Government can alter the marketplace demand for and the price of credit by changing the value of money. It does this by creating more of it or withdrawing some of it, by its own borrowings or by directly lending money itself at certain rates.

The Federal Reserve System has considerable power to alter the market demand by creating both money and credit. The Treasury Department by itself or working through the Federal Reserve has power to alter the market demand through its management of the Federal debt.

However, there are two disciplines outside the Government which limit both monetary and fiscal policy:

1. The actual amount of savings in the society and the willingness to risk the savings in the economic climate prevailing.

2. The impact on our economy of economies abroad.

Both outside disciplines are strongly affected by the size of Government borrowings (the Federal debt). They also are affected by the amount of private borrowings against assets and future earning power, and the maintenance of money as a stable measure of the value of services, goods, and savings.

It is argued by some that easy credit and cheap money are necessary to promote maximum employment and economic growth. This is putting the effect in place of the cause. Maximum employment and economic growth will produce easy credit and cheap money but not vice versa. By trying to use the effect to produce the cause, we may damage both.

Maximum employment and economic growth are basically produced by intelligent spending. We must always be able to distinguish the real from the sham. The expenditure of the savings of people to create new wealth and to increase purchasing power is, of course, stimulated by consumer spending in the first place. However, if there is insufficient incentive to save and then to invest at a risk, the cycle is broken. Here is where the interference of Government to produce artificially low rates of return for investment or to produce cheaper money defeats its objectives.

Only by the exercise of self-discipline can we maintain correct monetary and fiscal policy. That discipline is to balance our Federal budget and our international payments over the life of the business cycle.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse from Acts 15: 8: *And God, who knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit, even as He did unto us.*

Let us pray:

O Thou Eternal Holy Spirit of the Triune God, who dwells with us, pervades us, and possesses us, may we be sensitive and responsive to the promptings and persuasions of Thy leading.

We penitently acknowledge that we need the interpreting light of Thy guidance and infallible wisdom for there are many difficult problems which tantalize and terrify us.

There are today strange and mysterious experiences that confront us which need our lofty social ideals and best efforts in order that justice and freedom and mercy may never perish from the earth.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 624. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 86-380, the Chair appoints as members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations the following members on the part of the House: Mr. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina; Mr. KEOGH, of New York; Mrs. DWYER, of New Jersey.

THE LATE HONORABLE EDWARD KEATING

Mr. ASPINALL. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, today it is the office of the present House delegation of Colorado to announce the passing of the late Edward Keating, one of our former Members who served the people of his State and Nation ably, fearlessly, and effectively in this body from March 4, 1913, until March 3, 1919.

Seldom is it given to an individual to live long enough to see the fruits of his labor evaluated by his fellow man. Few may ever know whether or not history places a sufficiently high regard upon their efforts to acknowledge them as something above the ordinary. Our late colleague was one of those who was favored with that rare privilege.

When he passed away at his home here in Washington, D.C., last Friday, he did so at almost the age of 90. History has recorded the value of his efforts, especially to that great segment of our free enterprise system—organized labor. He served labor during its days of turbulence and tranquillity. He took up the cause of labor when even the shedding of one's blood in its righteous defense was not an uncommon occurrence. He counseled in the chambers of labor for a forward and constructive approach to its problems. His understanding of the private enterprise system and labor's particular part in the wise operation of the system made him welcome at all tables and before all forums in which the cause of labor was discussed and pleaded.

His life was not an easy one. His early days were spent in what now might be termed as poverty, but was not recognized as such by him because of his industry and consuming desire to serve his family, his community, and his Nation. While he was able to thrust his head and shoulders above the level of ordinary accomplishment, during all this time he never forgot for one moment that he was one of those who was privileged to become an accepted leader.

He was born in Kansas, the last of nine children. His father, who was to live only 5 years after young Edward was born, fought to free Ireland from British misrule. Stephen Keating was such a patriot to his country that, when he fled to America in 1848, there was a price on his head. At 14, young Edward was working as a salesman or, in those days, a "butcher," in a passenger train between Denver and Aspen, Colo. A little later, he became an employee of the old Denver Republican as a copyholder in the proofroom and, at the same time, joined the International Typographical Union before he was old enough to vote. He advanced rapidly to the position of reporter and then shifted to the Rocky Mountain News in Denver. Before he was out of his teens, he was city editor, then managing editor, and a little later editor of this paper.

