, namely:

Agriculture bill, Committee on Agriculture.

Army and military academy bills, Committee on Military Affairs.

Naval bill, Committee on Naval Affairs.

Indian bill, Committee on Indian Affairs.

Post Office bill, Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

River and harbor bill, Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Diplomatic and consular, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The full account of events leading to these far-reaching changes is a fascinating and instructive chapter in American political history. There is an abundance of evidence that the underlying motivations were at least twofold. Growing discontent in the legislative committees with committee operations under the Holman Rule, added to jealousy of the inherent power that goes with the money function, lay at the base. No less an authority than "Uncle Joe" Cannon said the final cataclysm was triggered by political revenge against Chairman Randall for his key role in helping defeat his own party on a major tariff bill in the preceding Congress. There was, he said, sentiment to obliterate the committee altogether but they settled on

stripping the committee of much of its jurisdiction.

THE NEXT 35 YEARS, 1885-1920

Organization for the conduct of business not only influences the mode of operation but importantly affects results. The predicted results of extravagance and confusion came soon after the appropriations were scattered in 1885. Most of the major departments received their funds partly from a legislative committee and partly from the Appropriations Committee. There were no consistent patterns in approach to the aggregate requests. True to its practice, the Committee on Appropriations tended to economical grants. The seven legislative committees, on the other hand, more or less leaned toward generosity and even actively competed for recognition in this connection. There was little if any coordinated consideration of the overall needs and condition of the finances. No system of choices between competing agencies and interests worthy of the name existed.

Illustrative of the chaotic scatter, the Army bill and the Military Academy bills were annually reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. But the Committee on Appropriations reported all funds for clerk hire of the War Department in the District of Columbia, and in the fortification bill provided not only the Army fortifications but also field artillery and the ammunition for it.

Some confusion and mischief sprang from the overwhelming temptation to indulge in deficiency appropriating and spending—in both the legislative and executive branches. The departments were not infrequently disposed to the practice of accelerated spending to force the Congress to later supply the deficiency. The continuous spirit of contest spawned much show of economy, resulting only in shifting the burden of final decision from one place to another when the departments returned early with deficiency requests to piece out the necessities for the year.

Of the inevitable results of such divided authority one prominent observer said in 1920—after the drawbacks of the system had alarmed the whole country:

One committee is working one way and another committee is working another way. The right hand does not know what the left hand doeth, and we find through all of our appropriation bills duplications in the service; we find waste and extravagance. We see great departments going to one committee for an appropriation, and if the funds are not granted they go to another and they not infrequently succeed.

Only 4 years after full-scale operation under the divided system, another observer wrote:

Under the system of congressional finance here described America wastes millions annually. But her wealth is so great, her revenue so elastic, that she is not sensible of the loss. She has the glorious privilege of youth, the privilege of committing errors without suffering from their consequences.

THE 1920 REFORM

The reconsolidation of all appropriation jurisdiction in the Committee on Appropriations on June 1, 1920, and the companion enactment of the Budget and

Accounting Act of 1921 establishing the national executive budget system and creating the General Accounting Office were, unquestionably, the most fundamental and consequential national fiscal reforms since 1885. The movement began to take form in 1909 with inclusion in the sundry civil appropriation bill of provisions requiring the President to be apprised of the annual departmental requests for appropriations in the event they exceeded the probable revenues. The object was to secure his views as to how best to bring the requests within the revenues or, alternatively, to obtain his suggestions for loans or such new taxes as would make ends meet.

Incredible as it might seem, even after 120 years, the United States alone among the important nations of the world, had not established an overall national budget system. Congressional committees dealt pretty much directly with the applicable departments and agencies. The President had no prescribed statutory budget responsibility. The Secretary of the Treasury made and submitted revenue estimates but merely collected the appropriation requests and sent them along without correlation, revision, or recommendation.

An outgrowth of the 1909 move was the creation, in 1911, of the Taft Commission on Economy and Efficiency which made an exhaustive study and report on the need for a system under which the President would formulate and lay before Congress and the country a comprehensive, unified financial plan for governmental operations. On the other side of the same coin was the contemplation that Congress would reorder its systems in such manner as to secure some coordinated consideration and action on the President's unified budget. So compelling had some such reform become that by 1916 both national political parties put reform planks in their national platforms. The Democratic plank:

We demand careful economy in all expenditures for the support of the Government and to that end favor a return by the House of Representatives to its former practice of initiating and preparing all appropriation bills through a single committee chosen from its membership, in order that responsibility may be centered, expenditures standardized and made uniform, and waste and duplication in the public service as much as possible avoided. We favor this as a practicable first step toward a budget system.

Both the budget legislation and the companion rules change were committed to a Select Committee on the Budget, headed by Mr. Good of Iowa, who was also chairman of Appropriations. Understandably, the proposition to reconsolidate appropriation jurisdiction encountered considerable opposition. The resolution, to become effective July 1, 1920, was adopted 200-117. It also increased the membership of the Committee on Appropriations from 21 to 35.

THE YEARS 1920-65

The defined jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations has remained unchanged since the reconstitution of 1920. It reads now as it did then—rule XI—"appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government."

The framers of the 1920 change had in mind—and so stated—that centralization of appropriation jurisdiction would enable Congress to pass upon the budget "in one measure," with a "full and comprehensive discussion of the big problem of Government finance. Members of Congress can see at a glance the entire picture." There is considerable ground for conceding that the precise conceptions envisioned in 1920 have not been fully achieved, but no ground justifying denial that the two reforms, taken together, represented great improvements in handling the Government's financial business. No serious student of Congress, to my knowledge, has ever contended otherwise.

Two major efforts in the direction of "single measure" consideration proved notably short lived. The legislative budget plan in the 1946 Reorganization Act—still on the books, unattended—was launched in 1947, foundered, and finally fell to the side in 1949. This plan to bring together for policy debate and decision by the Congress the general dimensions of budget income and outgo in advance of processing the individual budgets and bills was not a new idea. Mr. Shirley of Kentucky, a former chairman of appropriations and active in the pre-1920 reform debates, had during that time espoused a somewhat similar plan.

Failure of the legislative budget experiment resulted in the trial, for the single year of 1950, of the one-package appropriation bill approach.

Whatever their merits or shortcomings—and they had some of both—here were serious efforts at alternate ways of coming to grips with an old problem. From the Monday morning vantage point of hindsight, we may safely say that, for assorted reasons, they departed too far from the realities.

SYNOPSIS OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITIES

It seems wholly accurate to say as a general proposition of fact that the committee, not unlike other committees and the House itself, is governed not only by formal rules and regulations but also by the stringency of custom, tradition, and precedent. The formal rules are relatively few and spare.

The distinguished Parliamentarian of the House has concisely annotated the pertinent applicable formalities in the House rules and manual. Briefly, some of them are:

(a) The committee is forbidden from reporting legislation—unless, of course, it qualifies as retrenching expenditures under the Holman Rule.

(b) The committee is generally forbidden from reporting proposed reappropriations of unexpended balances of appropriations.

(c) Authority of the committee to conduct studies and examinations of the operations of the executive branch is in standing law and the House rules.

(d) The committee possesses subpoena power but traditionally has been sparing in its use.

(e) Hearings and reports on the general bills must be available at least 3 days before consideration of the bills in the House.

(f) The committee is a privileged committee in that it may report the general bills at any time.

(g) The committee may sit during sessions of the House. It is also authorized to hold executive or "closed-door" hearings—

and it always does so, for which it is sometimes criticized.

(h) It is authorized to study the so-called permanent appropriations with view to discontinuance of as many as can practicably be, and to study the disposition of proceeds of sale of Government property or services. Both matters have been in abeyance for some time.

(i) The committee is authorized to appoint such staff—clerical, professional, and investigative—as it deems necessary to its purposes.

(j) The committee is authorized and directed to join with others in reporting a so-called legislative budget. But as noted earlier, the matter has gone unattended since 1949.

There are of course other rules and precedents applicable to strictly procedural routines. The rules of the House are the rules of its committees so far as practicable.

THE APPROPRIATION FUNCTION—NEVER TOO POPULAR

We have glanced at some evidence of the committee's unpopularity in the earliest years. The history of the appropriating function—long before 1865, and subsequently—strongly suggests that it has seemed only to enjoy varying degrees of unpopularity. Its reputation for negativism is widespread—but grossly exaggerated. And it has seemed that this has so consistently been the case that one may wonder whether it is inevitable to the system. Affirmative action on the billions more often than not gets overshadowed by unfavorable reaction to the negative action on the millions. And in matters of public spending, saying no and being unpopular sometimes seem almost inseparably bound up together.

We have seen the grief that came from operations under the Holman Rule in the committee's early days, yet, significantly, for the greater part of the last 100 years, the House itself has seen fit to clothe the committee with the abrasive, contentious, negatively oriented retrenchment rule, vigorous application of which would certainly again bring down the displeasure of many Members.

It is probably one of the safest of premises that the interests, wherever they lie or whatever they be, will rarely if ever neglect advocacy of the truly essential needs; that these needs will more or less automatically present themselves, abundantly accompanied by justification. It not unreasonably follows that the appropriation function—however organized—is to look at all demands objectively with the attitude that not everything is essential or indispensable. For with public money hardly ever in sufficient abundance to cover all that is desirable, a first and foremost function is the allocation of resources among competing demands—setting priorities of purpose and amount. Thus has it been a natural consequence for the system to veto or diminish the budget requests as often as reasons deemed sufficient to do so could be found.

Not at all conclusive but of passing pertinency is the report of a political science researcher who interviewed members of the Committee on Appropriations several years ago. Half a dozen "younger liberals," he reported, concurred with

one of their number who said he "came here as a flaming liberal but as the years go by I get more conservative. You just hate to spend all this money. You come to the point where you just say, 'this is enough.'"

Thus the general system long ago acquired a negative orientation—and there are considerable grounds for saying such was proposed by the House itself. The not unnatural and often vociferous outcries of disappointment accentuate the image and fasten it firmly upon the system and certainly account for considerable unpopularity.

It is illuminating in this connection to turn to the debate here on the floor in June 1920, when the reconstitution resolution was pending. At a time when the Committee on Appropriations had jurisdiction of only 6 of the 14 general supply bills—over none of the great ones; when it was a much smaller committee of 21; when Government was far more narrowly confined; when the whole prewar budget was less than a billion dollars; when none of the 50 members of today's committee, or of last year's committee, were in the House; even in those vastly different days, the committee had its detractors. I quote from the remarks of the floor manager of the resolution:

I beg of you today to vote your intelligence, your convictions, and not your prejudice toward the committee or any member of any committee, and I realize that the committee is not popular, and when it becomes popular I for one shall question the quality of its work.

SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT THE SYSTEM

In government by majority, what will satisfy one may dissatisfy another; what one may regard as essential another may regard as only desirable, or perhaps even a waste. Government—that is, the business of politics, and thus the lot of politicians—is somewhat a matter of dealing with problems to which there are often no easy answers. All of us more or less have our philosophies, our interests, our ideas. What may be "about right" today a changing world may make "about wrong" or inadvisable tomorrow; I expect this has always to some extent been the case.

The business of appropriations—deciding how much we ought to spend and for what purposes—therefore heavily involves a mix of philosophy, fact, and faith. One's interest must nearly always be reckoned with. One might strike an analogy to the old saw about the forest and the trees. The modern forester follows the sustained yield procedure of going through periodically, selecting and felling. He cuts out the stunted and the diseased, and to keep the forest healthy he also cuts out some of the sound trees. He has to make some priority choices for the good of the whole forest. And so it is, or ought to be, with Government budgets. We cannot afford the luxury of becoming so preoccupied with the welfare of each and every activity as to forget about the good of the whole.

"Uncle Joe" Cannon told the story of how, when he was first married, he bought a pig to be fattened for his winter meat supply. But he made a mistake. He said he took so much interest in that

pig, feeding it, watching it grow, scratching its back to hear it grunt its satisfaction, and talking to it, until by the time it had grown big and fat at hog killing time, he had not the heart to turn it into his winter's meat. What began as an asset became a liability. A constant problem of the appropriations business—and this far transcends the committee province—is to try to find ways to avoid "Uncle Joe's" predicament.

Immediate constituency interests have a way of influencing the perspectives. But I would recall something Abraham Lincoln said while serving here in the House:

There are few things wholly evil or wholly good. Almost everything, especially of governmental policy, is an inseparable compound of the two, so that our best judgment of the preponderance between them is continually demanded.

As a general proposition of principle I would advance the thought that we as a nation shall be in deep trouble if that day ever comes when all of us are satisfied with a given level of appropriations—no matter what the level. I would judge it best for the general good health of representative government that we find ourselves in some state of perpetual dissatisfaction—but with our perspectives in good focus.

It is undeniable that, as a nation, we have weakened our ties with some primary fiscal principles—strikingly so, I would say, when the record of Federal appropriations and spending after the 1920 reform, but especially in the last 35 years is compared with earlier periods. War and war-related necessities account for the bulk of the aggregate totals but the people demand more and more public services and—perhaps too willingly—charge a portion of the cost to the future. Already our national debt casts a shadow over coming generations. It is, in any event, in the nature of man that money borrowed from posterity, being obtained without great effort or sacrifice, is apt to be more lightly regarded and thus more readily spent. Even allowing for war years, 29 Federal budget deficits in the last 35 years stands in striking contrast to any previous period in the history of the Republic.

How much of this may fairly be laid at the door of the system is debatable—and wholly unprovable. Under the comprehensive, coordinated financial plan annually brought forth in the executive budget, the President, in the last analysis, at least theoretically, constitutes a majority of one in deciding what the budget shall recommend. In contrast, committee decisions on appropriations are by a majority of the 50, and House decisions by a majority of the 435 Members. Manifestly, majority rule of one differs decidedly from majority rule of 50 or 435. There will be less unity and cohesion in the latter than in the former—which should amaze no one. But it by no means follows—as some are prone to erroneously deduce—that inferiority is more often the product of the less unified system.

Systems and procedures are not unlike people—a mix of virtues and shortcomings. The best system, having no inherent magic, sometimes performs un-

satisfactorily. Prudence dictates the necessity of caution in admitting innovations upon established ways. Slowness to change is a source of stability. Those who clamor for change sometimes overlook a great truth, which is that the legislative practices are a growth, not a scheme. They derive from many trials and tests over a long period of years. We would do well at all times to keep the lamp of history before us. I have not the slightest doubt that contemporary arrangements for legislative disposition of the vital money function are as objective and unbiased as could be devised. Systems at all times inevitably bend to the wills and dispositions of those who command them. Yet clamor for change is to the good and I would say it is at all times well to listen to the tempered suggestions of experienced men for improvements.

The British statesman, Edmund Burke, once said:

A disposition to preserve and an ability to improve, taken together, would be my idea of a statesman.

In this connection I would add only that we ought to guard against yielding too readily to clamor born of frustrations about the course and direction of things. Changing for the sake of change is seldom the right answer. Self-restraint and self-denial are often not easy. Fiscal reforms are usually advanced in the name of economy. Economy is usually painful. Seldom is it popular. "Straight is the gate and narrow is the way."

Perhaps we need reform of the will more than we need reform of the way. Public attitudes shape the ultimate course of events. Being but a reflection of the people at large, the House—and essentially the committee—in the long run does just about what a majority of the people want. It is nothing short of amazing to see how quickly the cloak of necessity can be stripped from an expenditure when the people so demand it—or, conversely, a desirable object elevated to the essential and immediate category. Way back in 1879, Mr. Garfield touched the general subject broadly in these words:

And this problem (of raising and appropriating revenues) presents itself, every year, under new conditions. An adjustment which is wise and equitable for one year may be wholly inadequate for the next.

In a representative democracy it is certain there can be no prospect of acting wisely where there are no means of judging rightly. The transcending importance of sound public opinion was eloquently put by Chief Justice Hughes:

We have in this country but one security. You may think the Constitution is your security—it is nothing but a piece of paper. You may think that the statutes are your security—they are nothing but words in a book. You may think that elaborate mechanism of government is your security—it is nothing at all, unless you have sound public opinion to give life to your Constitution, to give vitality to your statutes, to make efficient your governmental machinery.

Mr. Speaker, obviously the Committee on Appropriations sometimes performs unsatisfactorily. As in the past, we shall on occasion in the future be found to be wanting. Doubtless we shall sometimes

be disappointing. We are in favor of improving ourselves. We are not insensitive to the soundness of the practice of periodic checkups even when feeling pretty fit. But being a creature of the House, and part of the House, we are somewhat like the House. We are, with abundant good reasons, if I may so express it, quick to adjust but slow to change. Human nature changeth not. So I predict it will be this way when the bicentennial comes on March 2, 2065.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MR. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I know of no experience that could be more rewarding than my 12 years as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York, Mr. Taber, the late beloved Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] who has spoken so eloquently about the history of this body.

The committee was established while this Nation was struggling with the accumulated debts and the heavy expenses of the Civil War.

During all of my years on the committee we have been faced with similar problems, though on a far larger scale. Instead of financing the reconstruction of battle-torn sections of our own Nation, we have been financing the reconstruction of other nations throughout the world.

During its first year of responsibility, the Appropriations Committee of the House dealt with expenditures of slightly over \$1 billion. Today, 100 years later, we are working on a budget of \$100 billion.

That year the interest on the public debt was \$77 million. Today it is approaching \$12 billion.

In many talks around the country during the past several weeks, I have discussed the staggering size of this budget and the heavy responsibility it places upon all of us on the committee. I think it is also appropriate today to reflect on how much greater the budget for 1966 might have been if our committee had not faced up to its responsibilities and held the line against billions of dollars of suggested new expenditures in recent years.

The savings we have achieved each year are the result of long hours and many days of meticulous attention to the details of the Federal budget. I think few people in this country have as thorough an understanding of the complexities of our Government as do the members of the Appropriations Committee who do this work year after year.

I am certain that my colleagues on the committee share with me a deep appreciation for the fact that the House with few exceptions has accepted and approved our recommendations each year. This evidences a respect for the committee which I trust we shall continue to merit in the future.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to estimate how many billions of dollars the House Committee on Appropriations has saved taxpayers since March 2, 1865. Complete records are not available prior to 1873. Some idea of the incredible amount involved may be found in the fact that in just the 6 years I have been privileged to serve as an appropriations member, the committee has made budget reductions totaling \$22 billion.

Our committee's prestige and importance was established at the outset when Thaddeus Stevens, its creator, resigned the chairmanship of the Ways and Means Committee by his own choice in favor of becoming the first appropriations chairman. His successors to this high post have been some of this country's most brilliant men, including Ohio's James A. Garfield, whose writings on budgetary matters still are acknowledged as among the foremost in the field. The present distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], are gentlemen well equipped to follow in such illustrious footsteps.

The honor of serving the Nation as a member of this great and powerful committee is one I value highly.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Committee on Appropriations.

In his remarks he referred to his predecessors as chairmen of the Committee on Appropriations collectively and to several of them individually and by name. It is my pleasure to refer to GEORGE MAHON by name and to add that the luster which was attached to those 23 chairmen who preceded him has been preserved and made brighter by the addition of him to that group.

When he became chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in May 1964, he succeeded to this position with a background of 29 years' experience and service in the House of Representatives, of which are included 26 years of service as a member of this committee.

He presides over this committee with dignity, fairness, and a deep sense of responsibility to the Congress and the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to the Georgians who have served on this committee. During the first 100 years, 11 Representatives from Georgia have been elected to membership on the Committee on Appropriations.

The first Georgian to so serve was Representative James H. Blount, of Macon, who represented a part of the area which now comprises the Sixth District of Georgia. Representative Blount became a member of the Committee on Appropriations in 1875 and served until his voluntary retirement in 1881.

In this connection it is interesting to note that 4 of the 11 Georgians whose congressional service has included membership on the Committee on Appropriations represented all or part of the present Sixth District of Georgia. In addition

to Representative Blount, these include Representative Charles L. Bartlett, of Macon, Representative William C. Wright, of Newnan, and the Member who now addresses the House.

The list of Georgia Representatives who have so served and the period of the respective service of each is as follows:

James H. Blount, Macon, 1875-81.
Judson C. Clements, Rome, 1887-91.
Leonidas F. Livingston, Kings, 1891-1911.

Charles L. Bartlett, Macon, 1911-15.
William Schley Howard, Kirkwood, 1915-19.

Gordon Lee, Chickamauga, 1921-27.
William C. Wright, Newnan, 1929-33.
Malcolm C. Tarver, Dalton, 1935-47.
Prince H. Preston, Statesboro, 1949-61.
Henderson Lanham, Rome, 1955-57.
JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr., Griffin, 1962-.

Because of the unusually heavy volume of work of this committee, most of its work is performed in executive or closed sessions. This is not because of any desire on the part of the chairman and members of the committee to conduct hearings in secret since the proceedings of these hearings are printed in full and are made readily available to all members of the press and the public, but only because the work could not be concluded if continual public hearings were held.

Exceptions to this rule of executive sessions occur each year when each subcommittee opens its hearings to both the Congress and the public, at which times the representations and comments of the Members and of interested persons are welcomed and made a part of the records of the hearings of the respective subcommittees. In addition the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia also conducts some public hearings.

The Committee on Appropriations sometimes increases certain items contained in the budget. We like to think, when this is done, that it is the result of careful consideration and mature judgment in instances where a slightly larger amount for a given item could be more effectively and economically extended than could a small amount for a particular item.

There are many more occasions when the amount requested by a department or an agency is reduced by committee action. When this is done, it is the purpose of this committee to bring appropriations more closely into line with both requirements and justifications.

We do not use what is often referred to as a meat-ax approach. The Committee on Appropriations does not cut for the sake of cutting; rather it fulfills a responsibility and obligation to see that the people of the United States of America receive a dollar's value for a dollar spent. This is the objective which the Committee on Appropriations strives to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I was impressed with all of the contents of the remarks made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but the last paragraph of his remarks is especially fitting to this occasion and bears repeating:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the Committee on Appropriations sometimes performs unsatisfactorily.

As in the past, we shall on occasion in the future be found to be wanting. Doubtless we shall sometimes be disappointing. We are in favor of improving ourselves. We are not insensitive to the soundness of the practice of periodic checkups even when feeling pretty fit. But being a creature of the House, and part of the House, we are somewhat like the House. We are, with abundant good reasons, if I may so express it, quick to adjust but slow to change. Human nature changeth not. So I predict it will be this way when the bicentennial comes on March 2, 2065.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the 100th anniversary of our Committee on Appropriations, which we are observing this year, is an appropriate occasion for some reflection on what has transpired in the past and what is involved in the congressional responsibility for funding Federal programs today and in the future.

A stimulating and enlightening source of reference on this subject is the speech that was given on this floor today by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON, the gentleman from Texas.

Chairman MAHON's address not only contains an illuminating review of the history of the committee which he so ably heads but also provides wise counsel with respect to the appropriations function.

The text of this important speech will be found on pages 3959-3963 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I commend it to the thoughtful reading of all Members of the Congress and others.

The Committee on Appropriations of the House has had 24 chairmen, including our present chairman, since it was established as a standing committee of the House on March 2, 1865. This list of chairmen is a roster of names that stand out in American history.

One of the famous men in this group was James A. Garfield, who went from his seat in the House to the Office of President of the United States in 1881.

Another who served as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was Joseph Cannon, of Illinois, the powerful Speaker of the House early in this century.

My own State of Tennessee takes enduring pride in the fact that two of her illustrious sons served as chairman of this committee in the House—one in recent times and the other in the last century.

The late Joseph W. Byrns, of Nashville, served as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House in the 72d Congress. He was a Member of the House through 14 terms. He was the majority leader of the House in the 73d Congress, the Speaker of the House in the 74th Congress, and was standing for reelection to the House for the 75th Congress at the time of his death in 1936.

Another Tennessean, John D. C. Atkins, served as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations when the committee was in the second decade of its existence. He served one term in the House before the Civil War and returned in 1873 to serve five more terms.

The late Senator Kenneth D. McKellar, of Tennessee, who was a member of the House before his election to the U.S. Senate in 1916, served for many years as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

It has been my great privilege and honor to serve as a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House under the inspiring leadership of two of its ablest and most dedicated chairmen—the late Honorable Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, and Hon. GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, our present chairman.

In observing the centenary of this important committee, it is right and proper that we should pay particular tribute to the men who bear and have borne the principal responsibility for the success of the vital Federal funding process.

From my own experience as a member of this committee over the years, I know that the chairman deserves much more recognition and credit than he is ever likely to receive.

The Committee on Appropriations has the reputation of being the hardest working committee of the Congress. It must carefully screen every one of the countless items in our Government's voluminous money bills. This entails exhaustive studies, investigations, hearings, analyses, and reports. It involves work that is always exacting and can often be tedious. But the members of this committee serve with enthusiasm, and with pride and satisfaction in the knowledge that they are helping to strengthen, develop, and build up our country.

In this period, with annual Federal expenditures climbing ever closer to the \$100 billion level, the burdens of the chairman of our Committee on Appropriations have been increasingly heavy.

We are in a time of unparalleled change and growth, with our domestic needs and foreign commitments placing unprecedented demands on our Federal Treasury.

Congress has provided the money needed for massive programs to assure our military superiority and our leadership in space and science, as well as the funds required for other essential services and programs for our rapidly expanding country.

This upward trend in Government costs increases the need for vigilance against waste and extravagance in Federal appropriations, and for the practice of true and sound economy.

The Committee on Appropriations, which is invested by the Constitution with the original responsibility for all Federal funding measures, has not neglected this aspect of its primary function. Millions and billions of dollars have been saved for the American taxpayers through budgetary cuts and mammoth economies effected by this committee in recent years.

The steadily mounting workload places greater demands on the chairman's skill and judgment, on his knowledge of men and institutions, on his energy and devotion, and on his patience and persistence.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is the man chiefly responsible for maintaining the commit-

tee's traditional hard-working habits and building up its esprit de corps.

His job requires heightened concentration on wise and prudent practices and measures, on teamwork, competence and dedication.

In short, the direction of this committee composed of 50 members and a dozen subcommittees, responsible for reporting the funding of all the vastly complex operations of our Federal Government while also fostering economies in Government, is a monumental task.

Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, managed this challenging job with notable success through nearly 19 years.

Chairman MAHON serves in the very highest traditions of the committee, the House, the Congress, and the Nation.

It is true that our appropriation system has been greatly improved by the changes in budgeting and funding practices that have been made in the 100 years since the Committee on Appropriations of the House was created.

While giving credit to ideas that have improved the appropriations process, let us also acknowledge the enormous contribution to American security and progress which has been made by the patriotic, knowledgeable and dedicated men mainly responsible for making this system work so well—our great chairman and the hard-working men of the Congress—my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations.

During this century, the House has evolved a system that has worked effectively under severe testing. "Contemporary arrangements for legislative disposition of the vital money function are as objective and unbiased as could be devised," as Chairman MAHON has stated.

Under the able leadership of our present chairman—Hon. GEORGE MAHON, the gentleman from Texas—our country can count on the appropriations decisions needed to keep this Nation strong, secure, and moving forward.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD on the subject of the 100th anniversary of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AIRCRAFT NOISE ABATEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, for appropriate reference, four bills to bring increased and better coordinated Federal attention to one of the resultant problems of modern air transport.

All of these measures amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and grant the Administrator new powers and authority.

They are substantially identical to bills introduced in the 88th Congress which I and several colleagues then sponsored. They constitute a full-fledged program against aircraft noise.

One of the measures specifically authorizes the Administrator to conduct research for the purpose of determining more effective criteria for lessening objectionable airplane noise. Furthermore, the Administrator is required to issue certain rules governing air commerce which, in his estimation, can reduce health hazards and noise nuisance; penalties are prescribed for violations of these regulations. The fourth bill will establish in the FAA an Aircraft Noise Abatement Service to coordinate all activity in this field, headed by a Director whose duties shall be: development of a workable and effective measuring system for determination of aircraft noise; conduct of research into the potential construction of quieter aircraft; accumulation of more effective devices and control procedures; consolidation of current research data from all available sources.

The thrust of this legislation is to establish direction and authority with the Federal Aviation Agency, and to require the Agency to spare no effort in bringing relief to the thousands of justly indignant citizens who reside near the din and activity of bustling modern airports.

For years this has been a civic concern of many New Yorkers who live in close proximity to La Guardia and Idlewild Airfields on Long Island, N.Y. There is certainly no indication that air commerce is decreasing. On the contrary, larger and noisier craft are entering the service; in coming years we will be experiencing the introduction of the supersonic craft; the fact of the matter is that we must come to terms with the problem, not by isolated efforts and competing jurisdictions, but through coordinated and well-financed effort on the part of the Federal instrument, the FAA.

It should be our policy, realistically, to preserve as best as we can the comfort and normalcy of homeownership and apartment dwelling within modest distance of our airports. We cannot ban the airplane; nor is it desirable to institute a maze of dreamlike restrictions which would seriously hamper the availability and service of modern air transportation. But I do insist that we do everything possible to ease resultant hardships and not run roughshod over patterns of residential life.

We must recognize a primary Federal obligation. The legislation I have introduced attempts to pull the loose ends together into a cohesive unit. The FAA is indefinite as to its powers in this field and this legislation will endow them with requisite obligations by law.

With these bills I look toward an extensive research activity. The proposed Aircraft Noise Abatement Service is equipped with the responsibility of a continued quest for more meaningful procedures and devices for reducing airplane noise. Consideration should be given to evolving a plan for restricting night flights.

The courts have already pronounced on the issue in general. In 1962, the

Supreme Court ruled that agencies operating airports are liable for compensation to property owners if their property is rendered practically useless. The Washington State Supreme Court, in a 9-to-0 decision, held that an airport must pay damages to homeowners when jet aircraft shake the walls, drown out television and radio reception, and prohibit normal conversation.

The problem is complex. Other countries are experiencing this as well as our own. The OECD Observer, in its August 1964 publication, reported that European governments are intensifying efforts to meet the increasing aircraft noise in an article entitled "A Menace To Be Met."

Early last December I wrote to the FAA asking for comments on the four bills. The Air Traffic Service Director replied that because the executive branch had not formulated a position on the problem, he was unable to comment. I regret this very much, and I still hope that the administration will devote the attention to this problem which it deserves. I include the Director's reply to me, together with a résumé of FAA research operations, in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

In my view, the research contracting out of the FAA in this field may well constitute a contribution. But I do urge that it be fully consolidated with other efforts, and that it be substantially increased.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to give its early consideration to this legislation to improve and make more effective our program against aircraft noise.

The above-mentioned material follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., December 30, 1965.
Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALPERN: Mr. Halaby has asked that we respond to your letter of December 7, 1964, concerning problems and programs involved with aircraft noise.

Inasmuch as you appear to be extremely interested in our current research program with regard to aircraft noise, we are taking the liberty of enclosing a portion of a quarterly status report of the Aircraft Development Service (see enclosure). We know that the National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council (NANAC) is preparing a recommended research program for appropriate segments of the aviation industry and Government. You may well want to contact NANAC on this subject.

We are gratified to note that you appreciate that the problems associated with aircraft noise are complex. We have approached the problem from three basic viewpoints: (1) Reduction of noise at its source, (2) development of air traffic and aircraft operating procedures to minimize noise, and (3) encouragement of compatible land use planning in the vicinity of our Nation's airports. We believe that all three of these approaches are necessary if progress is to be made.

You asked for our views on your four bills on the subject. As you know, on any given matter, our comments must coincide with whatever overall view is developed within the executive branch. As yet, no overall position has emerged on the various legislative proposals offered in the 88th Congress and we are therefore unable to comment on your bills at this time.

We trust this is responsive to your request and if we can be of further assistance, please advise.

Sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD P. BURTON
(For Lee E. Warren, Director of Air Traffic Service).

ACOUSTICS

Program manager, James F. Woodall.

550-001-00, "Noise Reduction and Control at the Source"; 550-001-01H, "Investigation of Compressor Noise"; contract FA-64-WA-4920, dated February 18, 1964, Boeing Co., Seattle, Wash.: This project involves the analytical and experimental study of a model compressor to develop the expressions for prediction of noise generated by individual components; i.e., the rotor, stator, and duct casing. The work is approximately 75 percent complete.

550-001-02H, "Development of a Scale Model Freon Compressor as a Tool for the Investigation of Compressor Acoustics": This project involves the design, construction and testing of a scale model closed loop Freon compressor to determine its feasibility for simulating the aerodynamic and acoustical characteristics of a full-scale air compressor. The intent is to develop an inexpensive means for conducting the future acoustical development testing needed to reduce the noise generated by compressors. The first quarterly report has been received and approved.

550-001-03H, "Development and Application of Extended Plug Nozzle Noise Suppression Theory"; contract FA64WA-5062, dated May 7, 1964, Williams Research Corp., Wall Lake, Mich.: This is an applied research and development program to demonstrate the jet noise suppression characteristics of the extended plug nozzle on a small turbojet engine.

Analytical and cold jet work is underway by Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill. (IITRI), who postulated the theory, and Williams Research has set up the laboratory facility required to test several plugs on a small jet engine. IITRI will develop the scaling parameters designed to optimize the plug shapes that Williams Research will test. The objective is to minimize the shock wave as a noise source and is not meant to imply that the shock wave is the only source in the jet stream. Parallel efforts to promote mixing and reduce the exit velocity should be continued. The work is approximately 60 percent complete. Third quarterly report due in mid-November.

(Proposed) 550-001-04H, "Applied Research re Compressor Noise": A study of and subsequent tests of choked inlet guide vanes as a method of compressor noise suppression and acoustical treatment of guide vanes or struts as a method of compressor sound reduction.

550-002-00, "Noise Reduction and Control-Transmission Paths"; 550-002-01H, "Noise Abatement Studies of Jet Transport Aircraft and Helicopters"; contract FA-64-WA-4949, dated February 10, 1964, Bolt Beranek & Newman (BBN), Los Angeles, Calif.: This contract involves three separate tasks:

Task I: Predictions of the noise exposure from new short- and medium-range jet transports.

Task II: The effects of jet transport departure profiles on the noise exposure produced on the ground. This includes the flight test program conducted by the FAA at JFK Airport in New York.

Task III: Helicopter noise and its relation to heliport location design as influenced by urban noise environments.

The data required for these three tasks is being obtained now, and preliminary results should be available by the end of this year.

The field measurement program of actual airline operations at JFK Airport has been

completed. The work is approximately 75 percent complete.

(Proposed to amend contract): Add task IV, a study re effect of varying (a) glide slope, (b) power used, and (c) threshold location on approach noise exposure.

550-003-00, "Noise Reduction and Control-Receivers"; 550-003-01H, "Study of Noise Evaluation Criteria"; contract FA-64-WA-4951, dated February 1, 1964, Bolt Beranek & Newman, Los Angeles, Calif.: This is a two-part study. The first involves an investigation of the factors responsible for individual differences in judgments of equal loudness or noise. The second part is a laboratory study of the masking of speech by aircraft noise. Final report should be available by February 1965.

PEOPLE ARE ANGERED BECAUSE OF THE POOR POSTAL SERVICE NOW BEING RENDERED BY THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO THIS ONCE GREAT DEPARTMENT?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last year the Postal Operations Subcommittee held hearings regarding the poor and deteriorating mail service. Several Members of Congress testified as to their knowledge of the poor service. Also testifying to the poor service were the workers themselves, including officials of the National Association of Letter Carriers and the National Federation of Postal Clerks.

A report on these hearings is available from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Because the subcommittee held hearings only and took no specific legislative action, I have written the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI], asking that the hearing be resumed and that some concrete action be taken by the committee. I do so because the service is getting worse and worse in spite of the fancy talk by Post Office Department officials.

The employees of the post office are particularly alarmed over the situation due to the fact that they get the blame for a situation over which they have no control. It is the management innovations that are at the root of the problem in my opinion. You just cannot run the Department and fool the people by slogans, letters of the alphabet, numbers, and so forth.

Recently I had a very distressing experience with the Post Office Department. This concerned a painting by a young lady who had suffered from childhood with cerebral palsy. It took her 3 weeks to paint this picture, which she did by placing a brush between the toes of her left foot. I purchased the picture for \$100 to help her along. It was framed and wrapped by a professional molding and framing firm in Omaha. It was wrapped with nine layers of heavy cardboard, some of which was heavy corrugated paper and the rest a stiff heavy-duty pasteboard. It was delivered to me in a smashed condition even though it was plainly marked "glass."

The story of this picture is described in an article written by the Washington

correspondent of the Omaha World-Herald, published in my district. The article is as follows:

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Jan. 31, 1965]

SPEEDUP BLAMED FOR DAMAGED MAIL

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM of Omaha pointed to the shattered glass in the picture frame. Then he directed attention to parallel marks on the package that he believes could have been caused by nothing other than a vehicle running over it.

"This is all going to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, another example of what is happening to our postal service," said Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

The Omahan, third-ranking Republican member on the full committee, and the ranking GOP member of the Postal Operations Subcommittee, said he would ask that the subcommittee reopen hearings relative to the increasing complaints on mail handling.

The painting that arrived at his office in such bad shape was one he had purchased from Mary Ann Bay, the 35-year-old Omaha artist afflicted since birth with cerebral palsy, who has taught herself to paint and draw by holding a brush or pencil between her toes.

The painting had been wrapped for mailing by an Omaha picture-framing concern which, he said, "has had years of experience in wrapping and sending packages."

There was masking tape over the glass to protect it. There were, he said, nine layers of stiff cardboard, some of it ribbed, to further protect it. On each side of the cover were large, red and blue stickers, "glass, handle with care."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM said that rank-and-file employees of the Post Office Department "are as upset as any one over the deterioration in service."

The Second District Congressman blamed the Department's work measurement system—which he called the "speedup"—for part of the trouble.

"And so-called mechanization has been way overplayed," he said.

"All you have to do," he declared, "is to visit a large post office and see the system of conveyers and chutes. Workers are forced to throw mail into chutes and it goes zooming down to another platform—there is no braking system to stop its speed. And under the speedup there is no time for an employee to see if a parcel says 'glass' or 'breakable.'"

He said complaints have been mounting steadily the past 2 or 3 years, that congressional mail both to the House and Senate is loaded with such complaints from postal users.

"They're working these fellows to the point of exhaustion," he said of postal workers. "The whole thing is the result of top management, in my opinion. They're trying to run the postal system by gimmicks, numbers, and alphabetical gimcrackery."

In announcing he was going to ask that his subcommittee reopen its hearings into poor service, so "we can get to the root of this thing," Mr. CUNNINGHAM asserted:

"The American people won't stand for this kind of service with the high rates they pay."

He recalled that at Christmas, it took 15 days for a small package from his brother to arrive in Washington from Omaha. It got here 4 days after Christmas.

Fortunately, the painting by Miss Bay was not itself damaged. But Congressman CUNNINGHAM said he would not have the glass restored to the frame until his subcommittee had a chance to look at it, the package and "the marks of that vehicle that ran right over it."

Following the publication of this article I was amazed to receive a heavy volume of mail describing similar poor

mail service in just the Omaha area. A followup story in the Omaha World-Herald regarding the receipt of the picture by me says:

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 14, 1965]

CUNNINGHAM'S MAIL REPORT OPENS GATE ON COMPLAINTS

His own experience with a badly damaged painting has brought Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM a rash of complaints from Nebraskans about the rough handling of packages in the mails.

The letters fall into the you-don't-know-the-half-of-it category.

The Omaha Congressman last month received a well-wrapped painting but found that the glass in the frame was shattered. There were parallel marks on the package that he felt could only have been made by a vehicle running over it.

An account of the incident, which had its ironical aspects because Mr. CUNNINGHAM is the top Republican on the House Postal Operations Subcommittee, appeared in the World-Herald.

Then came the letters.

An Omaha woman expressed sympathy, but said that "on the other hand I am delighted as now we may get the long overdue investigation into the postal situation or the snafu that it has become."

A Greenwood, Nebr., man wrote that he recently had received a steel toolbox through the mails, then added:

"It was marked received in Greenwood in bad condition; when I opened it, it had two dents in it, both about an inch deep and 3 or 4 inches long."

"The box is of heavy enough gage steel that it would take a very hard blow from a hammer to even dent it. Also one end was caved in."

An Omaha couple complained that "we never seem to receive a package anymore but what it is damaged, broken, smashed and paper torn."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM received a copy of a letter that a De Witt, Nebraska woman had sent to Postmaster General John Gronouski.

"We have just recently moved to Nebraska and since moving we have been utterly appalled at the condition of parcel post packages when they reach us," she wrote.

One such package was marked "fragile," she related.

"From its condition," she added, "I can only suppose the postoffice employs an elephant to dance on each package."

An official of an Omaha firm complained about the poor condition of packages mailed by his firm when they reach their destination.

"If things do not improve," he said, "I earnestly believe my business could be seriously hurt by loss of customers."

Another Omahan said he mailed a portrait, after wrapping it to the specifications of the local postoffice, and that it reached the addressee "a total mess."

A Fairbury resident wrote that packages he received looked "like they go through a meat grinder."

One Nebraskan insisted that books he received through the mail were so damaged "that this must have been done deliberately."

Representative CUNNINGHAM has thanked his complaining constituents for providing him with more "ammunition."

He said last month that he would ask that the postal operations subcommittee reopen hearings relating to complaints on mail handling.

He blamed the Post Office Department's work measurements, or "speedup" system, for part of the trouble and said mechanization has been "overplayed."

He also accused top department officials of trying to run the postal system "by gimmicks, numbers and alphabetical gimcrackery."

Since the original publication of the story in my hometown newspaper, I have received, as I stated, an amazing reaction from others who know how poor our mail service is. Here are some sample letters which I have received in just a few weeks, and more are coming in to me every day.

JANUARY 31, 1965.

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Supposedly, the Post Office Department saves money by closing its windows across the Nation at 12:30 p.m. on Saturday. Supposedly, the Post Office Department saves money by not selling postal money orders on Saturday. Supposedly, the Post Office Department saves money through the ZIP code, and other systems of that ilk. Supposedly, the Post Office Department saves money. I have never been able to make money by just sitting around and not doing anything, and neither can the Post Office Department.

I have written Senator CURTIS asking him the reasons for these supposed economy moves, and he was just as baffled as I am as to why these conditions exist.

Even if I were to receive figures as to how much the Post Office Department supposedly saves, they would no doubt be the type used so readily by President Johnson. Just last year I saved a million dollars by not buying a castle in Spain. I didn't ever have the million dollars in the first place, but, by not spending this nonexistent million dollars I saved it. I think you know what I mean. If there are any figures not of that type on the supposed savings of the Post Office Department, I would appreciate them.

I hope you are able to bring about some reforms in the Post Office Department through your position as a legislator and member of the Postal Operations Subcommittee.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

FEBRUARY 3, 1965.

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am glad you are serving on the Post Office Committee. I put in nearly 40 years in the Railway Mail Service and though I am retired I am still interested.

Do you know why the headquarters of the old 14th Division Railway Mail Service was moved to Wichita, Kans.? It does not seem right for the office which is supposed to supervise the Railway Mail Service to be located so far away and especially a city that has so little RPO service.

As for the rough handling accorded your picture as shown in the Omaha World-Herald it was not surprising to me. It seems that our postmaster is so sold on mechanical devices for handling mail in order to reduce the number of employees that one can expect such damage. Also I note they are requesting the large users of the mail to do the work of the post office employees by separating it and tying in bundles. It would be better if the Post Office Department did away with some of the desk clerks who do nothing but figure out impractical ideas and force them on the public, in order to save money.

It seems to me that "service" has been discontinued and that no one cares if the mail is delivered or not. Post Office employees used to take pride in seeing that mail was properly delivered even when part of the address was missing. Now they send it to the dead letter office or return it to the writer as not known or incomplete address.

I had that happen very recently. Just because the star route carrier did not know the party the letter was addressed to, a first-class

letter was returned to me with the notation "unknown" on it. As I had plainly written the R.F.D. box number on it I could not see why it was not delivered. I wrote a complaint to the postmaster but his reply indicated that I should have placed in care of the party who has that box number. That is not always possible.

Very respectfully,

FEBRUARY 2, 1965.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: I am writing to you in regard to the postal service we are receiving.

I just received a steel tool box through the mail which was well packed, in a box with paper around it. It was marked received in — in bad condition. When I opened it, it had two dents in it, both about an inch deep and 3 or 4 inches long. This box is of heavy enough gage steel that it would take a very hard blow from a hammer to even dent it. Also, one end was caved in.

I stopped my carrier the next day and asked him what was going on. He said 90 percent of the packages received in — come in damaged condition. He said he thought that most of the damage was coming from nonpostal employees or from contract truckers. If this is the case why can't the Postal Department get a little more strict in who they give their contracts to? I think that we pay enough for postage to at least be able to receive a steel box undamaged.

A voter,

FEBRUARY 3, 1965.

The Honorable GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am writing to commend you in your efforts to have the Post Office Department handle the mail more carefully. Our World-Herald carried the story of you and the picture you received through the mail showing the glass that was broken in handling.

This morning I received a package from the — containing copies of —. I haven't found out as yet how it ever arrived as the outside wrapping was nearly torn off. The deliveryman said that this package was not an exception to the general run of packages.

We appreciate your efforts and hope that you can get some changes made that will remedy the situation.

Very truly yours,

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to complain about our mail service which has gone from bad to worse. We are living in horse and buggy days as far as our mail is concerned. It was far better when one could buy a postal card for 1 cent and you could mail a letter for 2 cents. And those were the days when we had two deliveries a day.

In spite of the ballyhoo about ZIP code and all it was going to do to speed up mail, we are lucky if we get mail by 3 or 4 p.m. Postage has gone up but service has gone down.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. —

FEBRUARY 5, 1965.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: I would like to commend you for your blast at the parcel post handling as was reported in the Omaha

World-Herald. I have been meaning to write on this matter, and this just helped me along. My small business is almost 100 percent mail order. The utter disregard of our merchandise by the employees at the new Omaha postal facilities, and the poor condition in which our packages are being received by our customers is of great concern to me. Our packages are too small to use trucklines and postal service is our only method of operation. If things do not improve, I earnestly believe my business will be seriously hurt by loss of customers. Thanking you again for your effort, I am,

Sincerely,

JANUARY 31, 1965.

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: In a way I was unhappy to read in the World-Herald, of your unfortunate experience concerning the mutilated picture mailed from Omaha. On the other hand, I am delighted, as now we may get the long overdue investigation into the postal situation or the snafu that it has become.

We have relatives and friends in California and we use the mails a great deal and we become more distressed every week with the service we get.

In the past few months we received an aluminum pan that had to be hammered back into shape—a box of chocolates—melted and crushed, and many other near mutilated articles—plus one package that we sent that was never received. A friend across the street brought us a check from Union Pacific that had been "mistakenly" delivered to her.

Let's get on this, GLENN, and straighten out this deplorable situation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. —

FEBRUARY 14, 1965.

MR. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your campaign against the rough handling of our mail has prompted this letter. I am surely wondering what is happening to our mail. My daughters in — and — call by long distance to know why I haven't answered their letters—letters that I have never gotten, and some of mine to them have gone astray. Where does this mail go?

Silverware that I ordered on January 10 from Minneapolis has been sent but never received. General Mills is now investigating. Thursday Mr. — received a tube which was supposed to contain a fishing lure. One end of the tube was gone when we took it from our box — completely torn off. No lure. He has written the company, but how long can these companies absorb these losses?

Anything you can do will surely be a wonderful service to us. Mail means so much to us all. Mr. — and I are retired and it means an extra something to hear from one's family.

Sincerely,

Mrs. —

FEBRUARY 9, 1965.

HON. GLENN C. CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, too, wish to complain about poor mail service. We forgot to insure a package and received a letter from Chicago saying the wrapper came off, although it was wrapped perfectly. The higher the postal rates the poorer the service, it seems.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. —

FEBRUARY 14, 1965.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am reporting to you, as have others, that a week ago I received a large package from — that was completely demolished. It was a heavy, large suit box. The one corner was completely torn open, the paper wrapping was almost torn off, the cord was loose, and there was one small article in the box and the box was filled with crushed newspaper. I could not tell if it was insured as only the address was visible, the wrapping torn to pieces. It was from relatives of mine who were on their way to Europe, and I cannot contact them as I do not yet have their address.

They are people of means, and it evidently was valuable.

I notified the office here at the time, but could not tell if it was insured. I suppose it was as they always do insure packages.

I thought this, along with what is happening, should also be brought to your attention.

Thanking you,

Mrs. —

FEBRUARY 14, 1965.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: We greatly appreciate your taking an active interest in the matter of damaged mail.

We have had unhappy experiences with damaged parcels not only at Christmas time but also at other times during the year. And this in spite of elaborate packaging which almost makes the cost of mailing prohibitive.

We certainly hope your efforts in this respect are successful.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. —

FEBRUARY 1, 1965.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: I am greatly interested in an article in yesterday's Omaha World-Herald newspaper, and want you to know I, too, am concerned about the postal service.

Our business is about 75-percent mail orders in the wedding printing line, and I mail out every day. It has gotten to the point that it will take from 5 to 7 days to get a package to —, a distance of about 30 miles. Our mail, I am told, goes into Omaha and out to —. Now just what happens to those packages is a good question. Right now I have an order lost between — and —. These I have to make up when they have not arrived in time to be used, as in wedding and anniversary printing time is a factor.

In the past year I estimate I have had to make up about \$80 of orders, since they did not arrive in time. I am going to attempt to take this amount off my income tax as it is certainly a loss, and the postal system has caused the loss.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, I firmly believe the ZIP code is the cause of a great percentage of the lost and missent mail. Our trouble has been much more marked since the postal employees are forcing me to use the code. One postal clerk told me not long ago that it was most difficult to learn all of the figures, that they knew where every town was in Nebraska, and all the major towns in the United States, but it was next to impossible to learn the ZIP numbers. When they are confused as to numbers, naturally those packages and letters are going to be routed wrong.

Anything you can do about this postal service will be greatly appreciated by us. Actually we have had very little loss as to

damaged packages; it is the complete loss and the holding up of mail that concerns us.

Yours very truly,

Mr. _____

JANUARY 31, 1964.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: I was most interested in the article in the Omaha World Herald of this date about the mail situation. It is consoling to know you are going to ask your subcommittee to reopen its hearings into the poor service we are receiving.

I have a post office box, and have had for a number of years, and have noticed since the new system went into effect the slowdown in mail delivery to the box.

I was taking some extension course studies from _____ a while back and the delivery was so poor that I paid a high fee to have all of them sent first-class mail so I could receive them without waiting up to 2 weeks after they were mailed to me. Even then, some of them would be a week getting to my box.

I am a secretary in a business office, and we note there also the fact that instead of the mail being speeded up any there is usually a delay in getting most of it.

Keep in there with the investigating—we at home will appreciate it more than you think. So often we just feel there is nothing we can do about it. I have talked with many people whose feeling is the same as mine—that the new system certainly is a dismal failure so far as either speeding delivery, or in the care of the mail in handling. It just does not seem sensible after all the money put into the new system that by this time there is even poorer service than under the old method.

Yours very truly,

FEBRUARY 16, 1965.

The Honorable GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Congressman, Second District.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: As a postal clerk I read with interest the article which appeared in the Omaha World Herald. The breakage in the parcel post has increased a great deal since the new facility was built here in Omaha. It would really open the eyes of some of our taxpayers to see the great amount of rough treatment their parcels receive. The crux of the matter is these great labor-saving machines cannot read as our clerks did in the old fashioned way.

Another statement from our Postmaster General struck with great alarm at our _____ here in Omaha. This is the statement that the Postmaster General wants to do away with airmail rates and airlift all mail. This would strike at the very heart of our mobile service on trains.

I find the mobile clerks do have the most pride in the service they perform. In a small group of employees the desire to carry your own job is much more pronounced than in a larger unit. Perhaps Mr. Gronouski thinks he can save money by flying mail but I would be willing to wager it would take more man-hours in a stationary unit to work the mail than it does on an RPO or HPO. At the present time the Department is working to remove mail service from two trains leaving Omaha.

These two trains are train No. 27 and return trip No. 28 from Omaha to North Platte on the Union Pacific. The other train in jeopardy is train No. 17 and return train No. 8 from Omaha to McCook, Nebr. If you think we can be of any assistance please advise.

Thank you in advance.

JANUARY 20, 1965.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: First of all we want to congratulate you on the election last fall and wish you much success in the coming term. We haven't changed our views one bit on good conservative Government management, so don't relax and let them win you over. One thing that has bothered us for a long time but have neglected airing our views is the postal service and especially the parcel post. We never seem to receive a package any more but what it is damaged, broken, smashed and paper torn. It is disgusting. Sometimes the article inside is damaged. The rates were raised last year and what do we get. The first-class mail was speeded up but now seems to be slower than ever and I can see no good reason for this state of affairs. We are sorry that we cannot say a good word for the whole Department.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. _____

JANUARY 29, 1965.