Although he held office in the city and county of Denver, the State of Colorado, and was later on a Member of this great body, he really never left the profession which he loved so dearly, that of the newspaper business.

He was a personal friend of then U.S. Senator Thomas Patterson, of Colorado, and later on, at the request of that great early leader of labor, Samuel Gompers, founder and longtime president of American Federation of Labor, Edward Keating became the assigned leader of the "labor bloc" in the House.

When he left Congress in 1919, he was appointed a member of the first commission to classify Government employees. Soon thereafter, he became the editor of Labor, a hard-hitting crusading paper that fought for the public interest as well as for the welfare of the workers. At its peak, this paper attained a circulation of over 800,000. When Edward Keating retired from the editorship of the paper, he was elected "editor-manager emeritus for life."

After his retirement, his interest never lagged in behalf of the laboring man. At a labor dinner honoring former Congressman Keating, president George M. Harrison, of the railway clerks, turned to Keating and said:

You have helped countless millions of men and women and children whom you have never seen. Through your efforts, little children today have more to eat, better homes, better clothing, better education, better medical care. * * * You have raised a monument in the form of this

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

great newspaper. May God reward you for the contribution you have made to the men and women of the labor movement.

At the funeral mass of Edward Keating at Our Lady of Victory Church, the Right Reverend Monsignor George C. Higgins paid tribute in such a knowledgable, beautiful, and gracious manner to the life's work of Edward Keating that I am desirous of having his words made a part of my statement, Mr. Speaker, and I respectfully include this sermon at this place in the RECORD:

SERMON BY RT. REV. MSGR. GEORGE G. HIGGINS

"Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after justice for they shall be filled." (Sermon on the Mount.)

Some men are born into the labor movement, so to speak. Others come into the movement by deliberate and conscious choice—and at great personal sacrifice—for the sole purpose of serving the cause. Mr. Keating was such a man. Given his unusual talents and his wide experience, he could have gone far in almost any walk of life. But he wasn't interested in going far by the ordinary standards of the world. He chose instead to dedicate his life unselfishly and ingloriously to the cause of organized labor. And those of us who were privileged to know him as a friend can testify to the fact that few men in the history of the American labor movement ever served its traditions more faithfully or more unselfishly.

Mr. Keating was a dedicated man. He had a vocation in life—a calling to which he gave himself with eager and almost instinctive generosity. It would not be an exaggeration to say—and may it be a source of comfort to his family to hear it said—that he literally gave his life to the cause to which as a very young man he had freely dedicated himself.

We publicly honor any man who has dedicated his life to the labor movement. But the labor movement is not a religion—or at least it shouldn't be. It wasn't a religion for Mr. Keating. The labor movement is a means—a noble and indeed a very necessary means—through which the workingman expresses and puts into practice the spirit of justice and charity which he owes to his religious beliefs and which is nourished by his religious practices. This is what the labor movement was for Mr. Keating. He loved his God, and he loved his fellow men. He loved them because they are children of the same God and redeemed by the blood of the same Christ. And all his life he tried to show his love for God by helping his fellow men. He did this through the labor movement. In doing so, he was reflecting the spirit which has always animated the labor movement—at least as we have known it in the United States. The labor movement has concentrated on the material welfare of its members and on the material welfare of the Nation as a whole. For this it was founded and for this it has had to struggle against the bitterest kinds of odds. But through it all the labor movement has been conscious of an even higher purpose—conscious of the dignity of man and his spiritual destiny. As far back as 1923 it announced to its friends and enemies alike that it was founded on a belief in God and a belief in the spiritual values of man—and that, in struggling for the material needs of its members, it was aiming always to raise them to that higher level of living demanded by the basic teachings of religion. Surely it is appropriate this morning to recall these noble words and to ponder over their meaning in the life of Mr. Keating:

"The labor movement of our country, recognizing the fact that all freedom and all higher development of life, rest upon first providing assurance of the essentials of existence, has first demanded economic justice as a basis for all other things. But the labor movement has always taught that the material is essential to something higher, and that the inspiration of our movement strives continually for something above and beyond the material. The labor movement strives for economic improvement with unrelenting zeal and fidelity because economic improvement is the first fundamental requisite; but it holds out to all mankind a flaming torch lighting the way to a greater fullness of life, to complete realization of the finer and nobler aspirations of the mind and soul. The labor movement fixes as its goal nothing less than the complete richness of life, without limitation of any kind, the attainment of the complete human ideal, in all of its economic, ethical, and spiritual implications.