DEAR SIR: A situation has been created which I feel you would want to be apprised of. This situation has developed at the total expense of the taxpayer, both in money and loss of service. I herewith emphatically urge a general review of the Post Office policies toward hiring new employees and patron service.

The following are the reasons for my request:

1. During the year 1964, postal employees were reduced or positions reverted (in this particular area) at a percentage exceeding 15 percent. At the same time mail volume had increased 9.9 percent. During Christmas of 1964, our local office was unable to process our own outgoing mail and had to send a larger portion of it to be processed. This was due to lack of personnel and lack of space. Our third-class mail was delayed from 2 to 3 weeks during this same period for the same reasons.

2. Positions in this office have been reverted and thus employment reduced to the point where substitutes have been required to work from 150 to 170 hours every 2-week pay period. This certainly is not in keeping with the administration's policy of war on unemployment or the guidelines laid down to private industry pertaining to overtime, etc. In addition, most substitutes were required to work 7 days a week since as far back as September, although the Postal Manual stipulates that substitute employees are to be used to fill in for absent regular employees and to supplement the regular employee complement (Postal Manual 714.22a). These hours could be reduced and more help employed at a savings, financially, to the taxpayer, and at the same time increase the efficiency of the service.

Instead of progressing in efficiency and conditions through the years, the postal department has reverted to the conditions that existed 10 years ago.

The consensus of opinion is that this is not a local problem but rather that it must be fought through the regional office in _____ or the Post Office Department in Washington, D.C., hence this letter to you asking for help in this area.

I am asking you to help repeal the Whitten amendment, hire more employees, and elimination of sweatshop tactics in our post offices. In this way the American public can best be served both by making available more positions and by a much more efficient postal service.

Sincerely,

JANUARY 31, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just read the article entitled "Speedup Blamed for Damaged Mail" appearing in the Omaha World-Herald, Sunday, January 31. I wish to commend you for bringing this matter to public attention.

Postal employees throughout the country, who take pride in their work, are very much concerned about the service and conditions mentioned in this article. Although we have to take the brunt of public complaints, criticism, and blame, it is our fault and we have very little power to make corrections.

An investigation of reasons for poor service and inefficiency might very well begin in your home post office in Omaha. Some questions which could bring interesting answers might well be as follows:

During the just-passed Christmas operation how many clerks were needed to rewrap parcels damaged by sorting machines? How many hours did they use at what cost? How does this compare with "money saved" by using machines?

If I or any member of the organization I represent can be of any help to you in your investigation of postal operations, please do not hesitate to call upon us. I, personally, will put myself at your disposal in any way that I can be of help. We will welcome the chance to again take pride in our product, which is good postal service to the American public.

Sincerely yours,

FEBRUARY 4, 1965.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I should like to write and thank you for the copy of "Washington Report" I received in the mail today and ask that my name be put on the list. As a registered voter _____ I appreciate very much the fine representation you have given our district and, as a postal employee, I especially appreciate the fine work you have done on the Post Office Committee. I was pleased to read in last Sunday's World-Herald the statements you made concerning the damage and delay to mail that is happening since the advent of "automation." I am employed in the _____ of the post office and feel that the concentration of mail in huge sectional center facilities as opposed to the "en route distribution" is in many ways causing the delay and damage that the mail is suffering now. I realize this is the plan of the Department and picture of things to come, but I feel that "automation" won't cure all the ills if the human element is left out.

As I have written you many times asking for support of postal legislation and other favors, I felt I should tell you that I appreciate your fine efforts especially concerning the Post Office Department.

Sincerely,

FEBRUARY 4, 1965.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would like to register a complaint to you about our postal service. For some reason, the Postal Department has discontinued parcel post deliveries on Tuesdays. I have talked to the local postmaster and he informs me the Department gave him orders not to deliver parcels, and is not even allowed to go through the parcels to find one when someone asks him to. He has dug them out on various occasions but he is going against his orders and we do not

wish to get him into trouble. We get pharmaceuticals for prescriptions about every day and it makes it bad to not be able to get them on this particular day. I suppose that you have had the same complaint from scores of other people, so would like to add mine. I can't really think of any good reason why the Post Office Department made this ruling, but in my estimation, I think that it is stupid.

I don't suppose anything can be done about this situation, but just the same I would like to register my complaint.

Yours sincerely,

FEBRUARY 15, 1965.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regards to the poor postal service we are putting up with these days. It seems to have hit an all-time low. As a member of national opinion poll, all our mail is important. Though all mail is properly addressed, stamped, return addressed and ZIP coded, it is either not received or returned. Also when it is received it is damaged in transit regardless of care taken in packaging. This December I personally sent three children sums of money in three envelopes (\$6 total) to ———, distance 18 miles. It never was received. This is not a large sum, but as a submarine widow living on a small pension it does count in my livelihood. Not being a Bobbie Baker or residing in a country receiving foreign aid from the American taxpayer, maybe I expect too much, but when I have to pay for mail not delivered or damaged en route then I must say this U.S. Postal Service is the lowest, inefficient service I have witnessed in my 59 years.

Yours truly,

FEBRUARY 8, 1965.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: Upon review of the article and picture that appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on January 31, 1965, I can sympathize with your problem from firsthand experience. It is my assignment as a postal clerk in the ——— office to answer telephone inquiries of all kinds and to furnish information and advice to postal patrons. It is becoming quite a routine matter to advise these patrons on procedures in securing damages for parcel post packages received in bad order.

Since the Post Office Department has placed heavy curtailment of manpower levies on individual post offices, and administrative workloads have been increasing by leaps and bounds, primarily due to such programs as individual work measurement, cost ascertainment, POMSIP, BOMPOP, ZIP coding, ABCD, NIMS, and others whose values have yet to be established. Postal employees left to actually distribute the mail are under such production quotas that they simply do not have the time to be careful or accurate in the distribution of mail.

Since the effectiveness of individual work-measurement has been watered down to a point where it is almost nothing but a bother to postal clerks and their immediate supervisors alike, its elimination alone could convert over 100 each 4 weeks to mail production operations at ———. Many other similar savings in manpower hours utilized in other above-mentioned programs could be realized if these programs could be eliminated.

A word about the problem of substitute employment in the postal service might be appropriate here. A continued schedule of 12 hours per day, 6 days a week certainly is

not inductive to good health, accurate distribution and careful handling of delicate packages. Simple arithmetic shows us that for every two men working 12 hours a day, three could be employed 8 hours a day. Elimination of substitute employment would offer many benefits to the public, the economy of the Government, and to the well-being of those currently employed in this status. Sick leave abuses would be reduced, more accurate distribution and care of the mail could be expected, and more people could be employed—all without cost to the Government.

It is hoped that you will endeavor to see that these reforms are realized during the 89th congressional session.

Yours truly,

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It seems it is time someone starts giving us a little consideration on this postal situation. The public have gracefully accepted higher postal rates right along, but it is about time we get value received. The only packages I send or receive are from or to Denver, Colo., which isn't very far and doesn't require too much handling, but what a mess they are. Packages containing clothing or such come boxes broken, paper torn and in bad shape, but of course nothing to break. Last year my gift from Denver broken in a million pieces. This year a breakable gift arrived very well packed, but an arm broken off of a very nice figurine. The party didn't insure so is a complete loss. The gift I sent was well packed in a carton packed by the manufacturer. These packages both were well marked "fragile." Mine arrived broken, but I had it insured so had to take time to file a claim at the post office, the party on the receiving end had to deliver the damaged goods to their postal people, and I have to start all over buying another Christmas gift. There is no compensation for the inconvenience on both ends. Then the postal clerk told me not to get alarmed if I don't hear about it for 3 months, they are so busy and have so many claims.

Really, Mr. Congressman, John Q. Public deserves more than this. Sometimes these broken things cannot be replaced, so it is time we begin to be considered a little. I am sure there is a cure for this reckless handling and we are depending on you to help us.

Thank you for your interest, I remain,
Respectfully,

FEBRUARY 10, 1965.

Mr. GLENN CUNNINGHAM.

DEAR SIR: We read your article about the mail service and we agree.

I have trouble getting my magazines, sometimes they are left someplace else, are torn, and sometimes I don't get them.

We have several different men carrying our route. Don't see why we can't have a regular carrier.

Yours truly,

Mrs. ———.

FEBRUARY 23, 1965.

Congressman CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was elated to read in the Omaha World Herald of your interest in the type of postal service that is being given to the citizens. Please keep up your inquiry and your interest in this situation. I, too, have had some very unpleasant experiences with the delivery of parcels. I feel some change in the present method is much needed.

Thank you.

Mrs. ———.

FEBRUARY 5, 1965.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please add my name to your mailing list for "Washington Report." I have gotten a few in the past but am not sure that my name is on your list.

The postal service in my area is careless and irregular. Letters and magazines come torn and mangled. Other mail is miscarried and never received. Perhaps you could look into this matter and legislate some improvement.

Sincerely,

FEBRUARY 19, 1965.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Also glad something is being done re rough handling of mail. A year ago Christmas I sent a well-wrapped fruitcake to Ohio. After quite some time I received what was left of the wrapping, which happened to have my return on it. Always wondered who ate the cake.

About a month ago we shipped an FM radio to Oregon—very well packed and tied—marked "Glass, fragile." It was received in shambles. Glad it was insured.

Sincerely,

FEBRUARY 22, 1965.

The Honorable GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: First let me thank you for your untiring efforts on behalf of the postal service and the postal clerk. I have followed newspaper articles recently in regard to damaged parcel post with a great deal of interest. During the Christmas rush I worked ——— in the new Omaha Post Office Building and I can only say that it is disgraceful that parcel post should be subjected to the treatment that it is. Several clerks were on duty doing nothing but rewrapping and caring for damaged parcels.

It is in regard to another phase of the postal service that I wish to bring your attention. It is my firm conviction that the postal service is becoming worse and worse each year. One of the reasons for this, as I see it, is the attitude of the Post Office Department toward good service. The Department is so bent on keeping distribution of mail off the trains that it deliberately delays mail in order that it can be distributed in a post office.

The present concept of postal service is to divide a State into a number of areas. Within each of these areas is a post office, which is designated as a sectional center. Mail from all post offices within this prescribed area is trucked to this sectional center to be distributed and then trucked back out again to the numerous post offices for delivery. Trains moving from one end of the State to another carry mail to and from many of these sectional centers. Before a mobile postal clerk may distribute these packages of letters labeled to a sectional center he must have authority from the Department.

One train arrives in Omaha shortly after ———. Packages of letters that are picked up en route labeled to the sectional center facility, Omaha, Nebr., must be dispatched, according to present instructions, to the Omaha Post Office for distribution. Yet within these packages are letters for offices on star routes leaving Omaha too soon after the train's arrival for the Omaha Post Office to make connection. These circumstances have been called to the attention of postal officials, but to no avail. Direct pouches are made by this train for offices on these star routes so that connection from the train can be made upon arrival in Omaha, and yet

clerks are not permitted to rework these packages so that the mail contained therein for these star route offices can be included.

I expect that the Post Office Department would deal rather severely with me if they were to learn of this correspondence with you. Therefore, I must ask that you not divulge the source of your information. If I could be sure that my job were not in jeopardy by doing so, I would be happy to be more specific. I am deeply disturbed at the trends in the postal service and would like to be able to do something about it.

Respectfully,

FEBRUARY 8, 1965.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: Please keep on with your efforts with reference to careless handling of mail—particularly the matter of mail being held until there is a bunch large enough to make a delivery worthwhile for the mailman.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. _____

FEBRUARY 19, 1965.

The Honorable GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: A few weeks ago I read an article in the World-Herald concerning the poor delivery of a package to your office in Washington. I would like to tell you what I experienced recently with the Post Office Department.

Before Christmas I ordered a box of holly from a grower in Portland, Ore. It was to be sent airmail and special delivery. The package was mailed from Portland on December 19 and arrived in Omaha on December 21. However, it was not delivered to my home until January 12. And, of course, by that time it was in no condition to use, besides being out of season.

Now the big question is—where was the package from December 21 until January 12? It was not a small package which might have been misplaced easily.

I called the post office the day the package came and took it there the next day. After some kind of "investigation" I was told they could only pay for the postage since the package was not insured. I have \$5.50 invested and as far as I am concerned it was no one's fault but their own—so why shouldn't they pay for it all? The package was clearly addressed and plainly stamped that it arrived in Omaha on December 21, and also without a question anyone would have known that holly was in the box and it was perishable. Do you have any suggestions?

Sincerely,

FEBRUARY 15, 1965.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: I take this opportunity to encourage you in your effort to secure more conscientious mail service. I cannot understand how this service could have deteriorated so rapidly.

Sincerely,

FEBRUARY 5, 1965.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: Our Time magazine, that once used to be delivered on Tuesday, is now almost always delayed until Friday's delivery. By this time, the news is stale. I am assured by Time, Inc. that they are not at fault. I have called our local branch post office at least four times about this magazine and also the TV Guide which is sometimes delayed until the week of programing. Each time I am told that

the magazines are being sorted "here on the floor." Does it really take 3 days to sort? What do the mailmen do with their afternoons, now that they make only one delivery a day?

Mrs. _____

FEBRUARY 10, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GLENN: I was very interested in the story in the paper about the picture you received which was all smashed. It seems that the mail for _____ gets similar treatment. Almost every time we send a package to New York it gets there via a special station the Post Office Department seems to have established to handle damaged mail. The delay is sometimes 4 to 10 days.

One envelope that New York mailed to me here in Omaha was 10 days late in arriving although it was sent via airmail with plenty of postage affixed.

I have instructed our people to send no packages unless they are wrapped with strong cord, but even this does not stop delays.

Very respectfully yours,

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Please do something about this impossible mail situation.

Mrs. _____

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: I could go on and on about the post office deal, but it doesn't seem to do any good.

Our mail and packages arrive torn up and probably things lost out. A package laid in the post office for 25 days and we went to check and it was there marked "wasn't home when we tried to deliver it." No word followed. Also, a package was lost and all they said was oh, people lose more valuable things than that.

FEBRUARY 7, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Mr. _____ sent me a copy of the clipping which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald, "Speedup Blamed for Damaged Mail."

I read with interest the entire article and wish to commend you for the stand that you have taken and for putting the blame where it belongs in regard to the deteriorating postal service. I also appreciate the fact that you have given the career postal employee a pat on the back for doing a fine job.

There are many facets of our operation that we do not condone but of which we have no choice because of management and the Hatch Act. In spite of Executive Order No. 10988 and the signing of the national agreement and local contracts the situation is not getting better. In fact, I do not feel that management is living up to the Executive order, and I do know that management is breaking both the national and local contracts. I know this to be true in the Wichita region and even after you prove local management has violated a contract the most we get out of region is that local management gets a slap on the hand and then given a green light to do it again.

Again I wish to thank you for your interest in the postal service as well as our welfare.

Sincerely yours,

FEBRUARY 1, 1965.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: After reading the article in the Sunday World-Herald of January 31 I couldn't help writing to you of my experience with our mail service. To me it is getting worse every year. I never get a box of ceramic glazes that one or two bottles aren't broken or a package from Montgomery Ward that isn't crushed, box and all. Looks like they go through a meat grinder. Machines can do so much but hands are needed for fragile mail. We have a laundry here that put in a machine to iron dress shirts and I never saw such a mess. This mechanical age is disgusting.

I had from my childhood home an old magazine rack. By the time it left Omaha it had damage written all over it and by the time it got to _____ the glass was all broken and something had cut into the frame. And also into scenery. You can't replace a family heirloom. This was probably 65 years old as my folks were married in 1900 and it was a wedding gift. The insurance on it was \$20 but they only paid for fixing it up. That didn't help the frame much as things were finished differently years ago—more complicated. I think my sister got a little over \$5 for it. I think if they had to pay more something would be done. I collect nearly every time I send a ceramic piece no matter how good I pack it. Since postage is so high it costs more for the packing weight than the actual merchandise.

I've got so I just don't send expensive wares any more.

This is just another disgusted Nebraskan when it comes to using the mails to transport our merchandise.

Sincerely,

FEBRUARY 14, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: According to the attached clipping, you can use information about poor mail service. Here is my tale of woe.

Three glass trays—not delicate glass—were wrapped separately in several thicknesses of newspaper, each wrapped tray separated from the other with plenty of excelsior, packed in a heavy carton, taped, the carton wrapped in a heavy kraft paper, taped, and tied with stout cord. The package was stamped "fragile" six or eight times. When it arrived here from _____ each tray was broken into small pieces. I am out \$6 for the trays, plus \$1.20 postage, as the package wasn't insured. In the future we shall use express instead of the mails.

It is good to know you are attempting to do something about this deplorable situation.

Yours very truly,

Mr. Speaker, the big wheels of the Post Office Department can say all they want to about how great our mail service is and can continually float trial balloons as to new methods of handling our mail. But, Mr. Speaker, the facts speak for themselves. In short, the service given today by our Post Office Department "stinks."

LUBBOCK EXCHANGE CALLS COTTON PROGRAM A FAILURE

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most devastating indictments of the so-called one-price cotton program was issued by the Lubbock Cotton Exchange of Lubbock, Tex., on February 25.

A letter from the exchange to me repeats what I have been saying for months: The program is not working; it has caused a sharp drop in cotton exports; it has caused heavy increased costs to taxpayers; it has caused a build-up in Government stocks; it has reduced income for cotton farmers; it has destroyed much of the private enterprise merchandising system for cotton, and replaced it with bureaucrats.

The Lubbock Exchange draws conclusions, to which I take exception.

The best way out of the mess is lower price supports, not the direct payments urged by the exchange. However, the direct payments are much to be preferred over the present legislative monstrosity.

In this connection, I doubt the accuracy of the exchange's conclusion that wheat farmers are satisfied with the payment program now in effect.

However, the exchange has rendered a great public service in documenting the colossal failure of the present cotton program.

Here is the full text of the exchange's analysis:

LUBBOCK COTTON EXCHANGE,
Lubbock, Tex., February 25, 1965.

Congressman PAUL FINDLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY: This is to be a lengthy letter and I beg of you to please read it entirety as it is the only way we have of conveying to you the seriousness of cotton and the cotton industry. The present cotton program is not working successfully. It has brought about a decrease in cotton exports, an increase in Government cotton stocks and much added costs, and a reduction in the cotton farmers income.

For a period beginning August 1, 1964, to the present, cotton exports are about 40 percent of what they were a year ago during this same period. Exports in the 1963-64 season were 5,700,000 bales. The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that exports for the current season will reach approximately 4,500,000 bales. The cotton trade believes the export figure will be somewhere around 3 million bales. Up to February 9, 1965, we have only exported 1,758,000 bales. As of now, the total number of bales that have been taken into the loan this season is 6,946,000. We have redeemed 832,100 bales up through February 5, 1965. The Government has 10 sales programs currently being conducted. Cotton sales of three of these programs are listed below, these figures being the sales through February 8, 1965:

NOC-26.....	1,722,986
NOC-28.....	478,154
NOC-29.....	486,456

Total..... 2,687,596

The figures on the other seven programs are negligible and would not affect the above figure. As you can see, the Government has accumulated over 3 million more bales added to their already tremendous stock. The Government stock August 1, 1961, was approximately 1,485,000 bales. Today it is pushing

the 14 million bale mark and is costing the Government hundreds of millions of dollars to carry on this program.

The cotton marketing co-ops in Texas have been a detriment to the marketing program. Unfortunately, they are encouraged by the Department of Agriculture. Some of these co-ops have cotton storage facilities and offer premiums to producers to surrender control of cotton to them after which a good percentage of this cotton is dead to the market as storage fees are more profitable than what these co-ops can garner for merchandising operations. The Government, of course, is paying the bill.

On the south plains of Texas, we raise approximately 2 million bales and the past two seasons saw 60 to 70 percent going into Government loans through co-ops and form A's. As you know, the Commodity Credit Corporation ran completely out of money and 2 weeks ago was appropriated another \$1,600 million to carry on for the balance of the season.

In years past, the Department of Agriculture would confer with the cotton trade relative to what was needed, but this is no longer the case. Last season, the Department secretly conceived and suddenly announced the NOC-25 program whereby charges on form G and form A were canceled with the Government taking the loss on all these carrying charges. No one can estimate the loss to merchants who were then carrying stocks of cotton and bearing all the cost of the carrying charges. This action shook the confidence of the entire legitimate cotton trade which resulted in hand-to-mouth buying and forced more cotton into the loan.

The elimination of micronaire premiums and discounts in the loan was a damaging factor for cotton. Premiums and discounts are now figured by the Government in its sales of acquired cotton while cotton continues to enter the loan with no distinction between low and high micronaire readings. New crop sales are adversely affected as a result of this. We urge restoration of the premiums and discounts in succeeding loans.

In Lubbock, Tex., alone, there have been 22 legitimate cotton offices closed in the past 2 years and these were all tax paying firms.

There is only one simple solution to this serious condition and that is to pay the farmer a direct subsidy. The direct subsidy should be supplemented by support prices at a level that will permit cotton to move at the world price. Give them enough subsidy that they can survive and let them sell their cotton whether it go export or domestic. This will eliminate the tremendous Government cost and the cotton merchants of the United States will find a place somewhere in the world for every bale of American cotton. It will eventually restore our future markets whereby the cotton merchants can again stock cotton and protect themselves by hedges in the future market. The Talmadge-Humphrey bill provided for a direct subsidy when it was introduced into Congress last year. This is the best farm bill that has been presented to the Congress in many years. Our Congressman told us that the farmers did not want a direct subsidy. We have talked to thousands and they certainly do not oppose taking the subsidy. Wheat producers receive a direct subsidy and are very much satisfied with this direct subsidy.

The survival of the cotton industry depends on your decision, and we plead with you to study this carefully and help us in our fight to survive. If you should want any information, we shall be glad to help in any way we can.

Yours very truly,

IDRIS TRAYLOR,
President.

A FURTHER COMMENTARY ON OUR ECONOMIC STATISTICS

Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, 1963, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 14, pages 19584-19588, a copy of an article on our economic statistics by Oskar Morgenstern, of Princeton University. The article was critical of the methods of collection of our statistics and particularly urged that more attention be given to determining the margin of error in our economic statistics. Subsequently, I received a great number of comments from economists supporting the general observations in Dr. Morgenstern's article. These were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 7, pages 22849-22852.

On February 27, 1964, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 3, pages 3934-3939, a thorough and scholarly commentary on Dr. Morgenstern's article prepared by Raymond T. Bowman, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

I have now received a reply to Dr. Bowman from Dr. Morgenstern. In the letter to me from Dr. Morgenstern of October 6, 1964, he states:

You will recall the letter by Mr. R. T. Bowman, which you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and which was reprinted in the American Statistician, volume 18, June 1964. I have written a reply to Mr. Bowman's piece, and it will appear either in the October or December issue of that periodical. I am enclosing a copy of my paper, hoping that you may be interested. The whole matter came up at a meeting of the Federal Statistics Users Conference last week in Washington.

In order to move the dialog forward on this important subject, I include a copy of Professor Morgenstern's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

FIDE SED ANTE VIDE—REMARKS TO MR. R. T. BOWMAN'S "COMMENTS"

(By Oskar Morgenstern, professor of political economy, director, econometric research program, Princeton University, September 1964)

Mr. Bowman's detailed "Comments" (in the American Statistician, vol. 18, June 1964, pp. 10-20, reprinted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 3, pages 3934-3939, as a reply to a request by Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS on my paper in Fortune (October 1963) "Qui numerare incipit errare incipit" gives opportunity to state very briefly some of the points where we agree and where we differ. The justification for the following remarks lies first in the basic importance of the issue of error in economic statistics. Second, recognition of error becomes much more important than before because economics has entered a phase where quantitative statements about the economy and the consequences of economic policy are fitted into econometric models. Finally, large-scale computations are becoming more

common (and will surely increase in scope over the years). It is, of course, pointless to compute if one is unsure of the figures with which one calculates and if one does not appreciate what the computer may do even to faultless figures if sizable computations are made.

Mr. Bowman expresses a great deal of agreement with my views and this gives me much satisfaction. The agreement is that there are errors in our statistics, that we must try to locate them and to make them as small as possible. The valuable bibliography attached to his paper documents the great efforts made by many Government institutions to do precisely this. There was never any doubt about this type of work, and in my book "On the Accuracy of Economic Observations" (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1950, second completely revised edition, 1963), I have repeatedly commented on this fact and paid my respects to the many persons and offices engaged in providing the public with information of a statistical kind. Nor is there any doubt about the enormity of the effort required nor about the perpetuity of the task. When one source or type of error is brought under control others appear and sometimes fundamentally novel situations arise such as when previously inaccessible, large-scale computations become possible.

I would add, however, that I am disappointed to see in Mr. Bowman's paper a lack of appreciation of this situation and of awareness of the depth of the error problem in science in general. About this a few more words later. The position taken is basic, however, for the manner in which to deal with the prevalence of error, i.e., the fact that in any empirical field we can never free ourselves from our inability to "know" whatever we wish to observe, to measure, and to know, to any arbitrary level of precision.

Since errors exist, we must try to understand their nature, origin, extent and persistence. We must learn how to live with errors. To take an optimistic view that they will cancel out and somehow disappear or that they always go in the same direction is insufficient. If they do cancel out in some cases, they may fortify each other in other cases. If they are highly and positively correlated, as Mr. Bowman repeatedly emphasizes, and if they were constant additive or multiplicative components, they could be simply removed. However, this is not done; and this does not surprise me because such an assumption does not correspond to the facts. Nor is it clear which errors are allegedly so correlated, certainly not sampling errors unless the same sample were used in each case; but this would produce bias problems. Neither can the sampling error include the observational error. These are two quite distinct types of error and, if the sampling error is to include the other, then we have no useful concepts at all. But Mr. Bowman also recognizes that data whose accuracy is unknown are questionable measurements; yet he does not indicate what to do with such measurements. We can then only say that they are unreliable and unsuited for policy decisions.

Mr. Bowman's main concern, however, is with my discussion of growth rates. In my book they occupy only a relatively small part but even that is not properly considered by him. Instead, he limits himself to the Fortune paper which gave only an extract of what I had to say in my book. To begin with, there is no question but that growth rates taken over very long periods appear to become rather insensitive to errors in the underlying data, as is explained amply in my book. So Bowman's comments to that effect add nothing at all to my exposition which being much more detailed contains both examples and a mathematical derivation of this fact. Yet he is involved in a peculiar though rather obvious self-contradiction:

stating at the beginning of his paper that for long periods, say 1909 to date, there have been such profound changes in the composition of GNP that the economies of the two distant points in time are virtually incomparable—as are different countries in widely different stages of development—he nevertheless wishes to use the reliable growth rate. It is only reliable because of this great time span. The further, far more important, fact is, that growth rates are not primarily used for making such long-range comparisons. Rather they serve to justify policy measures for which yearly or even quarterly rate changes are important and are being used. There the picture is entirely different as the following demonstrates.

Though it is my contention that it is physically impossible to measure GNP or

national income without any error at all, I shall, in the following table, neglect any possible hypothetical errors and only consider the changes which were made in the official, allegedly, or at least presumably faultless data. These changes are corrections. There is no need for such if one has made a true observation in the first place; but one clearly has not done so and it is doubtful that the last reported figure for GNP or national income (or for any other observation) is free of error merely because it has been corrected, perhaps even several times. Tables 32 and 33 of my book (pp. 295–296) give the U.S. growth rates for successively corrected national income 1948–61. A summary computation based on all changes made extends table 33 there and is as follows:

Statistics of alternative growth rates of national income for the United States, 1948–62

	First	Last	Maximum	Minimum	Mean	Standard deviation
From 1947 to 1948.....	10.7	12.7	14.7	9.3	12.29	0.05
From 1948 to 1949.....	-1.2	-2.5	0	-4.4	-2.68	.09
From 1949 to 1950.....	6.3	11.1	11.8	6.3	10.77	.03
From 1950 to 1951.....	17.0	15.4	18.5	14.0	15.60	.02
From 1951 to 1952.....	5.2	4.6	5.9	3.6	4.69	.03
From 1952 to 1953.....	5.9	4.5	6.2	3.3	4.55	.05
From 1953 to 1954.....	-2.5	-1.2	0	-3.0	-1.23	.17
From 1954 to 1955.....	7.4	9.4	10.6	6.7	9.06	.07
From 1955 to 1956.....	6.2	6.2	8.8	3.6	6.31	.15
From 1956 to 1957.....	4.5	4.5	7.1	2.0	4.71	.15
From 1957 to 1958.....	.6	.1	2.7	-1.7	.25	.67
From 1958 to 1959.....	10.5	9.0	11.0	8.3	9.03	.02
From 1959 to 1960.....	4.7	3.6	4.7	3.6	4.08	.01
From 1960 to 1961.....	3.0	2.6	3.6	2.0	2.73	.03
From 1961 to 1962.....	6.3	6.4	7.3	5.4	6.4	.03

The table shows the growth rates from each year to the next (1) using the first published figures, (2) using the last published figures, (3) the maximum growth rate obtainable from the official figures, (4) the minimum obtainable growth rate, (5) the mean of all the values as calculated for each year of the table, and (6) the standard deviation of these values. The second decimal in the mean and in the standard deviation is obviously a computational consequence.

In none of these figures has any assumed error been introduced as was done in the table of my Fortune paper where plus-or-minus errors of 1, 3, and 5 percent for successive years were assumed and growth rates were shown to be correspondingly affected. (This was again an excerpt from my book where, in chapter XV, the whole matter is investigated in appropriate detail.) Now Mr. Bowman seems to object to the idea that the data contain any errors at all; but he cannot object to the successive official revisions the consequences of which are shown above. What is or was "the" growth rate? "You pay your money and you take your choice." I shall dispense with any further interpretation but would at least point to the change in sign even for 1957–58. The main interest is for the big differences between the first and the last rate. Policy decisions based on the first would in several instances have been quite different had the last figures been available. The more recent figures will also be revised over the coming years but everyone knows how the Council of Economic Advisers uses the first one available to tell the country in no uncertain terms how things are going and what the right policy is.

And all this abstracts completely from any error which, of course, has to be present and whose workings are evident even from the revisions, though these do not necessarily remove it. An interesting operation is to repeat the above extensive computations by introducing the ± 1 , ± 3 , ± 5 -percent errors with which one of my original tables was concerned. It is clear that the picture does not and cannot improve. I shall, however, not take up space by exhibiting these calculations.

All this is, of course, subject to the criticism that it is impossible to talk sensibly of the "growth" of a whole economy by determining only one single number arrived at in such primitive manner, errors or no errors in the observation. From a strictly scientific point of view, which I am confident sometime will prevail, this alleged measurement will hardly appear as conforming to the contemporary standards of science prevailing in physics, chemistry, or biology of today. As I have said elsewhere, would anyone describe the development of a human being by one summary figure? How could it show increase in height, weight, intelligence, knowledge all at once?

There are a number of exceptions that have to be taken to other points made by Mr. Bowman. Of these I mention only two:

1. It is asserted that if two or more series "move together," we can conclude that they are valid. This is stated for the two unemployment series and for the original and revised national income series. Such an argument is completely untenable; it reminds one of the well-known pseudocorrelations which have been so severely criticized in the literature ever since they first appeared and which, as a consequence, are now only seldom found. It is regrettable that this faulty argumentation is now used in a slightly different context. In this particular case (referring to the chart which Mr. Bowman uses on p. 15 in order to illustrate that covariation prevails in spite of data revisions) the point is further obscured by the existence of trends. If these were removed it is not even clear that the series would "move together."

2. The comments on rounding of figures and the retention of insignificant figures are entirely unacceptable. The two are not even necessarily related.

The problem of rounding is in some respects a very deep one and is extensively dealt with in chapter VI of my book, but no reference is made in Mr. Bowman's paper to that discussion. I have examined it especially for the case of inversion of large scale matrices as they occur, for example, in input-output studies. Computation is in

general complicated especially when the given figures contain errors as all economic data must do. Pounding away of insignificant figures is pointless; worse, it pretends accuracy and falsifies measurements. Insignificant figures and digits must always be gotten rid of no matter where they occur. Being insignificant, they can never do any good. In particular, they can never by a somehow mysterious process give a better picture of changes in economic processes. What is "significant" is, of course, a matter that also requires cognizance of the fact that measurement is always related to its use, in other words to a theory. Mr. Bowman says nothing about this.

So I am brought back to the point mentioned earlier that we are here discussing something much deeper than just some official statistics and their makers. It is not enough to admonish the public, as Mr. Bowman does, to use Government statistics with care and caution and to consider the copious qualifying footnotes too often attached to them. The various Government agencies should set the example. But they apparently do not know themselves how to handle the complicated footnotes and commentaries they are producing to their mutual discomfort. How else can one explain the sad fact that the Government uses statistics carelessly, reports absurd, alleged changes in price levels, employment, the balance of payment, private spending, etc., rates of only one-tenth of 1 percent and considers these to be "significant." The Government knows without a shade of doubt how much the productivity of an industry or of the whole country has increased from one year to another. And so it goes on. Important policy decisions affecting the well-being of the Nation are based on such "measurements."

It is the business of the makers of statistics to prove the degree of accuracy they claim for the data they present. That also implies justification of the concepts used in their collection. Errors must be estimated, no matter how difficult and painful this prove, so that the data can be used properly. The point is that it is far more demanding to use imperfect rather than perfect information in a scientifically and politically acceptable manner. This carries over to all manipulations to which the data have to be subjected.

The frequently heard argument that bad statistics are better than none is worthless and has very dangerous implications. The worst possible thing is to treat them as if they were without blemish. Such an attitude not only puts a brake on efforts to improve the data, but far more important, it is contradictory to the spirit in which science and government must progress.

GUARANTEEING TAX EXEMPTION OF ADVERTISING INCOME FOR PUBLICATIONS OF CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress I introduced two bills, which I am reintroducing at this time, designed primarily to give the Congress an opportunity to review the judgments it made in 1950 in respect to the taxation of income of nontaxable organizations derived from the operation of income pro-

ducing activities. The crux of the problem lies in establishing the lines of demarcation to determine what activities are sufficiently closely associated with the purposes of the organization which render it nontaxable in the first place to justify holding revenues derived therefrom nontaxable. The other side of the coin is the inequality in competition which is created by exempting from taxation income from activities engaged in by taxable business organizations which in effect are in competition in the same line of endeavor with the nontaxable organizations and yet are taxed.

I introduced these bills in the last Congress primarily to put a stop to the Treasury Department placing its judgment ahead of the Congress to establish new lines of demarcation through the technique of issuing new Treasury regulations, and to permit the Congress after full public hearings of people on all sides of the issues, including the Treasury Department and IRS officials to render any new judgments that seem desirable through law, not executive rulings.

The remarks I made at the time of introducing the bills in the last Congress are still pertinent. They are as follows:

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the effective administration of our tax system makes it necessary for the Internal Revenue Code to be implemented by detailed regulations which serve as a vehicle for carrying out the legislative objectives and intent of the Congress. In general, the record of the Internal Revenue Service in preparing and promulgating regulations within the purview of the revenue laws enacted by Congress is commendable. However, because of the vast complexities of our tax system and its administration and, from time to time an overzealous attitude on the part of certain of its officials, the Internal Revenue Service has sometimes exceeded legislative authority in its attempts to exact revenue.

When an executive branch of Government invades the exclusive power of Congress in an effort to legislate by regulation, redress may be had in the courts through a long, tedious, and expensive procedure which may result in irreparable damage even if the litigation is successful; or Congress of its own initiative may speak through the legislative process to thwart the attempted invasion of its prerogatives.

My remarks today are directed toward statements made by officials of the Internal Revenue Service that a regulation will be proposed which will have the effect of taxing the income of publications of tax-exempt organizations even though such publications may be substantially related to the tax-exempt purposes of such organizations.

The statute under which the Internal Revenue Service intends to propose a regulation is the Revenue Act of 1950. This law was enacted for the purpose of curbing a growing abuse on the part of certain tax-exempt educational institutions that were acquiring regular commercial businesses not substantially related to their tax-exempt purposes aside from the need for income. The focal point of attention at the legislative hearings and in the congressional committee reports preceding passage of the Revenue Act of 1950 was the acquisition by New York University of a macaroni factory.

In his testimony before the Senate Committee on Finance, the then Secretary of the Treasury Snyder said:

"Our tax laws have long recognized the principle that organizations operated for worthy public purposes should be encouraged by tax exemption."

About the provisions of the bill which would subject to tax the income of a substantially unrelated trade or business he said:

"These provisions preserve the tax-free status of the legitimate activities of educational and charitable organizations and, at the same time, correct the abuses which properly have received so much general condemnation. Business operations of charitable and educational institutions clearly unrelated to their exempt functions generally would be subjected to the regular corporation income tax. This would apply to organizations now engaging in such unrelated business activities as the manufacture of food products, leather goods, vegetable oils, and the distribution of petroleum products. The bill would not tax their income from related activities."

It is clear from Secretary Snyder's presentation and from the congressional committee reports that the statute was intended to subject to taxation only the income of a trade or business that is substantially unrelated to the primary purposes of a tax-exempt organization. In applying the statute, the operation of a publication such as a trade or professional journal may be regarded as a "business" but its income is properly subject to tax only if the publication is a business "substantially unrelated" to an organization's tax-exempt purposes.

Nevertheless, despite the legislative history and the clear meaning of the law, the Internal Revenue Service now proposes by regulation to tax the advertising revenue of publications of tax-exempt organizations, irrespective of whether the publication is substantially related or unrelated to its exempt purposes.

Since the intent of this law is unmistakable, it is clear that the Internal Revenue Service would, by the adoption of this proposal, usurp the legislative functions and prerogatives of Congress by going beyond the purpose of the statute.

The first bill which I am introducing today will assure to labor, agricultural, trade, professional, educational, charitable, religious and similar organizations the tax-free status of their legitimate activities which Secretary Snyder promised and Congress intended in the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1950.

The sole purpose of the second bill that I am introducing is to accommodate the situation where a publication is incorporated separate from the parent organization as is the case with the Journal of Nursing—the publication of the American Nursing Association.

The need for this legislation runs the gamut of our worthwhile organizations, such as the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, churches, labor unions, professional and business organizations, and the National Education Association, among other educational groups.

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR WATER ASSESSMENT OF IRRIGATION DITCH COMPANIES

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which would allow farmers to deduct as a business expense, all amounts paid to irrigation ditch companies or similar entities, for water assessments. I have been informed by the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who has introduced a com-

panion measure in the Senate, that the Internal Revenue Service has heretofore allowed deductions for such assessments as an ordinary and necessary business expense, but has recently changed its regulations on the subject, and is now disallowing such deductions.

The mutual ditch company, a creation of great use in our Western States, is organized as a means of conveying irrigation water from the point of diversion on a stream to the ultimate user, the farmer. Shareholders in such an association are entitled to water in proportion to their stockholdings, and shares of such stock have often been held to be real property in our Western States. A ditch company may make assessments against a farmer in proportion to the farmer's holding in the company. Unless these assessments are paid a farmer is not permitted to take water from the association ditch. On this ground it appears that the allowance of a tax deduction, as an ordinary and necessary business expense is justified.

In addition to the fact that the bill makes economic sense and good tax sense, I want to insure that substantive changes in the tax laws are made properly and not by regulation or interpretation. By introducing legislation the IRS officials will have the proper forum for presenting their reasons and data under cross-examination as to why they think a law should be changed with the opportunity also provided for those with differing viewpoints to present their side of the case. Furthermore, I always want to accommodate a Member of the other body in getting his ideas for tax law amendments channelled properly and constitutionally. It is indeed unfortunate when Members of the other body feel that there is such a lack of cooperation on the part of Members of the House that they must resort to extra-legal procedures, such as originating revenue bills in the Senate, or attaching them as non-germane amendments to House-originated revenue measures.

POWER INTERESTS CAN AGREE

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, proof that agreements can be worked out between REA cooperatives, municipal power users, and investor-owned power companies was realized in South Dakota recently.

Under the leadership of our able and determined Governor, the Honorable Nils Boe, representatives of each of these power users sat down at the bargaining table to reach an understanding over the troublesome territorial integrity dispute.

Disagreements over who shall serve customers in areas annexed to municipalities are not limited to South Dakota. This has been a perplexing question throughout the Nation. And the South

Dakota approach can serve as an example to the Nation.

The fact that these interests were able to reach agreement in South Dakota indicates that others may have success with the same course of action. Certainly there would be no harm in trying to sit down at the bargaining table and discuss in good faith the issues that so often find public power interests at odds with private companies, or vice versa.

I congratulate these statesmen of the South Dakota power industry and, in particular, Gov. Nils Boe who brought them together and kept them together through several difficult sessions.

Let us hope that this agreement ushers in a new era where such disputes can be settled at the bargaining table rather than by means of public acrimony.

Details of the South Dakota agreement are contained in a newspaper article from the Aberdeen American-News of February 23 and in an editorial comment in the Huron Daily Plainsman of February 25 and the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader of February 24, which follow:

[From the Aberdeen, (S. Dak.) American News, Feb. 23, 1965]

ELECTRICAL CONFEREES END HASSLE—RED-LETTER DAY, SAYS GOVERNOR AFTER AGREEMENT

PIERRE.—South Dakota's electric utility industries late Monday gave final approval to a statement of principle settling a 6-year dispute over service to customers in areas annexed to a city.

Gov. Nils Boe, disclaiming any credit for the agreement, highly commended the conference negotiators and termed it a "red-letter day" for South Dakota.

Reducing the statement of principle into legislation to submit to the legislature remains the task of lawyers for the three utilities, and the lawyers planned to begin work on it Tuesday.

The deadline for introduction of committee bills is not until Thursday, and Boe said he would ask one of the State affairs committee chairmen to introduce the measure.

Boe noted that the power industry controversy had brought "animosity into the social and political lives of the State."

"This can now come to an end," he said, "and we can turn our talents to other problems facing the State."

OTHER AREAS

The Governor encouraged the conferees to continue their discussions in the hope of finding other areas in which they could work together for the benefit of the consumer and South Dakota as a whole.

Representatives of the rural electric, municipal and private utilities set April 9 for their next meeting to see if there are other areas, such as advertising, in which they might work together.

The power struggle was launched in 1959 with REA introduction of what they termed a "fair play" bill allowing them to continue serving in towns they were in, even if the towns grew beyond 1,500 population.

They also asked the right to continue serving customers they served in areas that might be annexed by a city.

The REA legislation was bitterly fought by the municipal and private power groups, and the legislature became the focal point of the battle.

It wasn't until the 1963 session that the REA's got a part of what they wished—the right to remain in towns that grow beyond the 1,500 population mark.

PURCHASE LAW

However, that legislature also passed a law allowing the primary utility serving a municipality to purchase the facilities within

an annexed area of the secondary utility serving that area.

The REA's termed that aspect of the law "foul play."

In order to avoid another legislative hassle this year, Boe last fall asked the utilities to get together to settle their own problems.

The conferences began last December amid decidedly cool and suspicious surroundings, and often appeared to be on the verge of breaking down.

Compromises came hard to each of the groups, but by the time the fifth negotiation session came about, the three utilities seemed fairly close to a final settlement, which was reached in the sixth meeting Monday.

The statement of principle each finally agreed to support had aspects which were, to put it in the words of one of the participants, "distasteful and repulsive."

But Boe continually urged them toward agreement, even if it wasn't entirely satisfactory to anyone.

ANOTHER SESSION

He said another legislative session would be held in 10 months, and that any needed modifications could be suggested at that time. The important thing, he added, was to get something down to see how it would work.

The statement of principle as finally adopted included the following:

Repeal of the 1963 fair play bill.

Reenactment of that portion of the 1963 law allowing REA's to continue serving in towns that might grow beyond 1,500 population.

Allow the REA's to continue serving customers in areas annexed to a city, but service to all customers of any utility would be frozen at the time of annexation. Any dispute over service to new customers in the annexed area would be submitted to a board of arbitration.

Service to customers of any utility within a 3-mile perimeter around the city limits would be frozen as of a time to be decided.

Any dispute over service to new customers in the 3-mile zone would be submitted to a board of arbitration.

Establishment of a permanent board of arbitration to be composed of two members of each of the utilities.

Limitation of the board of arbitration in disputed cases to the four members of the utilities involved, plus the circuit court judge in the district where the dispute occurred and one local member of each of the utilities involved in the dispute.

Establishment of rates in municipalities by the primary utility serving that city, with appeal allowed as now contained in law.

Payment of all taxes now paid by the REA, with an additional 2-percent tax on gross revenue earned within cities payable to those cities where REA facilities are located in lieu of ad valorem taxes.

Negotiation between REA and the municipal utility in a city for additional taxes to be paid the city in lieu of revenue that city might have received if the municipal utility were to serve the annexed area, with any dispute as to the amount to be submitted to arbitration up to a maximum of 4 percent of gross revenue.

[From the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman, Feb. 25, 1965]

UTILITIES CONFERENCE AGREEMENT MAY SIGNAL THE DAWN OF NEW ERA

The prolonged conference which brought to a successful end the territorial service argument between the rural electrics, private utilities, and municipal power systems may signal the dawn of a new era in South Dakota utility relationships.

It took six sessions to hammer out the compromise solution to the question of REA service in areas annexed by cities and the

expansion of rural electric and city-serving utilities in the growth areas around the cities.

The lyrics of the song, "Getting To Know You," might apply to these sessions, for the companies now plan further conferences to explore other areas of mutual concern. Their next session will take up advertising and public relations and there is a chance they may "bury the hatchet" and eliminate the animosity which has handicapped past interutility relations.

We hope that the spirit of compromise and willingness to find accord, which marked the settlement of one basic issue, will prevail and that the utility segments can work together as an industry for the good of the entire State.

While some credit for the accord must go to the 18 negotiators who worked out their differences, the role that Gov. Nils A. Boe played in the conference cannot be overlooked. The conference was called by the Governor to find a solution to the problem and to draft legislation which all could support. In a campaign pledge made in Huron, the Governor promised his support of any agreement that was in the best interest of the people of South Dakota.

At times, when it looked as if the sessions were heading into a stalemate, the Governor personally intervened and was able to keep the talks going to their successful conclusion. Through his efforts, a 6-year-old argument has been reconciled.

Individually and collectively, the electric utilities are a vital factor in the lives of everyone and an equally important factor in the growth and development of the State. The settlement of some of the differences without the acrimony attendant upon other efforts in recent years will be beneficial to each of the three utility groups, the State as a whole, and last, but not least, that seldom-mentioned little guy, the consumer.

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus Leader, Feb. 24, 1965]

A HAPPY DEVELOPMENT ON POWER

All concerned are entitled to credit for the preliminary agreement reached in conferences at Pierre pertaining to legislation about the electric power industry in South Dakota.

For years and years the legislature has been the scene of a battle among the various interests involved with vigorous action both on and off the floor. Lawmakers grappled as best they could with the complicated issues and perhaps many of them were uncertain in their own minds about the best course to follow.

Governor Boe—a man with long legislative experience—saw another struggle ahead for the current session and wondered if something couldn't be done to clarify the issue. So he called a conference of the representatives of the three groups primarily concerned—the rural cooperatives, the municipalities, and the private companies.

First they meet in December in an atmosphere of considerable uncertainty. They assembled because the Governor asked them to do so but there wasn't too much hope that an agreement could be reached. And at first an agreement seemed an unattainable goal.

But the Governor persisted in his request for an understanding. In consequence one meeting followed another. In the process, it seems, there developed a better comprehension of the viewpoints and policies of each group. And there apparently also was a realization that some degree of compromise was required.

As the deadline for action drew close, pressures mounted and, interestingly enough, a growing spirit of conciliation was displayed. The Governor continued to plead for understanding, pointing out the unhappy

aspects of another legislative fight and the dividends that might accrue from a friendly settlement.

The net result was the agreement set forth in the statement of principle outlined Monday. It is possible that argument might develop over details but the progress officially recorded is certainly a notable step forward.

Governor Boe is to be praised for promoting the joint conferences. And the conferees deserve praise for proceeding in the spirit the executive suggested and developing in the American way a program acceptable to the three groups.

STUDENT CONGRESSIONAL INTERNS

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced my bill to authorize each Member of the House of Representatives to employ annually, on a temporary basis between the period from June 1 to August 31, one additional employee to be known as a "student congressional intern."

Having used summer interns in my office for several years, and being convinced of the great value in promoting knowledge of and interest in our legislative branch among our younger people, I have, in the two previous Congresses, introduced my bill which, in the past, was designed not only to permit an additional employee but which also authorized a small additional salary for that employee.

Now I have rewritten the bill to eliminate the salary authorization. Therefore, my proposal would cost no money in addition to what is now authorized for staff hire in each Member's office. I have done this because my inquiries indicate that the major inhibition in hiring summer interns in many offices is not so much the lack of available staff hire allowance as it is the limitation on the number of employees which each Member is permitted. While not all Members use the maximum number of employees allotted to them, I find that it is generally those Members who do so who are most interested in having a summer intern on their staff and whose wide range of legislative and constituent activity requires them to use the maximum number of employees. My bill would enlarge this number by one during the 3 summer months and thus alleviate this problem.

There are some organized intern programs, usually sponsored by the university involved, which not only help place the interns but which also subsidize their living expenses in Washington during the summer. I commend these programs, but I also feel that for the student from an institution which does not have an organized and subsidized program and whose own financial situation is such that he must receive some remuneration for his work, the interns from the subsidized programs represent rather

unfair competition. The student who, on his own initiative seeks out a summer job on Capitol Hill, should be permitted to be considered equally along with his subsidized competitor. My bill would permit the addition of this type of student to one's staff at whatever salary the Member had remaining in his account.

I sincerely hope that the Committee on House Administration will see fit to give favorable action to my measure this year, and I welcome the active interest and co-sponsorship of other Members who believe in the value of utilizing summer interns.

IN AFRICA HE REFLECTS HONOR UPON CAPE COD

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, a former resident of Falmouth, Mass., the Reverend Donald K. Abbott, is waging a frustrating, uphill battle with local officialdom in Rhodesia. His objective is nothing more than a simple expression of human compassion from the employers and bureaucratic overseers of a young African carpenter killed in a construction accident.

The repeated instances of callous disregard for the native African, which he has described, is the root of much of the hatred and antiwhite violence the world has witnessed recently in this troubled area of the world.

Those of us who are concerned about recurrent bloodshed and massacre in the Congo and elsewhere in Africa, and the growing influence of anti-Western forces, who thrive upon such turmoil, must support the personal, one-man campaign of this Cape Cod pastor for justice and for the dignity of men—regardless of the color of their skin.

I therefore commend to the attention of my colleagues in Congress the following article and editorial from the Falmouth Enterprise:

DEATH OF A NATIVE ROUSES FALMOUTH MISSIONARY'S ANGER

The Reverend Donald K. Abbott, a Falmouth man who has been for 15 years a missionary in Rhodesia, has written of the death of a native. It is an angry letter, and Mr. Abbott speaks of his sense of shame at being a white man in that part of Africa today.

Ignidation has led him to protest to Rhodesia's prime minister.

The native who died was a young man, killed in an industrial accident on the low veldt many miles from his home. His father is one of Mr. Abbott's charges at Chikore Mission.

The father was never informed directly of his son's death. When the missionary taxed officialdom with callous neglect of human decency, officials appeared to wonder at such fuss over the death of a black African.

"The stupid, arrogant callousness of the whole thing actually astounds me," Mr. Abbott wrote. "In the light of what is going on here, it is a very small thing. But it is representative of the attitude that is going, sooner or later, to send this country into a bloodier

mess than has yet erupted in most parts of Africa."

Dumisane Mtetwa was a semiskilled carpenter, employed by the Lewis Construction Co. at Triangle, on the Rhodesian low veldt, removing shuttering from a concrete structure over an irrigation canal. He was standing on makeshift scaffolding supported by a boat in the water.

"Tricky arrangement at best, but good enough for an African," commented Mr. Abbott.

Something gave way. African workmen fell into the water. Dumisane was struck by a falling object. He died before they could get him out of the water.

If this workman had been a white man in a white country, Mr. Abbott suggested, there might have been charges of negligence against the construction company. There undoubtedly would have been a fuss. "Dumisane was just another African."

LEGAL NICETIES

Police were notified. "Legal niceties have to be observed. Makes everything easier. White manager. White policeman. No difficulties. Hot in the low veldt. Can't leave bodies lying around. Bury him. Hire another boy. Notify his family? Telephone calls cost money. Send letter to his district commissioner. Remove him from the tax rolls. Can't expect a dead native to pay taxes."

It was 11 days before Dumisane's father learned of his son's death. He learned accidentally. A friend worked in the district commissioner's office, his job to file death notices. He wondered if the family knew of Dumisane's death, met the father in town and told him. The father and his African pastor then drove 300 miles to ascertain the details.

The Falmouth missionary wrote to the construction company manager: "When they asked your representative at Triangle why no attempt was made to contact Dumisane's family, his reply was to the effect that he was a businessman and could not be bothered with such matters. An unbelievably stupid and callous statement to my way of thinking. It is this type of blatant indifference on the part of the white man toward the feelings of the Africans that causes much of the racial strife in this country today."