"Through the inspiration of our labor movement, the Sunday preceding Labor Day, which is the first Monday in September each year, has come into general national observance as Labor Sunday. On this day it it fitting to give thought to the aspirations of labor and to find in what way the soul of labor may give thought and expression to its longings.

"Because of the aims and aspirations here set forth, we hold it fitting that all churches draw close to their altars the soul of labor on the coming Labor Sunday and that the men and women of labor everywhere make special effort to cooperate with the churches and to secure the cooperation of the churches with them, in order that there may be in the churches everywhere on that day a great union of expression in behalf of a higher, nobler life for the masses of our people; and in order that there may be everywhere a consecration to the cause of human betterment, particularly in those things that lead to ethical and spiritual growth—in those things that give flower and fruit to the great idealism of our labor movement, the embodiment and the expression of the idealism of our people."

This is the objective of the American labor movement—a noble objective, to be sure. And this was the objective of Mr. Keating—the motive power which made it easy for him to sacrifice his time and energy in the cause of labor. We honor him this morning for what he did to perpetuate this great tradition and to give it flesh and blood.

We lament his death—we mourn his passing. Of course we do. And it's only natural and human that we should. But ours is the sorrow of religious men and women, who, like Mr. Keating himself, believe in God and believe that man was created to share in the very life of God himself for all eternity. In the beautiful words of the mass which has just been offered for the repose of his soul: "Life is changed, not taken away." Mr. Keating has been taken from our ranks; but his life has only been changed—it has not been taken away. Please God, with the assistance of our prayers, he will soon have made reparation for his human faults and weaknesses and will have been called to eternal happiness with God himself.

One final word—a word which Mr. Keating himself would want us to utter in conclusion. The labor movement is a tremendous power for good in the life of our beloved country—the country to whose traditions Mr. Keating was so passionately devoted, as all his friends can testify. But the labor movement is only what its members make it. May the death of one of its respected leaders remind us that the life of any one of us is very short. May it remind us to put first things first. May it remind us that all our efforts and all our sacrifices will have lasting influence for good and lasting significance only to the extent that they are motivated by the love of God and by the love of our fellow men—only to the degree that we "hunger and thirst after justice" and not after personal glory or gain. "Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after justice, for they shall be filled."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Keating was a dedicated family man. His interest and devotion to his wife, his nephews and his nieces has been most apparent to all of us who were privileged to know him as an adviser and a friend. He shall be missed by his family, his neighbors and his friends, and particularly by those who worked with him so closely throughout his productive years.

Mrs. Aspinall and I extend our most sincere sympathy to his widow, Eleanor Connolly Keating, and the surviving members of his family.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado from the First District.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened to learn of the death of our former colleague, the late Edward Keating. My colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], has outlined that he served as a Member of this body for 6 years. His record exemplifies the objective and purpose he had in his lifetime. We in Colorado are proud of the leadership that Edward Keating demonstrated. This leadership started at an early age, as he was compelled to leave school and earn his own way. Within a short time he was being recognized by his fellow man. His willingness to work and his determination to do that which was good made him an outstanding person.

While a young man, he was first elected auditor of the county of Denver, and thereafter took an active part in civic affairs and helped bring about the amendment to our State constitution whereby the city and county governments of the city and county of Denver were combined as one unit. The activities of Mr. Keating resulted in great good to the people of the city and county of Denver. His understanding of people and his desire to help others naturally placed him in the political arena. He was the managing editor of the Rocky Mountain News in Denver and was fearless in his endeavor to publish all the news, and naturally performed acts for the benefit of the people.