To the Prime Minister of Rhodesia, Mr. Abbott wrote: "It is this type of incident which so greatly embitters the African in this country. There is very little question in anyone's mind that things would have been different if the color of the man's skin had been white."

Mr. Abbott recalled an incident when he was a telegraph operator in Falmouth many years ago. "One quiet Sunday afternoon I received a telegram addressed to a college professor. It concerned a death in his family. He had gone away. No one was quite sure where he could be reached. But I did get some leads. During the course of the afternoon I sent messages to many parts of the country in an effort to locate him. In the end, I had accumulated a file of more than a score of messages as a result of these attempts. Somehow I felt it was important that he be informed."

"Of course, he was a white man. Like me. I'm a white man, but sometimes I'm ashamed of it. Like now."

Donald Abbott is the son of Mrs. Vera E. Abbott, who lives at 6 Choate Lane in Falmouth. He was graduated from Lawrence High School and from Drew University and Union Theological Seminary. He served on a destroyer in the Pacific during World War II, and elected the ministry when he resumed college after the war. He and his wife went to the Rhodesian mission in 1950.

IN AFRICA HE REFLECTS HONOR UPON CAPE COD

We knew him as "Jakey" when with his brothers and sister he was growing up in Falmouth. For long now he has been the Reverend Donald K. Abbott. His own children are growing up at Chikore mission in what was until recently southern Rhodesia.

The Reverend Mr. Abbott is no idealistic newcomer, facing disillusionment in strange country, far from Cape Cod. He has been learning African life and African colonialism for 15 years.

The Reverend Mr. Abbott knows exactly what he is up against when he challenges the white administrators of Rhodesia and in burning anger accuses them of callousness and stupidity in the death of an African boy. He knows he will get little sympathy and accomplish nothing. He knows he will be branded, if no worse comes to him, as a troublemaker.

It is all so futile, anyhow. Dumisane Mtetwa from Chikore mission is dead and buried far from home. He died because the scaffold his employer sent him up on collapsed, but there was no inquiry into culpability. He was buried in a hurry because it is hot in the low veldt.

Dumisane's father at Chikore learned of his son's death by accident 11 days later. Dumisane's employer explained he was too much of a businessman to be bothered with such details. To the Prime Minister of Rhodesia, the Cape Cod missionary wrote: "It is this type of incident which greatly embitters the African in this country. There is very little question in anyone's mind that things would have been different if the color of the man's skin had been white."

Not content with writing one letter, Mr. Abbott has written many. He cares about human beings not the color of their skins. He believes in the dignity of man. He wants no Congo blood bath in his Rhodesia where whites seek to hold control though many times outnumbered by natives.

"In the light of what is going on here, this is a very small thing," Mr. Abbott wrote, "but it is representative of the attitude that is going sooner or later, to send this country into a bloodier mess than has yet erupted in Africa."

To his friends of the Enterprise, "Jakey" wrote: "I'm a white man. I'm ashamed of it. Like now."

"Jakey" need not be ashamed when there are white men who can stand up with courage, and compassion to protest abuse of men with colored skin.

We are proud, as we have long been fond of this man who was a boy in Falmouth. He makes us more than ever proud of the Cape Cod which breeds such men.

A MILITARY ANALYST LOOKS AT THE MERGER

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress who has also been a Reserve officer for 25 years, I have more than the usual amount of interest in Secretary McNamara's proposed realignment of the Army Reserves and National Guard. I have many serious reservations that his proposals, on balance, would contribute to a weakening of our

defense posture and would, in the end, significantly jeopardize our national security.

When I hear talk of "military reform" and "increased efficiency," I wonder if, perchance, the Secretary of Defense is not responding to what seems to be a natural phenomena in this country in the wake of great conflicts.

I sensed in the Nation—that is until the situation in Vietnam developed as it has—great interest in the demobilization of our defenses and an impatience with the burdens of financial cost and overwhelming responsibility that are ours as the leader of the free world.

There seemed to be, paralleling this drive for reduction of defense forces, growing support for the establishment of what has been labeled by this administration as the Great Society—focusing as it does its main thrust on domestic problems. I personally question the wisdom of this policy. Specifically, I have grave doubts about some of the proposals the Secretary of Defense has made with respect to the roles and missions of the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force and the National Guard and Organized Reserve.

Mr. Speaker, each of these essential components of our total Armed Forces has the proven capability of filling a specific national defense requirement. In each case their structure is most appropriate to the desires and abilities of our citizenry to participate, in varying degrees, in our country's defense.

Many of my own thoughts and the feelings of thousands of other Americans who have served in the Organized Reserves were eloquently expressed last week at a meeting of the Reserve Officers Association by Gen. S. L. A. Marshall, the distinguished soldier, writer, historian, and military analyst.

General Marshall is uniquely qualified to comment on this proposal. He has been with Reserve, Guard, and Regular Army divisions in combat. He has served in each as an officer, and he has served this country in three wars as soldier, official observer, and war correspondent.

General Marshall sees great danger in this proposed cannibalization of the Organized Reserve, and I feel that his comments on this most important subject, based on a lifetime of experience and study, should be of interest and concern to every Member of Congress.

Consideration of this question is most appropriate at this time because Congress will soon be confronted with it and because of its bearing upon our ability to respond to the challenges of the Communists in southeast Asia and throughout the world.

I therefore insert in the Record at this point the text of General Marshall's address to the ROA:

MILITARY ANALYST LOOKS AT THE MERGER

(Given at the Reserve Officers Association meeting, February 25, by S. L. A. Marshall)

My thanks to the chairman for his kind words of introduction. He believes as do I that it's better to feed a man a little taffy while he's alive than a lot of "epitaffy" after he is dead. At the same time I am reminded of what my old commander, Col. Rutten

Cutter, told me in 1919: "Marshall, you are so thick-headed that you are bound to become outstanding even among your fellow infantry officers."

Rejoicing to be here, I am under no illusion that what I say has intrinsic importance. This capital has a way of putting in lower case any sentiments from the hinterland.

But the founding notion of this Republic that, "in union there is strength" towers above all who would despise it. What we together think and what we do together either may still move mountains of disdain and indifference or the time has come to dispair of the American dream. I am not ready for that. When we feed the question into our family computing machine, it returns no such answer.

In addressing myself to a subject such as today's, I find it the better part of valor to speak from the record, especially in this capital where brave men think and speak out loud, provided they are alone in their bedchambers and are certain they are not bugged. There is always the chance that someone will misquote me and make pablum of what I intended to be controversial. That would be a fate worse than death.

When General Lodoen invited me to come, my first impulse was to decline for I felt that I had said in print most of what I believed needed to be heard. Reflecting compelled me to reverse myself. * * * If what I wrote for the New Republic at the request of Editor Gil Harrison, and what I dashed off for my syndicate, were all that was to be said, I should have kept silent in the first place. For it will not change the opinions of minds which have chosen to stay closed irrespective of the consequences to this Nation.

Come with me to Yorktown. On that old battlefield you will find a great monument to the event erected on its first centennial and paid for by public subscription. And you will also find this story. Critics over the country object to the expenditure, saying: "Why raise another memorial on yet another old battlefield?" Then Edward Everett, the great orator of the day, silenced and shamed them by asking: "Tell me, why do anything in this life?" and the cause went ahead.

If Edward Everett were alive today and could bring to this table an eloquence and exposition such as would make the case for preservation of the Army Reserve clear beyond dispute among reasonable men, though his voice carried to every ear in Washington, it would not alter policy, if those who make it, for reasons of their own, reject reason finally. It is simply one of the unalterable principles of logic that the one thing more difficult to refute than utmost wisdom is utter absurdity. There is never any rebuttal to Poobah who says this or that and views it as done, or to Humpty Dumpty, who used a word to mean exactly what he wants it to mean, and neither more nor less. There is the problem which confronts us. We heard vouchsafed to our people that which we know is patently false. We are asked to agree to what is called a "military reform" on the basis that it will increase efficiency with no loss to security, when commonsense tells us that the motivation is a mere countinghouse tidying up by an establishment that has used its funding more extravagantly than providently. About these things, it would be vain to repine, if we did not believe as soldiers that in this ill-considered course is a great jeopardy to the land we serve. Your fate and mine are of little consequence. But America is the rock of all future world hope. I would not have it imperiled for a few pieces of silver or hazard any part of its prospect so that great reputations might be further inflated.

You know, I know, that the Reserve as it has been maintained since World War II and Korea is not a model of military dynamism,

giving an absolute return for every budgeted dollar spent. The standard has never been high enough: the requirements have ever been too loosely applied. Where the blame lies for that, I will not discuss. But if I went to a surgeon with a migraine and he proposed decapitation as the cure I would get someone after him with a butterfly net. Now as for that other pretzelized argument—that merger is necessary so that there will be enough weapons to go around—beyond remarking that if this system were as flexible, thrifty, and ongoing as its press agency relates, it would adjust to duplicate use of material and facilities, I point out that to preempt a man's estate thereby to justify tossing him into debtor's prison is hardly a sporting attitude. It is akin to shooting Bengal tigers after one has cleverly nalled their hides to a wall.

About my credentials, to what my host has said with such painful servitude to heavenly truth, I add that I am here as an ex-military person, speaking for myself, speaking also as one devoted to the Army because for what I am and what I have I owe it much. I am only nominally a reservist. My work and association have always been apart from the corps. I have never gone on a training session for pay or participated in any such affairs as this: I was never asked. It was my happy lot to keep drawing active duty and to my Regular Army superiors I owe every honor and every promotion I ever received, and much more than my due. Furthermore, I have enjoyed a lifetime fellowship with the National Guard, I admire its fidelity, salute its essential role in the safekeeping of America and remember with pride and affection my association with some of its great soldiers and battle commanders, such as Roy Green and Ray McLain.

I recall, too, that my great friends on the high command—Bruce Clarke, Frank Ross, the late Floyd Parks, the late Walter Bedell Smith—began their military lives as guardsmen. No, I would not have anyone cast me as a foe of the National Guard, when in all times past I have helped fight its battles, and so will do in the future, when the issue is righteous and the trumpet call is clear. This is not one of those occasions. I do not criticize the Guard for wanting to survive at the expense of the Organized Reserve: the ethics of institutional existence glorify cannibalism, it being the nature of man to love place and power. But I differ absolutely with a civilian control which affords it the opportunity to bite off far more than it can chew. When the Secretary of Defense tells this Nation that the Guard as now constituted can be made a dependable and poised, relatively ready backup force, responsive to any conceivable contingency, he rejects history, and either egregiously exaggerates or bares a vast naivete toward the inviolable connection between soundness in high command in battle forces.

There are no good troops or bad troops; there are only good and bad leaders. So goes the old cliché, and it lasts because it is true. I have been with Reserve, National Guard, and Regular Army divisions in battle. I have been an officer of the Guard, the Reserve, and the standing force. I have seen all three tested, either being with them as a file, or measuring them as an observer. No other American at any time has had a broader opportunity to explore our human material in its total dimension. From that experience I conclude only what you already know to be true. Our fighters are a wonderful breed. The troops are ever the same. How they respond is according to how ably, how boldly, how compassionately, how intelligently, they are commanded. In the ETO, General Eisenhower requested me and my division to rate his infantry forces. It shocked him when we put a National Guard division at the top of the list. Need I add

that by that time all of its generals were Regulars and its officer corps numbered more reservists than guardsmen?

The Gray Board was wholly right in its assessment of where lies the fundamental weakness in Guard organization, and things have not changed since. As to preferment for high command responsibility, it is not a system but a multifarious variety. State politics does supervene in determining who shall wear stars, and political friends far too often get the call over men with soldierly competence and command capability. The average Governor, with little interest in, or knowledge of, the military, thinks of the State establishment as his Guard, to be administered and commanded in line with his interests and the State's interests as he sees them with little or no regard for the criteria relative to its fitness to take the field in war. I have dealt with enough Governors on appointments to know this, and I say it with all deference to the minority of States that adhere to a high standard to honor a noble tradition.

When military organization is thus trammelled, it cannot be lifted to a condition of relative readiness to take the field against an active enemy, because a secretary in Washington says that he will have it so. He lacks the power to intervene at the decisive point. High authority may advance suggestions to a Governor through the Guard bureau. But it cannot do more than that. Where varying degrees of paltering and ineptitude have to be tolerated, there cannot be standardization. Where high command is not braced to an ultimate task, training stays slack and by its sloth repels the truly qualified soldier who might help energize it. We have all seen this happen, if we have not gone through it.

And if you want the current and classic example of what I am talking about, come with me to my State, Michigan. There, due to political capriciousness, two generals and one colonel of the National Guard—honorable men who have served their State ably and fairly—are about to have their careers destroyed and their prospects ruined, with no one of importance speaking up for them or for the cause of justice. And a Governor who is not only celebrated but also an honorable man, sits in lone judgment on them. With the best of intentions, he still cannot understand the working of military organization. There is where the problem lies. And it is not 1 problem, but 50 problems, with each refracting its parochial considerations. No, I would not have things this way through the Nation. And I would say that when a new look needs be taken at a Fair Deal on the New Frontier of a Great Society, those who are willing to be armor bearers and yeomen of the line have earned a better shake than this.

But there is another collateral point which I deem more compelling. The Guard is not fluid. It is rigidly structured. Unlike the Reserve, it is pervaded altogether by the unit spirit and the unit idea. The man joins. He expects to remain a State soldier until his time runs out, unless, by outside chance, his organization is federalized in some national emergency. He does not—he cannot—think of himself as being under direct personal contract to the Nation, subject to one-man orders and bound to comply with them, irrespective of what happens to his unit. He is not in his orientation a truly national soldier, personally mobile and individually committed. But the competent reservist has to think of himself that way, and if he is truly good, he will so conduct his private and daily affairs that when the word comes, he can be off.

What are we going to do for able fillers the next time, if there is a next time, and should there be in Washington any thinking that such a grim possibility is excluded, why are we keeping 17 Regular Army divisions? As

I ask that question, I remember the scene at Yongdunpo, Korea, in December 1950—the high crisis of the Korean war. Second Division had been cut to about 2,700 men in 5 days of battle. The two infantry generals had been relieved, not for any fault in them, but because defeat always has to have a goat. The new commander, to put it mildly, was indisposed, and could not take hold. But the division had to be reconstituted and given a conviction of pride and organic unity in 3 weeks.

Gen. Walton Walker asked me to devote all my time to this problem, cooperating with Brigadier Generals Haines and Stewart. In 3 weeks, we enlisted 7,500 enlisted replacements and the proportionate number of junior officers. The gunner replacements had received only infantry basic. Many of the rifle replacements had had none. Yet in 3 weeks that division was en route to the field of Chipyong-ni, where it had to win, or see the Communist enemy rip through the center. Who were these little-sung heroes—the thin green line thrown in to stem the tide? They were all reservists pulled overnight from their homes. And I may add that I heard no crying from them, and witnessed no hangover of shock from the injustice done them. They acquitted themselves like men. I do not wish to see these supreme values of the spirit jettisoned by the United States. There is no substitute for them. Those who so say are not dreamers but sleepwalkers who would have the rest of us drift likewise from somnambulism to catalepsy. Let the pundits with their vast pretensions bewail that the existing organized Reserve is not geared to the contingency war plans of this Nation. I have heard this kind of tommyrot all my life from bureaucrats and journalists more oracular than knowing. Always when the clutch-and-crunch came, we have been saved by men who were willing to go, and possessing a feeling for soldiering, and a love for country, could adjust to whatever needed to be done. So it will be tomorrow. The sorriest of illusions is that we are in a new age requiring superman.

Until the end, that was how it went in Korea. The Reserves plugged the glaring gaps in the line. At the time of Old Baldy and Pork Chop Hill, when the war was wearing to a close, four out of every five rifle companies in line were commanded by Reserve second lieutenants, most of them recently graduated from college ROTC's. The artillery batteries had as many Reserve junior officers but usually the commander had more rank. The National Guard had been called out. Two divisions displaced to Korea after the line became stabilized. But it was the filler material out of the Reserve that saved the Army and the national honor. There is no such plasticity and adaptability by people within the National Guard as established, and civilian control can tap no magic to make it forthcoming.

From all that I have said, it must follow—and I am sure that even Univac would go along with this one—that a standing Army 17 divisions strong, with only a one-half million backup force which is in no sense a fluid reservoir of packet replacements, is not properly balanced toward any emergency within the professional imagination, and I will not argue about what should be the perfect equation, for I would then be playing the numbers game against the copyright owners. It is enough to say that what has been advanced as the approved solution is a hobble-de-hoy, a contrivance shaped by political expediency and not justified by any sober weighing of contingencies related to the national security. When power is thus exercised arbitrarily, meeting such general approval that reason must retire to its corner, we have cause to fear for our processes. We no longer are confronted by policy. It has been blacked out by personalism.

Wars may be lost beneath the dome of the Capitol. They may be lost in the private office of the Secretary. When they are so lost, it is the people who suffer and the soldiers who die, with the knowledge and the conviction that what was called military policy is a crime against life, a crime against poverty and a crime against liberty. These are not my words. They come from Emory Upton.

In the beginning I suggested that all talk on this subject is rather vain except as it affords us, together, light on why we contend for the object, and how we together work toward winning it. If I have contributed anything toward such a resolve, call it a happy accident. One in my role simply endeavors to articulate what thousands of his fellow citizens firmly believe. The question is what to do next. When in doubt about how to conclude in such a matter, I turn to George Washington, his anniversary being at hand, with none in this land yet big enough to obscure his wisdom. These words are to be found in a little-known book by John Marshall. "To attempt to carry on a war with militia against disciplined troops," wrote the great soldier, "is to attempt what the commonsense and common experience of mankind will pronounce to be impracticable. But I should fail in respect to Congress to dwell on observations of this kind in a letter to them." Should we be as deferential as was the Father of Our Country in this regard, we had best stack arms now. For while it is urgent that in this campaign we enlist the widest possible support along the highways and byways, direct and informed organization in behalf of this cause from within the Congress is an absolute imperative. Either it will be sustained there, and the fight will be won there, or the Nation will lose. Thank you for listening and for letting me share this company.

TEXANS OPPOSE PRESIDENT'S APPALACHIAN AID PROGRAM

Mr. McCLODY. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, during the past year, President Lyndon Johnson has been employing practically every means conceivable to have the Congress enact the highly discriminatory Appalachian Regional Development Act bill.

Opposition to this proposal has come from every State of the Union, but it was with extreme interest that I read an article in the Dallas Morning News of Wednesday, February 3, 1965, entitled "Report on Appalachian Front," written by the very able Ken Thompson, of the News staff. I read this article with interest not only because it was from the President's home State, but also because the News, which is one of the largest newspapers in that State, has consistently represented a consensus among all Texans.

This article clearly illustrates that there is strong opposition in the President's home State against this proposal to give preferential treatment to Appalachia. Obviously, Texans do not like having their hard-earned tax dollars being channeled to another State and

another region anymore than do the taxpayers of New England, the industrial East, the Midwest, West, and every other region of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this article in the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of every Member of this distinguished body:

POVERTY WAR: REPORT ON APPALACHIAN FRONT

(By Ken Thompson)

Although sponsors of practically every piece of controversial welfare legislation in Congress these days have suddenly found that their pet proposals are absolutely essential weapons in the much-advertised "war on poverty," in point of fact the administration's poverty program encompasses only two basic legislative measures.

One of them, the billion-dollar omnibus bill, was a collection of a lot of old proposals for combating poverty on a national scale via work-training-study camps, a job corps, loans and grants to rural families and businesses. Wrapped up in a new package with brandnew labels, this part of the poverty war was approved by Congress last year.

The second part of the administration's program—a special billion-dollar aid package for the 11-State Appalachia region—ran into difficulty in the waning days of the last session of Congress. Not sure they had the votes to pass the measure, the administration's congressional lieutenants never brought the Appalachia bill to the floor of the House for a test.

On the first day Congress convened this year, the bill was reintroduced.

The President has given top priority for early passage of the bill, hoping that, along with medicare and the proposed excise tax cut, the Appalachia aid project can get underway before Easter, at the latest. With a far more liberal Congress handling the measure this session, it is likely the President will get the kind of action he expects. On February 1, the Senate approved the measure 45 to 13, and sent it on to the House.

While there is no disputing the fact that hard-core poverty and unemployment exist in the 11-State Appalachia region, there are many objections to the approach which this measure would take to solve the problem.

A minority report prepared by members of the House Public Works Committee last year gave a dozen reasons for opposing the bill.

One of them was the traditional reluctance of many Members of Congress to provide "preferential treatment" for any single region of the country. Another was that the special Appalachian Regional Commission the bill would create to administer projects might "be a means for bypassing existing State and local government agencies," providing another layer of government between the State and Federal levels.

Opponents also object to the absence of standards based on need to determine eligibility for aid within the region. Many of the 355 counties included in the Appalachia region are quite prosperous and cannot qualify for assistance under other Federal welfare programs, such as area redevelopment or accelerated public works. And several of the projects included in the Appalachia bill would conflict with other Federal programs.

At the same time the Federal Government is spending millions of dollars to purchase beef to prop sagging prices, it would, under the Appalachia bill, spend more millions to develop pastureland in the region, thus increasing beef production.

Principal objection to the Appalachia bill, however, is that it approaches the problem of poverty with the idea that job creation and economic recovery can best be accomplished by government pump priming.

This approach has failed to prove itself. Take the area redevelopment program, launched 4 years ago with the same idea.

When Congress approved the Area Redevelopment Act, 103 areas were designated as "depressed" and eligible for aid. Today few of those original depressed areas have made much progress toward recovery, and there are now well over 1,000 areas that qualify for the "depressed" label.

There is an even more specific example. Two years ago, a pilot project for the Appalachia poverty program was begun in Williamson, W. Va.

To demonstrate the kind of job that Washington could do to revive the stagnant economy of the region, a model industry was established at Williamson with \$1.8 million in financing—mostly loans from the Area Redevelopment Administration and the Small Business Administration. For 2 years this model industry, National Seating & Dimension Co., Inc.—which the New York Times described as the "newest and most modern in the furniture parts industry"—provided some 100 jobs.

But it made no profits, and 2 months ago, with great reluctance, the company had to close its door and discharge its employees in the face of mounting debt.

Today, with the collapse of both the investment and the experiment, \$220,000 in local stock ownership, \$75,000 in loans from three West Virginia banks, \$134,000 from the West Virginia Industrial Development Authority and \$1,029,000 in aid from the Federal Government has been wiped out.

State and Federal authorities, still hoping to make the experiment a success in spite of the disaster, have been looking for a buyer in private industry who is interested in a readymade \$675,000-a-year writeoff.

Failure of the experiment is blamed on a number of factors, including management mistakes and a smoldering labor situation. The United Mine Workers organized the company's 78 production workers 2 years ago and, while they called no strikes, they have been blamed for several temporary slowdowns, much absenteeism, and refusal to work overtime. The situation wasn't helped, says a company spokesman, by "a few union troublemakers."

But the same spokesman placed the primary blame on the fact that a lot of Appalachia's people simply don't want to work. The company's employees could make almost as much money and live as well "standing on the street corner" collecting unemployment checks, aid-to-dependent-children payments, Federal food stamps, and other welfare benefits as they could earn working full time at the plant.

Collapse of the Williamson experiment—which was supposed to prove how efficiently the Federal Government can solve the poverty problem—should have taught a valuable lesson. Its failure, the New York Times noted, has left a "bitter legacy" for both the rescuers and the rescued.

Out of this legacy or lesson, perhaps somebody will be able to conclude that the Government can't solve all our problems for us and perhaps is already trying to solve too many.

CLEVELAND BILL TO PROVIDE HUMANE TREATMENT FOR LABORATORY ANIMALS

Mr. McCLODY. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to provide for

humane treatment of laboratory animals and issued the following press release, which I place in the Record under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

CLEVELAND BILL TO PROVIDE HUMANE TREATMENT FOR LABORATORY ANIMALS

Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire, introduced legislation March 2 to provide for humane treatment for animals used in scientific experiments conducted by the Federal Government or by recipients of Federal grants.

"Humane protection for laboratory animals is a proper concern for any civilized society," Congressman CLEVELAND said. "I have studied many proposals and am convinced my bill will provide standards of humane treatment without impairing legitimate research. It follows closely the guidelines established in England in 1876. That law is still in force today and has the approval of the overwhelming majority of responsible British scientists."

"My bill would eliminate a great deal of the needless duplication of experiments on animals that exists today. Last year, when I was a member of the Select Committee on Government Research I was deeply troubled by testimony we received concerning the tremendous amount of experimental duplication involving operations on animals where the work had already been done and the results were known."

The Cleveland bill states that "living vertebrate animals used for scientific experiments and tests shall be spared unnecessary pain and fear; that they shall be used only when no other feasible and satisfactory methods can be used to ascertain biological and scientific information for the cure of disease, alleviation of suffering, prolongation of life, the advancement of physiological knowledge, or for military requirements; and that all such animals shall be comfortably housed, well fed, and humanely handled."

The bill creates standards for the handling of animals and bars all Federal grants for research to institutions or persons not having a certificate from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare showing that they meet these standards.

The requirements of the Cleveland bill include:

1. That all premises where animals are kept shall be clean and comfortable with adequate space for normal exercise.
2. That animals shall receive adequate food and water and shall not be caused to suffer through careless handling or neglect.
3. That animals used in any experiment resulting in pain shall be anesthetized during and after the experiment, except where this procedure would frustrate the purpose of the experiment and that animals suffering severe and prolonged pain shall be painlessly killed as soon as the experiment is concluded.

Congressman CLEVELAND said that under his bill, "only persons licensed by the Government would be authorized to conduct experiments except for students working directly under the supervision of a licensed person. This in itself would cut down tremendously on the needless duplication of experiments."

The bill also requires keeping of accurate records on experiments and the animals used.

The British have had such a law for nearly 90 years," Mr. CLEVELAND said, "and their experience has been excellent. Indeed, British medical research ranks with the best in the world. It has not been harmed by the law requiring humane care of animals. Surely, we can do no less and I shall do everything in my power to see that this bill becomes law."

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, S. 3, because it represents regional and discriminatory legislation at its worst. Passage of this legislation will create a new and expensive pork barrel which will cost the taxpayers dearly, but do very little to resolve the serious problems of poverty.

There is little doubt that this program for Appalachia will be followed by other programs for special regions of the country.