The citizens of Colorado recognized his determination to be of assistance to them and he was elected to this body by all the people of the State of Colorado. Later, he was elected from the Third District, and while here continued his activities—particularly in the area of human rights. He brought about the passage of the 8-hour-day law and did not hesitate to speak up at any time on any subject that affected the people. He was a determined man, and this determination, with the aid and assistance of others, caused him to render great service to all the people so that those who may come after him in the future will enjoy the benefits for which he fought and which were obtained.

I extend my sympathy to his widow and surviving relatives.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado from the Third District.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it was never my good fortune to have known Edward Keating, yet I feel I knew, and still know, the substance of the man.

A year before his first term in the U.S. Congress, his own State of Colorado had just gone through a most difficult and bloody test of the right of labor to organize and strike.

It was a time when workingmen were determined to redress their grievances and to firmly establish their right to bargain collectively.

It was many years before my life began, but there are many here who now serve their country in these halls who do remember those struggles.

Edward Keating was one of the outstanding leaders of those days whose courage and talents weathered many, and often long and bitter disputes. He was one of many whose persistent efforts finally won the day and convinced the vast majority of the American people of the just cause of organized labor.

I say I have known and still know the substance of this man because, in our State of Colorado, the name of Edward Keating has long been a benchmark for a fair and responsible labor movement.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud Edward Keating came from our State of Colorado. I believe we are all better men because of him.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that anyone desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and services of Edward Keating

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

There was no objection.

SUPERIOR, WIS., ICE CURLING WORLD CHAMPIONS

Mr. O'KONSKI. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress we are graced with fine people who come to our sessions and watch our work. We are proud and happy to have them. Seldom, however, are our galleries graced with world champions. We have as our guests today world champions, four young men from Superior, Wis., who won the world championship ice curling tournament at Perth, Scotland, a few days ago. Coming from Superior and traveling all the way at their own expense, they competed against teams from Canada, Norway, Sweden, England, and Switzerland and brought home the bacon. It is the youngest team ever to win this world ice curling championship and the first team representing the United States that has won this championship.

We are proud to have these world champions with us. It is against the rules of the House to give them recognition, but in case you want to see what world champions look like, they are to my right wearing red coats, and coming from Superior, Wis.

ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 284, Rept. No. 200) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES 284

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3708) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging". After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Commitee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

QUALITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 285, Rept. No. 201) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 285

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed six hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit while the House is in session during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 245, Rept. No. 202) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

H. RES. 245

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, be authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations as required in connection with all matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee, including, but not limited to the following matters:

(1) The classification of all mail, postal rates, fees, and size and weight of all classes of mail.

(2) The administration, management, and operation of the Postal Establishment, mailability of articles and printed matter, generally including, among other things, the mailing of obscene matter and the mailing of unsolicited articles with request for payment or contribution.

(3) Personnel requirements manpower utilization throughout the Federal civil service.

(4) The purchase, lease, rental, use and modernization of land, buildings, vehicles, and equipment for the Postal Establishment, including research, development, and engineering programs related thereto.

(5) Compensation and other emoluments of Federal civil officers and employees.

(6) The administration of the civil service retirement, insurance, and health benefits programs.

(7) The United State Civil Service Commission and the Federal civil service generally.

(8) The activities of the Bureau of Census, National Archives, and the collection, reporting, and data processing activities of the Government generally.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), at such time or times during the present Congress as it deems appropriate, the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, or subcommittee, is authorized to sit and act during the present

Congress at such times and places within the United States whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or, in his absence, the vice chairman or any member of the committee designated by such chairman or, in his absence, the vice chairman and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or vice chairman or member.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and in compliance with section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. 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. 44]

Adams	Giaimo	Nedzi
Ashley	Goodell	Powell
Baring	Grabowski	Reid, N.Y.
Bonner	Green, Oreg.	Rivers, Alaska
Brown, Calif.	Gurney	Roosevelt
Buchanan	Hamilton	Roudebush
Callaway	Hansen, Wash.	Scheuer
Conable	Hays	Schisler
Curtin	Holifield	Sweeney
Dawson	Holland	Taylor
Dickinson	Jennings	Teague, Tex.
Dyal	Johnson, Okla.	Toll
Everett	Jones, Ala.	Vivian
Findley	Karth	Whalley
Frelinghuysen	May	Widnall
Friedel	Miller	Wolff
Fulton, Pa.	Moeller	Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 385 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6453) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and one-half to be controlled by myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6453, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, at this time we submit for your approval the annual District of Columbia appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1966.