In recent weeks, I have received letters and telephone calls from Kansas farmers expressing concern over the administration's recommended cuts in the budgets of the Soil Conservation Service and the agriculture conservation program.

However, section 203 of this bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements of not more than 10 years with landowners and farmers of Appalachia for payment by the Federal Government of up to 80 percent of the costs of providing for land stabilization, erosion, and sediment control, and reclamation through changes in land use, and conservation treatment including the establishment of practices and measures for the conservation and development of soil, water, woodland, wildlife, and recreation resources.

Congress is being asked to authorize \$17 million as a starter for this program in Appalachia. On the other hand, the administration in the interest of so-called economy is recommending cuts in other long-established conservation programs.

Mr. Speaker, we are not only discriminating against those living outside Appalachia, we are duplicating programs already in existence within the Department of Agriculture.

During the brief hearings held by the Committee on Public Works on this legislation, my colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] made the following observation in questioning of Mr. Fred Ritchie, of the Department of Agriculture, regarding duplication in section 203:

Mr. CLEVELAND. Apparently, then, the big difference between this section of the Appalachian bill and your regular programs in the area is that this gives the farmer a longer period of time to make a definite contract, and if the Secretary of Agriculture says OK, he gets a greater percentage of the cost of the program; is this the essential difference?

Mr. RITCHIE. This is the essential difference. It will permit the Secretary to offer to those farms that needed to apply these practices over a period of years an assurance that they would have help. And if he felt that the farmer could not contribute the customary 40 or 50 percent that would be required for the ongoing program, he could reduce the farmer's contribution.

This is the special treatment that will be afforded the farmer living in Appalachia. This section unduly discriminates against those landowners, operators, and farmers outside the Appalachian area.

Mr. Speaker, this section also has an enormously damaging potential to those engaged in the livestock industry in other regions of the United States. Section 203 of S. 3 actually is a broadened version of the "Pasture Improvement and Development" section of the Appalachian Regional Development Act considered by the last Congress. The administration has considerably broadened the proposal to include lands other than pastureland.

Both cropland and pastureland will be eligible for improvements under this section.

For over 2 years the livestock industry in my State of Kansas has been fighting for survival. Only a few months ago, the Department of Agriculture was spending money to buy surplus beef to bolster depressed prices. Two years ago when I joined with other Congressmen from livestock States to secure a reduction in foreign beef imports, we were told that our farmers should cut back on production to relieve the market of an oversupply of beef.

Now we learn that a cutback in cattle numbers produced in our area could be replaced by an increase in cattle numbers from the Appalachian region, under provisions of section 203 of this bill.

The citizens of my congressional district are disturbed and concerned by this legislation. Under the leave to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from a letter which I received from a constituent in Lindsborg, Kans. She stated:

My husband is a farmer and has always made a fairly decent living at it. He farms about 600 acres plus some pasture so you can tell that he is no marginal farmer. He has always fed out 100 to 150 head of cattle each year. President Johnson defines someone with less than \$2,000 income a year as poor, well I guess that means we are among the poverty stricken people as our income was less than \$1,500 last year and not much more the year before. The falling cattle prices and the drought last year to our wheat did not help the situation much.

All we read about in the paper is that President Johnson wants to take some of the farm subsidy money and put it where it will really do some good in Appalachia or in New York. In the meantime just what are we going to use for money to hang on with till people decide to pay decent prices for our beef?

This is a situation that really scares us and it won't be long till we aren't going to know just where to turn. Last year our taxes and farm payment alone came to \$3,800. So that with the fact that we have to just plain live from month to month is eating up what small capital we have left.

Maybe there are people that do not realize how desperate the situation is getting to be among the livestock farmers.

Finally, I want to include the following editorial from the McPherson, Kans., Sentinel, which undoubtedly predicts with accuracy what will happen if the Appalachian Regional Development Act

becomes the law of the land. The editorial follows:

APPALACHIA OPENS NEW FEDERAL GIVEAWAY GATES

Appalachia is a new name given to a far-reaching program to relieve impoverished conditions in parts of 11 States along the Appalachian Mountains from southern New York on south.

This program is intended to help rehabilitate thousands of families impoverished by depressed mining and related industries in the region. Whether it will be wisely managed remains to be seen. Rather than a boon, it could become one of the biggest boondoggles in history.

Before Senate passage could be won, President Johnson had to assure representatives of the other 39 States that their needs would be considered in later bills.

There is where the Federal giveaway gates may be thrown wide open. Appalachia wants a fat billion for only 11 States. Add 39 more States and we are going to see quite a big tax bill. It could become another pork barrel program to satisfy political obligations rather than actual needs of people.

Are there enough Senators and Congressmen with level heads to keep this new Federal giveaway from running completely out of control?

HOUSING AND URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, many of the President's housing and urban renewal recommendations parallel remarkably the proposals Republican members of the Housing Subcommittee have advanced for several years, the program we introduced last year and the program we have announced for this year.

I welcome especially the President's new emphasis on urban renewal for residential purposes, his attention to enforcement of building codes and zoning regulations as a means of preventing slums, his rent supplement plan for low- and moderate-income families, his recognition that rehabilitation and restoration of existing housing is often preferable to bulldozing entire urban renewal areas, his awareness of the needs of families displaced from their housing by Government programs, his departure from exclusive reliance on big public housing projects for low-income families in favor of smaller units including the leasing of existing private housing and the rehabilitation of older housing for this purpose, as well as his intention to continue and improve existing FHA, college housing, and housing for the elderly programs.

In each of these areas, the President's proposals—similar as they are to our Republican program—can go far to correct what is wrong with present housing and urban renewal programs and contribute to the goal of decent housing and suitable living arrangements for all our people.

The President's message was less adequate, however, in dealing with the need

for greater cooperation within metropolitan areas and greater coordination of Federal programs affecting such areas. Whatever one may think of the proposed Department of Housing and Urban Development, this Department could not coordinate the multitude of urban area programs administered by other agencies. The need for such coordination is daily more obvious and it could only be achieved through creation of a small staff with the Executive Office of the President, equipped with the authority of the President, and empowered to eliminate duplication and conflict between urban programs and to make these important programs more efficient and effective.

APPALACHIA

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the debate on this, the Appalachia bill, and I subscribe to the objections raised during this debate and those set forth in the minority views of the report of the Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member.

Last year, I sat through many weeks of public hearings and a thorough and exhaustive reading of the bill in committee.

This year, the Public Works Ad Hoc Committee met over a period of 2 or 3 weeks to review the revised legislation. The full committee held no public hearings, made no exhaustive studies, but in fact permitted not the simplest perfecting amendment offered by the minority.

The new members of the Public Works Committee were given no opportunity to study this legislation in depth, and new leaders of local governments affected were given no opportunity to present their views at public hearings.

I realize these unusual committee proceedings are not substantive objections to the legislation, but they do indicate the undue haste and lack of deliberation which seems to characterize the efforts of this administration to make a record, to create an image of leadership in getting things done.

Mr. Speaker, political steamrollers are undemocratic—but legislative steamrollers are undemocratic and dangerous. A rubberstamp politician soon wears out and his printed image becomes blurred by acquiescence, but a rubberstamp legislature sharpens the image of the executive and enhances his authority and power. I do not think the November elections were a mandate for change and dilution of our representative process.

And so the Appalachia bill, conceived in expediency and born in haste, has rushed through its prelaw life.

I concur with my colleague from Florida, the ranking minority member of the

Public Works Committee, this is regional, discriminatory pork barrel, and I agree with the gentleman from New Hampshire that we will be creating a launching pad for job piracy and industrial piracy.

As a result of defense cutbacks in my district and installation closures nearby, Suffolk County in New York and parts of adjoining Nassau suffer an unemployment rate in excess of the national average, and certainly in excess of many of the counties in the Appalachia region. The implementing of this bill will further the economic imbalance of Long Island and other metropolitan areas—in part, with Long Islanders' tax money.

Long Island will need millions for public transportation, for new highways, for sewage systems, for education, for its millions of suburban residents, which the smaller communities simply cannot afford.

If the Federal Government has this kind of money to distribute and this is often in doubt, it should be spent on an equitable basis of need, on a Federal-State-local matching basis.

The substitute bill offered by the gentleman from Florida will help Appalachia, and it will help other areas which may, to the same degree, or in some cases to a greater degree, need assistance.

NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC ACT OF 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] 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 Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, oceanography, the study of the oceans, is an important, complex science, involving numerous fields of specialization. Federal oceanographic research activities have helped to discover and increase our base of natural wealth, enhance our knowledge of weather and climate, strengthen our national security, and provide other national benefits.

The potential value of these activities is tremendous, but we have only scratched the surface in this research, partly because these programs need better guidance and synchronization.

I am introducing today a bill, which may be cited as the National Oceanographic Act of 1965, establishing a National Oceanographic Council and calling for expanded research in the oceans and the Great Lakes. This bill was sponsored in the other body, by Senator MAGNUSON and others.

Under the provisions of the bill, the Vice President shall be Chairman of the Council and members will include the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Defense, Interior, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, Director of the Office of Science and Technology, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Director of the National Science Foundation and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

Our Federal oceanographic activities are scattered through 6 departments, 22 agencies, and 37 committees of Congress. The purpose of my bill is to set forth policy and furnish the guidance, cooperation, and coordination needed to develop ocean research to the fullest extent. It would also help centralize and more readily provide significant and timely information to high officials, including Congress, about these aims and activities.

Federal support of oceanographic research has increased from \$24 million in 1958 to \$138 million in 1965 and projected figures indicate it may reach \$350 million in fiscal year 1972. This investment is estimated to result in annual savings in costs of goods and services amounting to nearly \$3 billion a year, plus almost as much in increased annual production.

The oceans cover about 72 percent of the world's surface and they offer unlimited supplies of fresh, usable water through desalination, valuable wealth in minerals, and wastes and sediments washed by rivers into the seas for centuries, and they are vast repositories of greater fish catches and protein food supplies.

Nearly all commerce between nations is carried over international waters. The oceans' currents and their other characteristics greatly affect our weather and climate. Greater knowledge of ocean depths, ocean topography, of vessel detection, ocean movements, fish resources and habits, and other such information is extremely important to our Nation's future. Freedom of the seas and improved vessel detection techniques are indispensable to our national security, particularly in these dangerous days of nuclear submarines and with other foreign vessels roving near our shores.

We have neglected too long the potentials of our oceans. The Russians certainly are not neglecting marine research, and we must not be left behind in this increasingly competitive race—or we may wake up to the shock of an underwater sputnik.

Cooperation between our educational institutions and the Federal Government in the field of oceanography is essential. The great bulk of our professional talent is resident in our educational institutions and the training of the thousands of new scientists for this field will be the responsibility of these institutions and of vital interest to the Government.

In Miami, Fla., we find the University of Miami, a major educational institution, and the Federal Government working side by side to further the advancement of knowledge in the field of oceanography for purposes of our national defense, our Military Establishment, commercial purposes and solely for scientific knowledge.

The university, boasting some of the most outstanding educational talent in the United States, realizes the fabulous future of oceanography; the Institute of Marine Science, under the distinguished leadership of Dr. H. G. Walton Smith, has pioneered in this field.

Recently, the school of engineering and institute of marine science have joined in offering a broad program in oceanographic engineering, adding to its reputation as one of the most important institutions in the United States devoted to education and research in the ocean sciences.

It was appropriate, because of the obvious necessity for close coordination, that the Department of Interior selected Miami as the site of its new \$1.5 million Tropical Atlantic Oceanographic Laboratory, staffed by 75 people which will begin operations in 1966. Two Navy ships are now being converted to research vessels—the *Geronimo* and its sister ship the *Undaunted*—and will proceed to Miami upon completion of the laboratory.

The oceans are the last great frontier of our planet and we are still only pioneers in the unexplored depths. But we must begin to concentrate and coordinate our multifaceted efforts and work together toward a common goal—progress and leadership in ocean research.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XII

Mr. RONCALIO. 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 Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the 12th part of a series on "New York City in Crisis" which has been running in the New York Herald Tribune for several weeks.

This installment is comprised of two articles which appeared in the Tribune of February 3, 1965. The first of these deals with the overall business crisis in the city and the second delves into the reasons why businesses are leaving New York City.

The articles follow:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: BUSINESSES COME—BUT MOSTLY GO; CITY'S STUDY REPORT, STILL NO ACTION

(NOTE.—This may still be the greatest city in the world, but its increasingly complex problems make it a difficult place in which to live and work. In their continuing investigation into the city in crisis, the Herald Tribune special team tells below the flight of businesses from the city. In addition, there are these reports.)

(By Berry Gottehrer and Marshall Peck)

On June 4, 1963, Francis J. Bloustein, then acting chairman of the city planning commission, sent a 3-page letter and a detailed 10-page memorandum to Mayor Robert F. Wagner.

The subject—New York City's growing business crisis.

In the letter, Mr. Bloustein said there had been a decline of 74,000 production jobs between 1954-58—a decline that has continued—and noted that manufacturing had been seriously curtailed by the demolition of 5.8 million square feet of loft and factory space in the last 3½ years without replacement.

"Industrial development in New York City is at the crossroads," read the memorandum from the planning commission. "Manufacturing jobs have been declining rapidly and steadily. Only in a limited sense can the current increase in white-collar employ-

ment be considered a compensating gain, since a large proportion of New York City residents are dependent upon blue-collar jobs.

"TIME PASSES"

"It is safe to say that unless valid solutions to these problems are reached, it will be impossible to check the rapid decline of industry in this city. Among other adverse results will be the hardening of business opposition to an urban-renewal program that appears to business to work against business and never for it. The economic consequences will be catastrophic in terms of lost tax revenue and mounting welfare costs."

That letter and that memo, each calling for an immediate study of the problem, were dated June 4, 1963.

Not until 1 year later—in its April 1964 newsletter—did the planning commission announce that Arthur D. Little, Inc., of Boston, had launched a study of the problems and potential of industrial growth in New York.

"A report," said the newsletter, "is scheduled to be completed in the fall of this year [1964]."

By yesterday, the Little study, which cost the planning commission \$30,000 and reportedly paints a critical picture of the city's inability to keep manufacturers from leaving, had become something of a political football.

What has happened to it in the 10 months since it was commissioned and the several months since it was due?

"I know the mayor hasn't seen the final report," said Leslie Slote, the mayor's press aid, yesterday. "I believe the mayor was at a briefing about 2 months ago when the preliminary report was discussed. But I don't recall his having looked at the preliminary report. You'd better call the planning commission."

"A report has been prepared and a copy of it has been sent to the mayor and to other key top city officials," said a planning commission spokesman. "I don't know whether the mayor has read it, but I do know that he is familiar with its contents. He and the board of estimate discussed it a few weeks ago and decided to send it over to the special commission studying the city's financial problems for an opinion. Since the report is still subject to change, it would not be right to release it in anything but its final form."

When will it be released?

WILL PUBLIC SEE IT?

"I hope in the very near future," he added. "But it's possible that it may never be released for public consumption. That wouldn't be the first time that's happened. There have been other reports and other studies paid for out of taxpayers' money that were finished but weren't made public for one reason or another. It's up to the mayor now. We're waiting for word from him."

While the planning commission—and 8 million New Yorkers—wait, the mayor continues to boast of the city's glowing economy and financial future—calling New York a town of throbbing vitality and full of bright and cheering aspects.

At a luncheon and again on television last week, the mayor pointed out that city employment, department store sales, deposits in city banks, and tourism were all up for New York in 1964. He also said that the city is still the largest single manufacturing, retail, and garment center in the United States, and that more than 27 percent of the top 500 firms in the country have headquarters in New York.

These are not untruths and these are not distortions. But they are, according to dozens of city businessmen, industrial real-estate brokers and chambers of commerce people, only half of the story.

It is the other half that the Little study reportedly went into. Yet even without the report it is not difficult to document the city's business crisis.

OTHERS' FINDINGS

In reports last December, acting labor commissioner James J. McFadden and bureau of labor statistics official Herbert Blenstock both set the city's economy into a nonpolitical perspective. Among their findings:

The growth rate of nonfarm employment in New York City from 1958 to 1963 was far below that of the Nation, 1.6 percent to 11.1 percent.

A loss of 80,000 manufacturing jobs (30,000 in the garment industry) since 1958. For a city whose unskilled and semiskilled population continues to increase this loss is significantly critical.

Despite the overall gain in employment (nine jobs created for every eight lost), the vast majority of the new jobs came in the fields of Government service and construction, believed by many to have been a temporary boom brought on by world's fair building and a change in the zoning code. Right now, the city's construction industry, according to Mr. McFadden, "is slipping—slipping badly."

Louis Broido, commissioner of the department of commerce and industrial development, created in 1962 to foster, retain, attract and expand business, industry and commerce, does not dispute these statistics. He simply has drawn some different conclusions.

A DIFFERENT OUTLOOK

Unlike most of the city's top officials, Mr. Broido does not ignore the past, evade the present or speak optimistically of the future.

Mr. Broido is different. He admits past failures.

"Blue collar industrial employment faces a further decline because of anticipated further growth of automation and possible further moveout of plants from the city, a process that has been going on for several decades, but which has been slowing down," he says. "In the last 2 years, since the organization of this department, we have inaugurated a number of programs to try to stem the outflow and we hope to bring it to a trickle and eventually reverse the trend."

"We first had to learn the causes of the outflow. Primarily, it was a problem of real estate and space availability. To offset it, we are working with industrial firms to find the proper site locations. There is plenty of land room in New York City. It is a matter of development. We're engaged in putting out fires every day and as far as bringing new business is concerned and new manufacturing business—all kinds of new businesses come in."

But Mr. Broido's optimism about the future is not shared by many people outside of the city administration. One man who disagrees—and has evidence to support his claims—is Philip Gordon, president of Surveys for Business, Inc., which does business and commercial studies in Manhattan.

WHENCE THE OPTIMISM

"I like to know where they get their figures and their optimism," he said. "We find that the momentum of business moving out of the city is picking up. Further, we feel that the full impact of the business moves has not yet been felt in terms of employment and, if it continues without abating, it will have even greater repercussions—by closing even more the ring around blue-collar workers. It will also reduce the number of entry jobs and the tax base."

"The whole thing is—nobody—including the city—knows why the companies are leaving. That's the basic problem. If you want to find out and solve the departure of companies, you've got to find out why they move. No one has done that. There must be compelling reasons for companies to pick up and

get out, but I challenge anyone in the city to give me an informed study."

It is not that the city hasn't made any studies. There is the Little report and there is a survey, taken by the department of commerce and industry, of 596 New York firms asking them what their reasons for leaving would be—if they should ever decide to leave.

At best, of only limited value because of the status of the firms polled, the survey showed that 70 percent would move because of the need for more space; 12 percent because of taxes; 5 percent because of labor problems, and the rest for other reasons.

The basic difference between Mr. Broido's limited optimism and Mr. Gordon's less limited pessimism is that the latter at least has some specifics to support his thesis.

Over the last 3 years, he has made a detailed study of the loss of manufacturing plants by New York City and has a documented loss of 180 companies.

IT MEANS MONEY

Yet, according to other businessmen, State officials, real estate brokers and industrial-park contractors, even these figures may be too low.

The New York State Department of Commerce reports a loss of 227 manufacturing firms by New York City to other areas of New York State since 1960 (with a high of 62 leaving or planning to leave in 1964). Of the 150 firms that reported their employment figure, the loss to New York City was 11,452 jobs.

And the State Development Commission of Connecticut reports that 86 firms (totaling some 10,756 jobs) have left New York City for Connecticut since 1950.

"We live off the clients we move out of New York City," says James Rice, vice president of a Maywood, N.J., contracting firm. "They gave us \$40 million worth of construction work last year alone. We're dealing with Triple A clients, the companies we've moved read like a Who's Who. Right now, we've got about 75 New York firms we've been trying to find a place for."

According to Mr. Rice's estimate, in the last 3 years 119 companies had moved from New York City to Nassau and Suffolk and 200 companies had moved to New Jersey in the last 3 years.

"New York's Commerce and Industry Department can't make a dent in the outward flow," he added. "Construction costs in some boroughs of New York are \$1.75 per square foot over New Jersey. Taxes are almost double. Land is more expensive. When you add up all the features, a company can't help but find it more attractive to get out of New York. It can't even be a warehouse city because the transportation pattern is so fouled up. It's almost impossible to move a truck around."

Harry Levien, a real estate broker in Long Island City, tells a similar story. One company—one of seven that he helped move in the last few months—asked him to locate a plant site with 500,000 square feet of space. The company—then in Brooklyn—said it didn't care where it moved and that space was the determining factor. "A few days later the company called back to tell me that they had just read stories that the mayor may increase taxes even more," says Mr. Levien. "They still wanted a 500,000-square-foot site but now they wanted it out of New York."

Leonard Yaseen, chairman of Fantus Co., Inc., plant-location consultants, says his company is "booked up for several years with orders from firms looking to move from New York."

IT'S JUST CRAZY

"It's just crazy," he says. "New York is still the leading manufacturing city in the country but it's getting into a situation where we are losing large segments. It's heading

toward the time when we will be a light consumers and services industry community. Manufacturers feel that the attitude in this area—while it may profess to be otherwise—is not in his favor. He feels lost in the city, he does not feel befriended. From the standpoint of city taxes, he gets no consideration even if he has a payroll of 800 people. He feels that he is an orphan and that he might do better to go elsewhere, where he would be appreciated, where there's a positive attitude toward what he's contributing to a community."

The most important thing he is contributing—and the one thing that cannot be evaded, ignored, or erased by false optimism—is employment, particularly to the unskilled and semiskilled of the city. "This is becoming a city with white-collar jobs and blue-collar people," said the owner of one dress concern.

Yet this is not a new problem. It has been around at least 5, maybe even 10, years as the white middle-class has increasingly fled to the suburbs to be replaced by a minority class that, unfortunately, has been largely unskilled and semiskilled.

It is these people—the unemployed and the untrained—who suffer most and will continue to suffer until the city does something to keep its manufacturers from looking elsewhere.

Yet the loss of business and industry, ranging from a garment firm making boys' wear and employing 10 persons to a mass production line operation employing 1,000 in producing plastic cups and containers, is not the only black spot on New York's commercial horizon. This does not mean that big businesses do not settle here any more. They do. But businessmen report that construction of office space is already so far ahead of the demand that a serious glut on the market is shaping up.

"New York City real estate dealers have the biggest inventory in history on their hands, right now," said one specialist in the field. "This city is becoming so heavy with office space that there may even be a collapse of the market."

NOT THE ONLY BLACK SPOT

A further complaint is that the city does not encourage builders to deviate from the tried and true formula of cramming the most office space possible into four sidewalk-to-sidewalk walls.

When the 38-story Seagram Building on Park Avenue and 51st Street, was built with a 100-foot-deep plaza and fountain as a bit of open space for all the city to enjoy, New York, in effect, frowned on the waste. The courts backed up the city tax commission's contention that the Seagram's people should be assessed for the building space it had given up to make New York a more beautiful place to live and work.

So far, the decision stands—challenged by many people but ignored by the city administration which brought about the action in the first place.

One of the steps being attempted by the city—and the department of commerce and industry—is the creation of the New York City Industrial Development Corp. It is a private nonprofit local development company that makes it possible for new and expanding industries to obtain up to 30 percent second-mortgage financing through a \$50 million revolving fund under arrangement with the New York State Job Development Authority.

Since this fund was announced in October 1963, the department of commerce reports that seven New York City firms have received assistance, which presumably was a factor in keeping them going and in the city. The 7 firms have kept 1,000 jobs here. Three other applications by firms are now being processed, the department says.

Despite frequent statements and periodic press releases by the city department, only

six firms have been assisted by this program so far.

So far, the city's other chief attempt to attract and keep businesses has been less successful. The idea—and one brought to fruition by a great many other cities—is to provide three industrial parks—parcels of land put together by the city and developed by private sponsors under city contract.

The first of these efforts was the formal proposal in January 1959, for an industrial park in the Flatlands section of Brooklyn on a tract considered blighted and unsuitable for large-scale residential renewal.

The proposal was greeted with tremendous enthusiasm by the mayor. "Making room for new industry in New York, as well as retaining old industry, is a major responsibility of the city administration," he said. "Programs like this indicate the acceptance by the city of leadership in this direction."

The decision to build two other parks—at College Point in Queens and at Mariner's Island on Staten Island—was called, by the mayor, a decision to create "two of the most exciting and significant ventures in this city's continuing efforts to maintain its industrial and commercial preeminence."

The mayor made this statement in 1962. Today, 3 years later, only one of the parks—the Flatlands—has even reached a detailed planning stage.

What happened?

The city simply hasn't been able to find a sponsor for the parks.

"We've had lots of nice discussions but the economics are such that no one wants to take it on," said one city official. "They would rather go out into the country. We're losing. Everyone knows it even if they won't say it. What we're doing so far is like trying to plug up a dike with a little finger. The question is, How do you stop it?"

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: THE REASON BUSINESSES LEAVE NEW YORK

(By Barry Gottehrer and Marshall Peck)

Not too long ago, somewhere between late Friday night and early Monday morning, a moving firm moved into the offices of a New York garment-district manufacturer, loaded all the company's furniture and equipment aboard several vans and took off for Mississippi.

This was no case of burglary. It was simply one company's efforts to take its business out of New York City.

Most of the companies leaving the city choose less dramatic and more permanent methods. This one company was brought back to New York under court order, lost \$300,000 as a result and was forced into bankruptcy.

WHY?

What makes a company run?

A manufacturer of pearl jewelry left because of cramped quarters and the soot and dust of the city attaching itself to its product.

A manufacturer of plastic wrappers for packaging left because of traffic and unloading problems and fire hazards.

A wholesale distributor of paint sundries left because of vandalism, the high cost of fire insurance, and inadequate loading and unloading facilities.

A manufacturer of plastic cups and containers left because of the scarcity of land for expansion and the havoc that crowded highways and bridges played on its shipping schedules. For Lily-Tulip Cup Corp., which employed 1,500 people (mostly unskilled and semiskilled) in its factory in College Point, Queens, and in its warehouse in the Bronx, the move was out of State to Holmdel, N.J., in February 1963. For the city, it meant a loss of more than 1,200 jobs.

A major food company left because it couldn't find sufficient space to consolidate its corporate quarters.

A manufacturer of blouses left because of rising labor costs and the garment center's monstrous traffic problems.

Schleffelin & Co., manufacturer of cosmetics and pharmaceutical supplies, left for a combination of most of these reasons. And, as in most instances, the move originated with a desire to modernize and expand. A close look at this firm's decision will emphasize the problem.

The company's cosmetic and pharmaceutical division had been in the building at 16-26 Cooper Square in lower Manhattan since the 1930's. "It would have been difficult to find a more archaic and inefficient building for manufacturing anywhere," said W. F. Megargel, the company's personnel manager. "It's a classic example of a real old multi-story plant. The building was put up before the turn of the century. It just reached a point a few years ago when we finally decided to look around."

Except for the fact that many urban renewal projects have wiped out—and continue to wipe out—the city's diminishing inventory of factories and lofts, which have not been replaced, the city administration cannot be faulted solely because a company decides to expand.

According to manufacturers and businessmen, however, the city must be faulted for failing to provide adequate space in which a company can expand. This shortage of space and the problems of labor costs, traffic, taxes, insurance and vandalism are responsible for driving the small businessman and the manufacturer out of the city in increasing numbers.

Specifically, Schleffelin left because of:

An old, inadequate plant.

Inability to find suitable new quarters in New York.

Inability to find suitable sites to build on.

High cost of building.

High cost of labor.

Traffic and shipping problems.

High taxes.

Indifference from the city government, which didn't even bother to check to see why they had decided to leave.

NOTIFIED UNION

"Economically, New York immediately was eliminated from consideration when we started looking for a new site," says Edmund Mendell, the company's general manager and vice president. "They simply had nothing to offer us."

After extensive surveys, Schleffelin decided to relocate in Apex, N.C., 12 miles from Raleigh and about 500 miles from New York.

Eight months before making the move, company officials notified the union (the company had been organized since 1937 and under Teamster jurisdiction since 1950) about the decision. "We told them, 'Here's why we're moving, we're sorry,'" says Mr. Megargel. "We offered employment to anyone who wanted to go to Apex."

Though it is only overnight by truck (an important consideration in the decision), the distance between New York and Apex left 60 Schleffelin employees out of work. Most of them were unskilled or semiskilled, in that they had learned packaging techniques under Schleffelin.

"I think someone should have taken more of an interest in us—the people who were let go," says Mrs. Irene Pagan, a floorlady who had been with the company for 34 years. "Someone should have found out what the trouble was with the company. If the union had talked with us and had asked us, 'Are you willing to take a cut?', I am sure we would have compromised."

"The company kept saying that business was bad. I would have said, 'Don't move away. Don't move to another place. We'll talk it over.' We worked for the company so long. We needed each other."

Schleffelin maintains a neutral position on the subject of unions but one company ex-

ecutive points out that the plant in Apex is nonunion and that there is no expectation that it will ever be otherwise.

"That's right," says Mayor Richard Heldmold, of Apex. "We don't buy unions down here. The people here are a little more independent. They wouldn't stand for it. They wouldn't even honor a picket line. I have a friend who had a shop where a union came in and called a strike. He just put out a sign, 'Help Wanted.' That ended the strike."

Yet it wasn't only lower wages and non-union shops that attracted Schieffelin to Apex. Though the town and surrounding area has only 1,650 people, Apex—and the State of North Carolina—have succeeded—where New York City has failed—in the business of attracting manufacturing.

SECOND FIRM

And one of the first places they look is to New York.

"We want industry and it knows it," says the mayor of Apex. "We like them and they like us. It's a two-way street. This is the second firm we've taken away from New York. Apex Manufacturing Co. came here 3½ years ago. They make bathing suits and employ about 150."

"We have an advertising program and 12 field men," says Harold Love, manager of general development in the North Carolina Department of Commerce. "We're always in New York City. We want to get a company down here. If they have a tax problem, we'll step in on the side of industry. If they're underfinanced, we'll see to it that they got capital."

After years of dissatisfaction in New York, the Schieffelin people were delighted with the help and reception they've received in Apex. The State department of commerce screened and pretested job applicants and helped out in several other areas.

"We're operating in Apex under a regular tax setup," says Mr. Mendell. "North Carolina did not offer us any preferential treatment, no tax holiday or anything like that. They did help us out in the area of utilities and services. They provided a powerline to our plant, put it up, and put in the sewage and water supply."

REAL EAGER

"They're real eager down here. It seems like the whole State has banded together to help you out. I have found, from my contact with the government in New York, a great deal of bureaucracy and a let-someone-else-do-it attitude that I have not found in North Carolina. There's direction and enthusiasm—here—up and down the line."

Today, Schieffelin, which spent \$1 million for its building, \$2,000 for landscaping, and \$100,000 for moving, has been in Apex since August 17, 1964.

Shipping costs are more expensive but the trucks make the city overnight and, besides, the payroll is smaller. New York's loss has clearly been Schieffelin's gain.

"In two ways, New York naturally has it over any place in the country," says Mr. Mendell. "That's in general prestige and the ability to be physically where many contacts are. But when it comes to manufacturing in New York, the costs become appreciable and the entire operation questionable."

VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] 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 Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to be present on the memorable occasion last Friday when our gracious First Lady, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, presented graduation diplomas to a group of VISTA volunteers in St. Petersburg, Fla.

These volunteers, ranging in age from 19 to 71, have completed 6 weeks' training under direction of the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies and the Community Service Foundation. They will now scatter across the country to live and work among the poor, in local projects where their services have been requested.

Mrs. Johnson's inspirational remarks set a high standard for these first VISTA volunteers and the many who will follow. Under unanimous consent, I insert her speech in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

REMARKS BY MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, VISTA GRADUATION, ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

I am delighted to be in St. Petersburg today to join in a program which is surely an exciting landmark in the history of our Nation.

One of the most interesting things about the program to me is the name itself—Volunteers in Service to America—VISTA, which says in one word what the program is.

You know, at our particular point of history, as we look back, this is a natural followup to successive periods when our country confronted great human problems. In the early and middle 19th century we proved that, whatever diversities existed among us, we could function as one Nation. In the later 19th century, we forged ahead an economic system strong and flexible enough to support an ever rising standard of living. In the 20th century we recognized that we are, ineluctably, part of a complex and churning world, and swung our energies toward making that role a force for freedom.

Now we are boldly taking hold of an aspiration which men have known as long as there have been human beings—the eradication of the bleak winter of poverty from the climate of a whole society.

Of all the economic opportunity programs being launched, none better expresses the spirit of the entire war against poverty than the VISTA operation.

I am pleased to meet you VISTA graduates in person and to see you at work—as I will later in the day. You have already made your mark here in St. Petersburg. The petition of the people of Ridgcrest and Old Baskin's Crossing asking for you to stay is evidence of your success.

That—in this brief time—must be a special source of satisfaction. You men and women of all ages, from all parts of the country, from a variety of occupations, have chosen to interrupt your careers and sacrifice economic gain or give up the well-earned leisure of later years in order to help others.

America is many things. But above all—more than any nation in the history of man—ever since the first frontiersman picked up his musket to help protect a neighbor—we have been a nation of volunteers. We have been a land in which the individual says—My neighbor needs me. I will do something.

You are graduating today into a stirring tradition. You are making glow again the words of that most American of poets, Walt Whitman, who wrote for us:

"Behold, I do not give lectures or a little charity when I give myself."

And I cannot think of a more appropriate place for this first VISTA graduation than here in the prosperous city of St. Petersburg.

The poor are not an island. Their needs toll out to the whole community.

The very fact that a man is poor means that he needs the help of others—that he probably lacks the education and often the hopefulness to lift himself unaided. Changing his lot is a decidedly practical matter for everyone. Millions of the impoverished place a heavy drag on the whole society, cutting down the ability to purchase what we produce, diminishing tax revenues—easy prey to delinquency and crime.

The intense interest of thriving St. Petersburg in the VISTA program is a heartening symbol of what is happening across the Nation, where all of us are realizing that all the poor are the responsibility of all America.

I am struck, too, by the way the VISTA program has been working out in this community. Too often well-meaning people have approached a social problem with the assumption—Let Washington draw up the perfect blueprint, complete down to the last comma.

But if the American experience has taught us any one fundamental lesson, it is this: There is no such thing as instant utopia—especially when the better world is conceived miles away from where it must take practical form.

Here in the St. Petersburg area, for some 7 years—long before we in Washington talked about a war on poverty—you have been at work to broaden economic opportunity.

Your many progressive educational institutions have been deeply involved. At Ridgcrest you have created a laboratory for healthy social change. You have proceeded on the only sensible assumption—that the national war against poverty must be fought in a thousand local battles—in the slums of individual cities, on worn-out farms, in the hollows of Appalachia, in isolated Indian reservations—wherever human beings stand with their noses pressed against the windows of our general affluence.

The result of your local progress is that VISTA has been able to function here as it should function everywhere in America. It has learned as much as it has taught. Its role has been not to bring fullblown answers but to join with others, tentatively, questioningly, on the road to a workable solution.

So we begin here, begin superbly, I believe, with this VISTA graduating class. I am proud to have been asked to give out your diplomas. I am privileged to share the rush of feelings that must be going through you.

Much has been said about the difficulties you will encounter. But you and I know that you also have before you the richest experience of your lives. To be at the forefront of a great national effort is an opportunity which comes to few in a generation, and the personal satisfaction it brings is deep and lasting.

For many of you this experience will be transforming. You will be confirming, in the most personal way, the wondrous truth which too often is a mere phrase. You will know, as nothing else could make you know, that we are all of us brothers, every one of us to every one of us.

You and the thousands who will follow you will have another privilege. In some countries, and in our own too, voices have been raised to say that a land as rich as ours can only produce a mink-lined civilization, marked by a moral deadening and the frenetic pursuit of pushbutton luxuries, a split-level, and a sports car. By what you are doing, you make those voices just so many hollow noises.

You are reliving the fundamentals on which the Nation was founded and by which it has grown great—That success is an imperative to service, not an invitation to apathy; that democracy means a human spirit which sweeps beyond mere laws; that the United States is blessed not so much by its roaring furnaces, not so much by its

abundant fields of grain, not even by spaceships aloft, but by the national vision which calls upon us to use our resources so that every American can walk with head high in the tonic air of self-respect.

To all of you VISTA graduates, pioneers in a long and proud line to come, may I express my congratulations, my warmest best wishes, and—let me add—more than a bit of envy.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL CEMETERY IN STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] 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 Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a measure which is identical to one I introduced in the 88th Congress and which would direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in the State of Rhode Island.

My State does not have a national cemetery within its borders and innumerable constituents and our State veterans organizations are deeply concerned. Many of our honored veterans cannot receive the final tributes due them and their families, as their family members within the State are hesitant and reluctant to utilize Federal facilities elsewhere. Our Rhode Island families are close knit and most can ill afford even annual visits to cemeteries outside the State.

Additionally, there is land available for the establishment of such a cemetery in my State and it is my earnest hope that the 89th Congress will look with favor on my bill and recognize the great contributions made by our Rhode Island servicemen.

OUR POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] 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 Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, from the time that the Nationalist Government of China was forced to find refuge on Taiwan in the late 1940's, the United States has sought to isolate Communist China. At the same time we have provided extensive aid to the Nationalist Government.

The latter policy has been highly successful. The economic progress on Formosa is one of the success stories of the U.S. foreign aid program.

Has our policy toward Communist China been equally successful? For

many years this question has not been adequately discussed in public forums. Yet our interests are best served when our policies are subjected to discussion, criticism, and review.

Mr. Speaker, I approach the question of U.S. policy toward Communist China with no preconceptions. I do, however, feel deeply about the need to bring this subject onto the public stage for searching inquiry.

Many questions can be propounded about U.S. policy toward Communist China. I list here four questions to illustrate the type of public discussion which I believe is long overdue:

First. In what ways are U.S. national security interests advanced or retarded by current U.S. policies toward Red China? Could U.S. national security interests be advanced by a change in our policies toward Red China?

Second. Is our policy which seeks to restrain aggressive or expansionist aims of Red China made more effective by prohibiting communication with that country? Does a policy of strength and firmness necessarily displace policies to encourage wider communication with that same country?

Third. Is U.S. opposition to diplomatic recognition and to the admission of Red China to the U.N. the heart of U.S. policy toward Red China, or could U.S. policy toward Red China change without necessarily altering U.S. position on these questions?

Fourth. Would a change in U.S. policy toward the admission of Red China into the U.N. be viewed by the non-Communist nations as a weakening of U.S. resolve?

Mr. Speaker, within recent weeks two eminent Americans have publicly discussed our policies toward Red China. On January 26 of this year the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, president of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., of New York, and Secretary of Defense under President Eisenhower, told the 63d annual dinner of the United States Steel Corp. in New York that the United States needs "fresh ideas and to devise new and bolder concepts to replace the tired, worked over, warmed over policies we have followed so long." He called for a stiffening of our total posture toward the Communist world, noting that "strength and will to use it is something all men understand and respect." He went on to say:

From a position of strength, there is no reason we should not talk to Red China. There are many things we both want. It is not wise to wait too long. National positions already frozen can become so forever. China is on its way and will become soon a highly industrialized nation. We must be openminded and think first of the Chinese people.

Red China wants and needs to trade, wants stature as a member of the U.N. We want the status of Taiwan established. Both of us really want the boundaries of Korea, India, and Vietnam settled.

From a position of strength and clear policy, there is no reason not to talk and to compromise in a whole package of problems. A politician would not make such a suggestion. China is currently a bad word. Most

believe agreements would not last. However, at the right time and from a new position of strength and a proven well-defined foreign policy, I would take the chance. There is much to be gained and little to lose. Moreover, people will not live behind walls of barbed wire or nuclear boundaries forever. They are sure to explode outward.

On February 20 last, our colleague and former U.S. representative to ECOSOC, Congressman JONATHAN BINGHAM, delivered an exceptional speech to the 30th anniversary banquet of the Yale Political Union at New Haven, Conn. In this speech Congressman BINGHAM seeks to assess U.S. interests in the question of admission of Red China to the United Nations. Because his speech puts forth a side of the subject which has not been widely discussed or considered, I include Congressman BINGHAM's speech in the RECORD following my remarks. While I do not necessarily agree with all the points he advocates, I think it is a good example of the type of dialog that should be taking place now concerning our policy toward Communist China.

The speech follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE JONATHAN B. BINGHAM AT 30TH ANNIVERSARY BANQUET OF YALE POLITICAL UNION, NEW HAVEN, CONN., FEBRUARY 20, 1965

As one of the founders of the Yale Political Union in 1935, I am honored to be your speaker this evening.

When this organization was launched, President Franklin D. Roosevelt sent warm greetings and expressed keen interest. Among those who were involved in its founding were Prof. A. Whitney Griswold, later president of the university, August Heckscher, Walt Rostow, and Potter Stewart. Over the years, the organization has lived up to its initial promise of providing a valuable training ground for Yale students interested in politics and in national issues. I congratulate the present officers and members and hope that the union will have a long and bright future, in the tradition of its already distinguished history.

I have chosen to speak to you this evening on our policy toward Communist China, which I know is one of the topics you have discussed in the course of this year's debates.

With American forces engaged in hostilities in Vietnam, this may seem like a bad time to be questioning the wisdom of our attitude toward Communist China.

But let us keep two points in mind:

1. The very fact that American men are being killed in Vietnam makes it more, not less, essential that we be sure the premises of our Far Eastern policies are sound.

2. Communist China is our real antagonist in the Far East and presents, at least in the long range, a threat to our national security. By comparison, North Vietnam, agonizing as the situation is, is a secondary problem. It presents a threat to our national security only indirectly, in terms of the danger of escalation of the present conflict, or in terms of the possible consequences of our having to leave Vietnam, opening the way for Communist control of all of southeast Asia.

My principal purpose this evening is to suggest that we—and by we I mean the American people—may not be facing the facts about Communist China.

I do not have access to secret information, but I do read the public prints. And I would submit the following as a reasonable accurate summary of the facts:

Communist China has now been in firm control of the mainland of China since 1949. Chinese boys and girls up to 20 years old can

remember nothing else. Probably a high proportion of the people who disagreed with Mao Tse-tung have disappeared. Mao's regime has showed itself a master of the totalitarian teachings of thought control. The regime has encountered a series of crises—famines, floods, the cutting of Soviet aid, the collapse of "the great leap forward"—and has survived them all.

Communist China is building up trade with the outside world—including substantial trade with many of our friends. After years of concentrating on its own domestic problems, the regime has felt itself strong enough to engage in a series of adventures abroad. Recently it has emerged as the world's fifth nuclear power.

There seems to be, in short, little evidence any longer that Mao's regime will collapse or be overthrown from within.

On the other side of the Formosa Strait, we have a Nationalist Chinese Government which in recent years has made remarkable progress, both economically and socially. But its dream of return to the mainland persists only as a dream, not as a reality. On the other hand, the Taiwan Government, with our help, can probably resist an attack from the mainland for the foreseeable future.

If these are the facts, or a reasonably accurate facsimile thereof, what is our policy in relation to them?

Our policy seems to be twofold: to try to resist, or "contain" Communist expansion in Asia, and, so far as mainland China itself is concerned, to hope Micawber-like that something will turn up. Our policy contains no element of carrot, and very little stick. It amounts to stalling for time, partly because we are not sure what else to do, and partly because, from the point of view of our own domestic politics, the subject of China has generally been considered "too hot to handle."

Yet, while we wait and hope for the best, Communist China will be building a nuclear weapons potential, to give edge to its awesome manpower potential.

Do we have ready on hand the means to destroy Mao Tse-tung's regime and substitute one more to our liking? With our nuclear arsenal, we undoubtedly do—but we are not likely to use it, unless the provocation becomes unbearable. And even then we would have to consider the risk of massive Soviet retaliation against us.

I for one do not think the Soviets would choose to destroy themselves, along with us, if we were to pulverize China's cities, but who could be sure?

Absent major military action, it is hard to see what effective policy of stick is open for us. Our efforts at economic sanctions to date have been largely ineffectual, mainly because even some of our closest friends in the world, countries such as Britain, Canada, and Japan, are not in sympathy and will not work with us.

If we do not have in usable form the means to destroy the Communist regime in China, then it would seem that we should at least be thinking about the possibilities of inducing that regime to become part of the international community of nations, with the same basic principles of international morality; i.e., the principles of the U.N. Charter.

For the most part, our attitude toward this eventuality up to now has been totally negative. As I know from my experience at the U.N., we have never been willing to discuss the conditions under which we might recognize Communist China or permit its entry into the U.N.

On the other hand, we have since 1960 impliedly recognized in our disarmament pro-

posals that effective international machinery for controlled disarmament will have to include Communist China. Thus, the "second stage" of our latest plan calls for the participation of all "militarily significant states" and the third or final stage for the participation of "all states." And it could hardly be otherwise.

Am I suggesting that tomorrow we should offer to recognize the Peiping regime on Peiping's terms, or abandon our opposition to the replacement of Nationalist China by Communist China at the U.N.? Not at all. To my mind, these steps are unthinkable under present circumstances, and at least so long as Communist China remains bent upon the forcible conquest of Formosa and openly maintains the necessity of aggressive war as an instrument of national policy.

But why should our policy be so totally devoid of the element of carrot, as well as of stick? Why, for example, should we not indicate the conditions under which we would be willing to accept Communist China as a member of the community of nations?

One essential condition would be the at least tacit acceptance of the continued independent existence of the state of Taiwan or Nationalist China. Another would be the acceptance of the principle of "competitive coexistence" as enunciated and accepted by the U.S.S.R. in the post-Stalin period.

One step that we could take immediately would be to announce that, if the People's Republic of China were to apply for admission to the U.N. as a new member state, we would not oppose its admission. This might seem radical to some, but it would actually be a very innocuous step and it would amount to little or no carrot, because for Maoist China to apply for admission to the U.N. as a new member would necessarily mean accepting the existence of two Chinas, an idea which up to now neither China has been willing to accept.

The problem of admitting Peiping to the U.N. as a second China is complicated by the fact that Nationalist China could veto its admission, even if we did not. But the mere announcement by us of such a position would improve our image in the rest of the world, where our ostrichlike posture today makes us look ridiculous. And if in fact there were any indication of Peiping being willing to make such an application for admission as a new member, this would signify such a basic change of policy on its part as to warrant a major effort by us to secure the acquiescence of Chiang Kai-shek.

The problem of membership in the Security Council, of course, presents enormous difficulties. There is a good argument to be made that Nationalist China is entitled to hold on to the permanent seat, as the successor to the government which was given that right in the Charter. But it is hard to see how any self-respecting government of mainland China could ever accept such a result. On the other hand, there is no reason to suppose that the Taiwan Government would ever accede to being replaced, and there is no legal mechanism available in the U.N. for accomplishing this against Taiwan's will. (A vote by the General Assembly would not be binding on the Security Council, which exists entirely independently of the General Assembly and is not subordinate to it in any way.) In the long run, however, if a general desire for settlement were manifest, and negotiations over all outstanding issues (including such troublesome problems as the Korean war prisoners and the offshore islands) were underway, a solution to the Security Council question could be found through the route of charter amendment, possibly by reducing the number of permanent seats to four.

In these remarks, I have by no means sought to describe what our overall policy toward Peiping should be. I am not expert enough to do so, and I do not have access to all the facts. But I am suggesting that we should review the wisdom of our Micawber-like attitude. That attitude may have been justified in the past during periods when the survival of the Communist regime in China was in serious doubt, but today there is no longer any apparent reason to hope realistically for the regime's collapse. I am also suggesting that we should reassess the available facts and their implications, and that, on the basis of this reassessment, we should outline a policy which would hold out some inducement to the Communist Chinese to turn from their own implacable hostility. Such rational pronouncements would probably have little effect on Mao Tse-tung and his associates, but who knows whether they might not strengthen the hand of some potential Chinese Khrushchev?

In 1933, after 16 years of hoping the Russian Revolution would go away, the United States decided to face the facts and undertake to deal with them. Now, 16 years after the Communists took over mainland China, it is time we did the same.

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. MAHON, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. MAHON), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. McCLORY), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. McCLORY), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MATHIAS (at the request of Mr. McCLORY), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, March 3.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McCLORY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HARSHA.

Mr. FINO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RONCALIO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina.

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. HEBERT.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.)

the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 3, 1965, 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:

670. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report indicating the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations for fiscal year 1965 for various agencies and the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 98); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

671. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the national oceanographic program for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

672. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on excess traveltime allowed military personnel using privately owned vehicles on permanent change of station travel, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

673. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improper application by the Hallcrafters Co., Chicago, Ill., of Government's share of vendor credits for volume discounts under contracts AF 33(600)-40992, AF 33(600)-40994, and AF 33(600)-42414; Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

674. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on loss of revenue resulting from the practice of requiring that surplus marine anchors be sold as scrap; Departments of Commerce, Defense, and Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

675. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 105 of Public Law 88-454; to the Committee on House Administration.

676. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the third annual report on the lead and zinc mining stabilization program, for the year ending December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 8 of the act of October 3, 1961; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

677. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation covering several bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

678. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

679. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

680. A letter from the Governor of the Canal Zone, President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under

the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937, and to extend cash relief benefits to widows of recipients"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

681. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize Secret Service agents to make arrests without warrant for offenses committed in their presence, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

682. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to reduce until January 1, 1968, the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents to \$50 fair retail value, to limit the exemption to articles accompanying such residents, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on use of contractor personnel in the Department of Defense (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 2. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1445. A bill for the relief of Charles Marowitz; without amendment (Rept. No. 116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3137. A bill for the relief of McKoy-Helgeson Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4025. A bill for the relief of Terence J. O'Donnell, Thomas P. Wilcox, and Clifford M. Springberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1867. A bill for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles; without amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2139. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes; with amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2166. A bill for the relief of Stalman Bros.-Simon Wrecking Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2881. A bill for the relief of George A. Grabert; without amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3074. A bill for the relief of Maxie L. Stevens; with amendments (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3899. A bill for the relief of C. R. Sheaffer & Sons; with amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLODY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4024. A bill for the relief of Lewis H. Nelson III; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4026. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Porter F. Sheldon, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4088. A bill for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4443. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Beas; without amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):
H.R. 5638. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRAY:
H.R. 5639. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS:
H.R. 5640. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each U.S. district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:
H.R. 5641. A bill prohibiting the use in the District of Columbia of firearms in the commission of certain crimes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5642. A bill prohibiting use in the commission of certain crimes of firearms transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:
H.R. 5643. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to authorize courts of bankruptcy to determine the dischargeability or nondischargeability of provable debts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5644. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to permit a husband and wife to file a joint petition in ordinary bankruptcy and chapter XIII (wage earner) proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5645. A bill to amend chapter XI of the Bankruptcy Act to give the court supervisory power over all fees paid from whatever source; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):
H.R. 5646. A bill to amend sections 334, 355, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 5647. A bill to provide for the humane treatment of vertebrate animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 5648. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that interest on series E U.S. saving bonds which are held to maturity or beyond shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 5649. A bill to encourage the States to extend coverage under their State unemployment compensation laws to agricultural labor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 5650. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code by making it clear that the tax exemption of a civic league or organization exclusively for the promotion of social welfare shall not be affected because of income, including subscription and advertising income, derived from carrying on any publication, such as a journal, which is substantially related to the purpose or function constituting the organization's basis for its tax exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5651. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by making it clear that the income, including subscription and advertising income, derived by an organization in carrying on any publication, such as a trade or professional journal, shall not be deemed to be unrelated business taxable income if the publication is substantially related to the purpose or function constituting the organization's basis for its tax exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5652. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer a deduction from gross income for water assessments levied by irrigation ditch companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 5653. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to establish the rates of disability compensation on an equitable basis giving due consideration to the continuing increase in the cost of living; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 5654. A bill to provide for expanded research in the oceans and the Great Lakes, to establish a National Oceanographic Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5655. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the amount which may be paid on account of the funeral expenses of certain veterans from \$250 to \$300; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 5656. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common carrier property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 5657. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5658. A bill to amend section 302 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the establishment of an Aircraft Noise Abatement Service within the Federal Aviation Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5659. A bill to amend section 601(a) and section 901 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the issuance of rules and regulations pertaining to the elimination or minimization of aircraft noise nuisance and hazards to persons or property on the ground, and to provide for penalties for the violation thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5660. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to issue rules and regulations to minimize or eliminate aircraft noise nuisance and hazards to persons or property on the ground; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5661. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for research to determine criteria and means for abating objectionable aircraft noise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5662. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 5663. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 5664. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (by request):

H.R. 5665. A bill to authorize disbursing officers of the Armed Forces to advance funds to members of an armed force of a friendly foreign nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 5666. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 5667. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5668. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to encourage the use by volume mailers of ZIP code through postage rate concessions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 5669. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to provide that a family separation allowance shall be paid to any member of a uniformed service otherwise entitled thereto even though he has been assigned Government quarters; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 5670. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a loan and grant to the State of Hawaii for the construction of the Kokee water project, Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 5671. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a loan and grant to the State of Hawaii for the construction of the Kokee water project, Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 5672. A bill to permit any wage earner to defer payment of a portion of the

difference between the income tax imposed for a taxable year beginning in 1964 and the amount deducted and withheld upon his wages during 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 5673. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe in North Dakota and South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 5674. A bill to authorize each Member of the House of Representatives to employ annually, on a temporary basis, a student congressional intern; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 5675. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5676. A bill to incorporate the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 5677. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to exclude from consideration as income, for the purpose of determining eligibility for pension, all amounts paid to an individual under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar type plans or programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5678. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 5679. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 5680. A bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5681. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 5682. A bill to amend section 359 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that such section shall become effective as of the date of its enactment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5683. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that payments to an individual under a public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs shall not be counted as income for pension until the amount of payments received equals the contributions thereto; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 5684. A bill to authorize establishment of the Tocks Island National Recreation Area in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 5685. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit retirement with full annuity upon attainment of the age of 55 years and completion of 30 years of service, to liberalize the formula for computation of reduced annuity, and for others

purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 5686. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to extend to veterans of Mexican border hostilities the same benefits enjoyed by veterans of periods of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 5687. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birthday of Dr. Luther Halsey Gulick; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 5688. A bill relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 5689. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 5690. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 5691. A bill to provide for an additional payment of \$40,000 to the village of Highland Falls, N.Y., toward the cost of the water filtration plant constructed by such village; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon:

H.R. 5692. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Illinois Valley division, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 5693. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 5694. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5695. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 5696. A bill to provide for the control and progressive eradication of certain aquatic plants in the States of Maryland, Virginia, New Jersey, and Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5697. A bill to prohibit the Postmaster General from intentionally issuing defective stamps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5698. A bill to provide social security coverage as self-employed individuals for State and local public officers, not otherwise covered under Federal-State agreement, who are paid on a fee basis by persons other than the State or local government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 5699. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt schoolbuses from the manufacturers' excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 5700. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitz-

gerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 5701. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay the market value of certain leasehold interests, buildings, and improvements and to pay severance damages to certain persons having interests in lands acquired for the Marion Dam and Reservoir project in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 5702. A bill to extend for 1 year the date on which the National Commission on Food Marketing shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress and to provide necessary authorization of appropriations for such Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 356. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the offering of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 357. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 358. Joint resolution designating the 8-day period beginning on the 12th day of October of each year as Patriotic Education Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 359. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.J. Res. 360. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Con. Res. 339. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document 394, 87th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 340. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of a United Nations Conciliation Committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Con. Res. 341. Concurrent resolution favoring an agreement among states of the Near East prohibiting the production of nuclear weapons and offensive missiles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H. Con. Res. 342. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the State of New York should raise its legal drinking age to 21; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 252. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to transfer the responsibilities of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

67. Mr. REIFEL presented a memorial of the South Dakota State Legislature memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, rela-

tive to the apportionment of State legislatures and governing bodies of subordinate units of government which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 5703. A bill for the relief of Regina Gebriel Chiari (also known as Gina Chiari); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5704. A bill for the relief of Nahida Riad Kattuah and her minor daughter, Lena Kattuah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 5705. A bill for the relief of Yousif Najaar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5706. A bill for the relief of Kyriakou Kyriakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 5707. A bill for the relief of Sofia Gargiulo Tinalli, Gennaro Tinalli, and Italo Tinalli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 5708. A bill for the relief of Alvin A. Canha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 5709. A bill for the relief of Anna Cardillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 5710. A bill for the relief of Angelina Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 5711. A bill for the relief of Arthur Noel John Pearman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 5712. A bill authorizing the consideration of the recommendation made for the award of the Legion of Merit to Dr. William A. Reilly for meritorious service during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 5713. A bill for the relief of Vuong Thi Bick Tuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5714. A bill for the relief of Manuel Lopez Pedroza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 5715. A bill for the relief of Jesse H. Burke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 5716. A bill for the relief of George Nickolas Kerhoulas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 5717. A bill for the relief of Teresa Szwachla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 5718. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Enrico L. Pabalate; 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:

115. By Mr. STRATTON: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of Yates County, N.Y., opposing the closing of the Veterans' Administration centers at Bath, N.Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

116. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of Ontario County, N.Y., opposing the closing of the Veterans' Administration cen-

ter at Bath, N.Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

117. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the commander, Italian American War Veterans

of the United States, Inc., Department of New York, Herkimer, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing the closing of veterans hospitals

and facilities in the State of New York known as Sunmount, Castle Point, and Bath, and elsewhere in the Nation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Appointment of the Honorable Kenneth E. BeLieu as Under Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my views regarding the appointment of the Honorable Kenneth E. BeLieu as Under Secretary of the Navy.

The Senate confirmation of a Presidential appointee to even the highest positions in the Department of Defense—or any of the executive departments of Government—is usually a rather routine proceeding, particularly when the individual concerned has been unanimously recommended by the committee which held hearings on his qualifications.

However, there was a confirmation by the Senate on Friday, February 18, that was far from routine. It concerned a person well known and much admired by the members of the Armed Services Committee of this House, and by the House as a whole. I refer to the Honorable Kenneth E. BeLieu.

Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues in this House the pleasure of noting the unusual enthusiasm with which Secretary BeLieu's nomination was endorsed by the Senate. Among those endorsing his nomination, and speaking specifically to it, were the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD; the minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN; Senator STENNIS; Senator ARKEN; Senator SALTONSTALL; Senator JACKSON; and Senator DODD. These distinguished Members of the Senate, all of whom have been closely associated with Secretary BeLieu during his years on the staffs of the Armed Services Committee, the Space Committee, and Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, expressed deep satisfaction that one of such high personal and professional qualifications as Secretary BeLieu had been appointed to the position of Under Secretary of the Navy.

In the course of the Senate colloquy endorsing Secretary BeLieu, President Johnson was complimented on making such an outstanding appointment. I would like, for myself, Mr. Speaker, to say that President Johnson's appointment of Secretary BeLieu is another demonstration of the President's well-known ability to recognize, develop, and

bring to positions of high responsibility in Government, persons of rare ability.

Several years ago, then-Senator Johnson, recognized Ken BeLieu's ability as a member of the professional staff of the Senate's Armed Services Committee. It was not long before then-Senator Johnson appointed him to be the staff director for both the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee and the Space Committee of the Senate. Both of these committees were chaired by then-Senator Johnson. We all know of the loyal and able manner in which Ken BeLieu handled these difficult and very important assignments.

Shortly after the Kennedy-Johnson administration took office, Ken BeLieu was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Navy. In his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, he has impressed the members with his professional knowledge of his job, his understanding of people, his loyalty to his superiors, and his honesty.

At a time when our Nation and our Armed Forces are faced with growing crisis in Asia, President Johnson has, in his promotion of Ken BeLieu, made a timely and widely appreciated contribution to the morale of our fighting men, and the confidence of Congress and the Nation in the Department of the Navy and the Defense Department as a whole.

Throughout the Navy, officers and blue jackets alike know that, in the new Under Secretary of the Navy, they have a person who understands the problems of the man in uniform. They know he learned these things the hard way, in combat in World War II, and in Korea, where he had his leg blown off in action.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that Members of this House will join with me in extending our congratulations to Ken BeLieu on his appointment and confirmation as Under Secretary of the Navy, and in complimenting President Johnson for making such a wise and timely contribution to the morale and efficiency of our fighting forces.

A Bill To Increase Veterans' Funeral Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to increase the amount payable on account of the fu-

neral expenses of certain veterans from \$250 to \$300.

In these days, it is not only the cost of living that is going up, but the cost of dying as well. The present allowance of \$250 for burial expenses is obviously inadequate today.

I am therefore proposing that this burial allowance be increased to a more reasonable and more realistic amount. Even \$300 is by no means enough, but it is at least a step in the right direction in trying to take care of our veterans who pass on. I hope the Members of this House will give this bill its strong support.

WLW Radio Station Wins Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend one of Ohio's outstanding radio stations, WLW, Cincinnati, Ohio, for receiving a well-deserved honor and recognition for meritorious service rendered on behalf of its listening audience.

On February 22, 1965, WLW radio station was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal Award by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., for its 1964 radio program, "That Certain July in Philadelphia."

This marks the second consecutive year WLW-radio has been so honored. Last year WLW won the highest award presented to a radio station—the encased George Washington Honor Medal—for its "Government Under Law" series.

WLW's winning entry this year was part of a regular feature, "People and Places" carried within "An Evening at Crosley Square" on a daily basis and hosted by WLW's Jack Gwyn. The award-winning show was written and narrated by Mr. Gwyn and produced by the WLW program department. Recognizing the negligible amount of material featured on the airwaves commemorating our national holidays, "Of People and Places" dramatically revisited Philadelphia that certain July to trace the events which inspired Thomas Jefferson to write the draft for the Declaration of Independence.

Each year the Freedoms Foundation honors companies, individuals, organizations, and schools who best exemplify the "Credo of the American Way of Life." The news media industry is indeed fortunate to have such an outstanding service to the public and it is an honor and

privilege to commend radio station WLW for its patriotic programs. WLW has contributed much in its broadcasting service to the people and such contributions are generally left unrecognized. For their efforts and valuable service to the listening audience, a commendation is in order.

H.R. 2027: A Bill To Repeal Section 14 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored a bill, H.R. 2027, to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act. This section reads as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State, or territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or territorial law.

The strongest advocates of preservation of this section of the law have banded together under the misnomer of "right-to-work" organizations. A more honest title for these groups should be "antiunion security" organizations because that—and that alone—is the sole intent and purpose of the right-to-work advocates.

Actually, there is no such thing as a right to work. Work opportunities are based upon the economic laws of our system and the law of supply and demand.

What the right-to-work advocates overlook or fail to mention in their feverish propaganda to promote their cause is that a union under Federal law, which attains certification as a bargaining agent for a majority of the workers, must represent all of the workers in that unit whether they are members or not.

The philosophy of the right-to-work advocates may be compared to the argument of a childless couple that they should not be required to pay school taxes because they do not directly use the educational facilities of the community.

The prohibition of management and labor unions from freely negotiating and executing union shop provisions in collective bargaining agreements creates a legislative umbrella under which a minority group of free riders may scurry. While sitting in the shade with none of the obligations or responsibilities to the union, they receive and enjoy all of the economic fruits and security provided them by the union.

To put this issue in simple basic terms, it is merely this: Should an individual employee for any reason at all in his own mind have the privilege of not paying dues to support a union which a majority of his fellow employees have chosen by the election process to represent all of them?

The aim and intent of the right-to-work advocates is to weaken the existing strong unions, destroy the weaker ones, and hamper and prevent the formation of new ones.

Congress should no longer provide this haven and shelter for this group. It should close this legislative umbrella which would require this group to move over to the sunny side of the street and exercise its rights in the democratic way under the free elective process and collective bargaining.

The quickest, easiest, and simplest way to close this umbrella is by repeal of section 14(b).

Service Academy Athletes Are Unjustly Maligned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, following the cheating scandal disclosed at the Air Force Academy, a few persons seized upon this issue to point the finger of blame at Academy athletics.

Noting that 42 Air Force Academy athletes were among the 105 cadet resignations in the wake of the scandal, the inference was made that varsity athletics was the real culprit.

The apparent assumption is that an athlete is not really a cadet—that athletics is an ersatz function of the service academies.

Mr. Speaker, I say that these assumptions and inferences fly in the face of the actualities, and as a result the service academy athletes have been unjustly maligned.

The fact of the matter is that every cadet or midshipman who participates in intercollegiate athletics must pass the same rigorous entrance requirements as the nonathlete. Furthermore, the athlete must maintain the same high level of proficiency as any other cadet while in the Academy.

As for the cry of "professionalism," one only has to consider that a so-called professional athlete would hardly pick one of the service academies. An academy graduate must serve on active duty a minimum of 5 years after graduation; if an athlete aspired to play pro ball, he would go to a university where he could immediately play in the pro ranks after graduating.

I believe it is a fallacy to attempt to differentiate between the "athletes" and the "nonathletes" at the academies, because all cadets and midshipmen participate in some form of athletics.

This is amply stated in a report prepared for the Superintendent of the U.S. Naval Academy. A portion of this report said:

The physical education and athletic program is so integral to the activities of the brigade, just as are the academic and military programs, that it is erroneous to as-

sume that athletes are not midshipmen or that midshipmen are not athletes.

In varsity sports alone, approximately 1,000 participate each season—fall, winter, and spring—representing the Naval Academy in intercollegiate athletics in 21 sports. About 2,300 midshipmen each season are members of intramural teams involving a total of 28 sports.

A program of physical education is continued throughout the 4 years so that all midshipmen receive instruction in such activities as swimming, wrestling, boxing, hand-to-hand combat, tennis, golf, handball, squash, personal conditioning and athletic administration.

The midshipmen are in a period of their lives which is important to their physical development and to the establishment of habits of healthful exercise and competitive spirit and teamwork that will serve them throughout their lives.

We believe that it is important for the midshipmen to be in good physical condition, for them to know how to stay in good condition, and for them to have acquired a genuine personal interest in physical recreation and competition.

The report further points out that Naval Academy varsity lettermen in football and basketball had excellent high school academic records before entering the Academy and have maintained high academic standing after entering.

The college board scores of these particular athletes differ very little from the scores for the entire classes of which they were members. The Naval Academy football and basketball varsity lettermen as a group have 38 percent of their number standing in the top half of the class for the classes of 1964 through 1967.

A Naval Academy professor made a statistical study covering a 10-year period—classes 1953–62—concerning midshipmen athletes in comparison with the rest of the brigade. The professor's study noted:

A fairly comprehensive study of the modern era (classes of 1953 through 1962) shows that the student athlete is hardly distinguishable from his counterpart in the brigade in every facet of his full Navy career. As a group, entering student athletes win their share of prizes and awards, consistently stand higher in first class aptitude, and consistently stand slightly lower in relative standing for the completed course. The group of student athletes has a good retention rate for service careers.

Other studies at the Air Force Academy and the U.S. Military Academy have produced similar statistics with regards to the relative standing of the varsity athletes.

The Military Academy, utilizing the members of the classes of 1964–67 who were on the varsity football and basketball teams as a sample of athletes, found their mean score on the college entrance examination exceed significantly the national mean for high school seniors who enter college.

Additionally, a review of the high school standings of this sample indicates that 70 percent were in the top 20 percent of their class and 90 percent in the top half. Considering that the high school standing is generally accepted as the one best predictor of academic success, this group of athletes demonstrates outstanding potential.

A review of the Military Academy classes of 1955-60 indicates no significant differences between retention rates of athletes and that of their class. In addition the officer performance of athletes is not significantly different from their contemporaries. As an example, the selection rate to captain for those first considered was 97.9 percent for athletes as compared to 97 percent for their contemporaries. It is further interesting to note that a survey made of Military Academy graduates in Korea established that physical ability measures were more related to the criterion of combat officer success than any of the academic course grades or final class standing.

The Air Force Academy made a survey of the high school records of members of its football and basketball squads. This survey, for the classes of 1964-67, showed that 80 percent of the football players were in the top quarter of their high school graduating class. A total of 77.3 percent of the basketball players, in the Air Force Academy classes of 1964-67, were in the top quarter of their high school graduating class.

In a breakdown of the academic grades for the spring semester of 1964, the Air Force Academy found that the average grade of all cadets was 2.81 on a 4.0 system. The average for the football squad was 2.67, and the average for the basketball squad was 2.56.

A similar correlation was found in the percentage study of cadets below the 2.0—or C grade—average. The percentage below 2.0 for all cadets at the Air Force Academy was 6.8. The percentage for the football squad was 7.0, and the basketball squad, 4.5.

These studies show that the high school records and Academy records of varsity athletes are almost identical with the overall cadet averages. The athlete is clearly no drag on the academic excellence of any of the three academies. In fact, a substantially greater proportion of the basketball and football squads than of their classmates were on the Commandant's merit list at the Air Force Academy.

Athletics and intercollegiate competition are healthy and essential to all three academies.

It is all too easy to hunt for a "whipping boy" in the case of the Air Force cheating, but the facts and figures clearly proclaim the folly of trying to make athletics the bete noir of this situation.

Coral Gables, Fla., High School Debaters Take Top Honors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Coral Gables High is one of the many fine

schools in the Fourth Congressional District of Florida whose students continue to excel academically and in extra-curricular activities.

On February 21, 1965, the Coral Gables High debate team was awarded the trophy as it made a clean sweep in winning all three categories in the 10th annual high school Cherry Blossom National Invitational Debate Tournament sponsored by Georgetown University.

Daniel S. Schwartz took top honors, being named the best speaker among the 400 competing debaters. Daniel has won many other debating honors among which was his selection last year as the Florida winner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy contest.

Dave Weiss and Wayne Silver were named in the top 20 and top 10 debaters, respectively.

Also, Daniel Schwartz and Wayne Silver took top honors of the 182 teams in the 2-man debating competition.

Meanwhile, the team composed of Joel Perwin, Dave Weiss, Wayne Silver, and Daniel Schwartz won first place in the four-man debating team competition. This team has won nearly every major tournament entered this year.

The Georgetown University tournament, which began on Friday, February 19, and went through Sunday, February 21, was one of the largest high school tournaments ever held with over 100 schools from 30 States participating.

The winners of the two-man competition, Dave Weiss and Dan Schwartz, were presented the Ryder Challenge Cup, named in honor of Father Ryder who established the Georgetown Philodemic Debating Society in 1831. The winners of the trophy went through six preliminary rounds which narrowed the field to 16 teams. These qualifying teams then met in four sudden-death rounds, leaving eight teams, then four, then two, and finally the winning team. The Coral Gables team won a total of 10 straight debates, defeating Fordham College Preparatory School of New York in the final round for top honors.

The topic for the debates was "Resolved, That Nuclear Weapons Should Be Placed Under the Control of an International Organization." The judges awarded the debate to Coral Gables by a score of 6 to 1.

Each year many of us in Congress, if not all, on request, furnish material on the national debate topic to students all over the country. I am sure my colleagues will be pleased to learn that students appreciate and do use the material successfully. Dan Schwartz in a recent letter to me said in part:

I am writing this to you, sir, because you were very instrumental in helping us achieve the honors we have won this year.

The real credit, of course, goes to these fine young competitors, their outstanding coach Kenneth N. Rosenthal, and to the excellent teachers of their school. I am sure my colleagues join me in extending hearty congratulations to them all.

Cotton and the U.S. Balance-of-Payments Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, the President of the United States submitted to the Congress a special message containing proposals for solution of our unfavorable balance-of-payments position. The balance-of-payments problem in the United States has been a persistent one. Although it has improved somewhat in the last 3 years, the deficit in 1964 stood at \$3 billion and, because of developments in the last quarter of the year, was substantially above the anticipated level. The fourth quarter deficit alone was over \$1.5 billion.

I do not propose in this statement to analyze our balance-of-payments problem or to discuss in detail various measures proposed by the President in his message to resolve it. I want rather to focus attention on one issue: The fact that our present Government programs for cotton have prevented us from increasing our commercial exports of cotton and have, as a result, denied us an important and sizable contribution to the solution of our balance-of-payments problem. If we had a cotton program attuned to economic realities, there is no reason in the world why we should not be exporting—for payment in dollars—\$500 million more each year. This alone would make a contribution greater in size than a number of the proposals advanced in the President's message. Moreover, it would do so by expanding trade and would reduce the need to rely on measures that are restrictive.

If U.S. cotton could obtain a reasonable share of the world market—a share that we have traditionally supplied—we could in the case of this single key export commodity strike continuing and telling blows against our payments deficit. Unfortunately, the U.S. Government program for cotton drives it into storage at the taxpayer's expense instead of encouraging it into trade channels, including the all-important export market. This results from the fact that our program involves loans to producers at above-the-market prices. The effect, of course, is to peg our cotton at predictable prices. As long as prices are thus established by the U.S. Department of Agriculture instead of in the market, our cotton competitors abroad know in advance what our prices will be. The result has been that we have become residual suppliers in markets that have been growing and for which we were at one time the chief suppliers.

Foreign cotton production has more than doubled over the past 30 years while output in the United States has continued at about the same level. Production in foreign countries has been increasing year after year to meet rising

demand abroad while we have continued actually to lose markets—markets in whose growth we formerly shared.

Our exports of cotton during the post-World War II years have averaged little more than half of what they were for the 20 years before the war.

Mr. M. K. Horne, Jr., chief economist of the National Cotton Council of America, recently summed up our cotton export position in an admirable paper delivered to delegate members of the council at Houston, Tex., on January 25. If we are serious about staying in cotton, says Mr. Horne, there has to be some kind of basic change for the better in the export market.

He points out that if we had shared in the growth of the free foreign world market for cotton since the late fifties, our exports would now be at 7 million bales instead of a prospective 4.2 million for the current marketing year which ends next July 31. By exporting 7 million instead of only 4.2 million bales in the current year, we could reduce our international payments deficit approximately \$350 million.

There is only one way of getting our cotton back into competition, and that is by meeting competitive prices—which, as Mr. Horne points out, "only can be done in a free market."

There is the nub of the matter. We no longer have a free market in cotton despite the fact that it is historically our most important agricultural export. We have instead an above-the-market loan program which drives our cotton into Government warehouses. This is asking cotton to bear an unusual burden. We have a price-supporting producer's loan for feed grains, but it is well below the level of the market, and does not interfere with the movement of grains into the channels of trade. We sell many millions of bushels of corn, grain sorghum, barley, and oats around the world. The producer of feed grains is compensated, in addition to the loan, by direct payments to make up a total fair price for his labor and investment. We also have a price-supporting loan for soybeans, but it is well below the level at which our soybeans are being sold in great quantities around the world. Soybeans move freely in world markets and are being traded today on our commodity markets in the liveliest fashion. We have a special wheat program with a price-support loan, but, again, it is a loan which is below the level of the world market. We do not allow the wheat loan to obstruct our exports, as in the case of cotton, and wheat growers realize fair prices through the certificate plan.

It is vitally important that we free the cotton market and get our fiber back into the channels of trade. As Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, then Senator HUMPHREY, said in the Senate last August 18:

Export markets are vital to the American farmer. * * * If we are going to maximize our exports—which is a matter of interest to our country—to the Common Market and to the other areas of the world, we must offer, as I have said, the best quality at competi-

tive prices. There is no substitute for price and quality when it comes to competing for commercial markets abroad. Therefore, every policy that we pursue must be to try to strengthen what we call the operation of the market—including the market price.

Then Mr. HUMPHREY went on:

I want to make my position clear: I do not believe Government programs ought to supersede the operation of our normal markets. Government programs should be designed not to supplant but to supplement; not to take over but to assist; not to move in as a competitive force, but to make competition more just and to make it more effective for the farm producer and for the Nation.

What Mr. HUMPHREY said last August should not be done is precisely what our Government has been doing in the case of cotton for some 30 years—with the loss of exports and the mounting international payments difficulties that have been described. Although it was hard to conceive of the cotton mess becoming worse, that is exactly what has happened since the passage of the new cotton law which took effect last season and will continue in effect throughout the coming season—and perhaps will be extended beyond that, unless we take firm action to prevent it.

What has happened under the new law?

U.S. cotton exports are today running at a rate some 40 percent less than last year. Government stocks continue to accumulate and promise by next August 1 to approach the previous alltime high of some 14½ million bales—the equal of almost 1 year's production. Interest and warehouse charges alone on the Government's inventory and loan stocks of cotton are in excess of \$100 million annually, or some \$274,000 every day of the year.

When the current cotton program was authorized, Congress was told that its first-year cost would be \$481 million. Instead, it now appears likely that the first-year cost will be between \$850 million and \$1 billion. Yet the total value of the annual American cotton crop, excluding seed products, is about \$2.25 billion, so our current cotton legislation is costing more than one-third the value of the entire crop.

Meantime, our cotton exchanges are dying. The New Orleans exchange suspended operations last year. Trading volume on the New York Cotton Exchange last year reached the lowest point in the 94 years of its history: less than a million bales were traded. This year less than a quarter million bales will be traded, based on current estimates.

In his August 18 speech, Mr. HUMPHREY had this to say of the importance of commodity exchanges:

Futures trading on commodity exchanges developed as a highly effective form of free market trading and competitive pricing because it grew up with, and proved adaptable to, our other free institutions—

He said:

It became an integral part of agricultural marketing because it focused supply and demand forces into a central price picture for

one and all to see, because trading was conducted openly, and because anyone with the wherewithal to trade could participate in the market, and in the pricemaking process.

Finally, Mr. HUMPHREY asked a key question concerning our agricultural programs generally that carries particular force in the case of cotton. After observing that the American people have a multibillion-dollar investment in inventories of a relatively few agricultural commodities, he said:

Fundamentally, we must ask ourselves whether the present programs boost our opportunities to increase efficient production and at the same time expand profitable markets here and abroad. We should reexamine our entire governmental control mechanism to see whether it is helping us to develop a rational agricultural policy. It is time the Congress asked for a complete examination of the commodity program structure.

I agree most heartily with Mr. HUMPHREY that it is time for Congress to examine the commodity program structure, and I suggest that cotton is the obvious place to begin. Among other reasons we should begin with cotton, it seems to me, is that it is the commodity with which we can move most quickly toward substantially larger markets abroad, and, therefore, toward an improved balance-of-payments position. Cotton is a volatile market that can expand or contract substantially in a short period of time. Cotton is not a product the importation of which is restricted by our major customers—if we do not export cotton, it is our own fault.

How, then, can we bring cotton back onto the world market? The solution is not difficult. The first requisite is to eliminate or reduce price-support loans to producers to levels that will restore cotton to the channels of trade, and allow it to compete freely with foreign fiber. Certainly, however, the producer should not be penalized. Consequently, a step to be taken simultaneously with reduction or elimination of the loan rate is to provide for direct or compensatory payments to producers that will bring them fair returns for their labor and investment. Compensatory payments, of course, do not interfere with the movement of cotton through trade channels and allow the market free play. Moreover, our cotton textile industry will continue to be able to buy cotton at world market prices.

If we enact legislation along these lines, the cotton futures markets will again perform their normal function, cotton will move in the channels of trade instead of into Government storage, and cotton stocks will be inventoried by merchants and mills rather than by the taxpayer. The overall cost of our cotton program will be reduced. Finally, cotton exports will increase and thus bolster our balance-of-payments position. With this program for cotton I think it is not too optimistic to suppose that additional exports of this one commodity could reduce our international payments deficit by some \$500 million on an annual basis—and perhaps more than that.