It is a pleasure to be permitted to serve on this subcommittee with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from California [Mr. MCFALL], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE]. All of these gentlemen are outstanding Members of the House and have rendered excellent service as members of this subcommittee.

We carefully considered budget estimates totaling $387,467,800 for fiscal year 1966. We recommend that the sum of $356,300,500 be approved.

The amount recommended for fiscal year 1966 is the largest amount ever recommended by this committee for the District of Columbia budget. The amount that we recommend for fiscal year 1966 is $14,827,172 more than the total amount approved for fiscal year 1965 and $31,167,300 below the 1966 estimates.

The District of Columbia is financed out of five funds: a general fund, a highway fund, a water fund, a motor vehicle parking fund, and a sanitary sewage works fund.

We recommend, Mr. Chairman, a Federal contribution of $41 million for the general fund; $1,973,000 for the water fund, and $1,149,000 for the sanitary sewage works fund. The Federal payment requested for the general fund for fiscal year 1966 totaled $50 million.

Our committee was disappointed that, for the second consecutive year, an unbalanced budget was submitted by the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1966 requests. This budget was out of balance $21,800,000. This type of a budget of course is exceedingly difficult to resolve. The budget for fiscal year 1966 would have been a balanced budget if anticipated revenue to carry out this program, which depended upon enactment of legislation was consummated, and certain action required of the Commissioners concerning a raise in real estate taxes had taken place. The committee has made reductions and adjustments in the financing and appropriation requests so that it is possible to report out a budget that is in balance with reasonable estimated surpluses in each fund.

Our committee recommends $26,311,900 for loan authorization for capital outlay projects financed through the general fund, highway fund, and sanitary sewage works fund.

The committee recommends the sum of $20,323,000 for general operating expenses. This is an increase of $1,516,900 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1965 and $1,003,000 less than the budget estimates.

For public safety we recommend the sum of $76,998,000. This is an increase of $7,790,000 over fiscal year 1965 and a reduction of $585,600 in the estimates.

We carefully considered all requests for the Metropolitan Police Department. We have in our Capital City an excellent Police Department and an outstanding new Chief of Police. Our former Chief, Robert V. Murray, made an outstanding Chief of Police and certainly he will be missed by all of the people in Washington.

In 1963 the Police Department requested 56 additional police positions which Congress granted. In 1964 the Police Department requested 100 additional police positions which again the Congress granted. No additional policemen were requested for fiscal year 1965. For fiscal year 1966, 100 additional policemen were requested and we recommend that 100 new police privates be approved. Funds are included in the bill for this purpose. Total authorized police strength, as recommended in the bill, will be 3,100 in fiscal year 1966. The sum of $36,391,100 has been allowed for the Department during the next fiscal year. This is $48,700 less than requested and $3,895,700 above the 1965 allotment.

Our committee believes that a well lighted city is a deterrent to crime. We have stressed this matter all during the hearings and have approved adequate funds to start such a program. In addition, we believe that another major deterrent to crime is the patrolman on the beat.

Recruitment of patrolmen has certainly not been a success for the past several years. Our committee now understands that plans are being developed in conjunction with the Civil Service Commission to bring about a more effective recruitment program which, it is hoped, will alleviate this problem by the beginning of fiscal year 1966. Our committee believes that payment of funds to an officer on his day off for additional services is not good law enforcement, and during the hearings we stressed the fact that no part of the funds for the 100 additional patrolmen could be used for any purpose except payment of salaries and necessary expenses incident to this additional number of officers. We have agreed to go along with the practice for the balance of this fiscal year of paying officers on their days off for additional services. This practice has extended for too long a time in the District of Columbia and should be stopped.

We have 86 man-dog teams in the Capital City and 6 teams are in training. Legislation is now pending which lifts the ceiling concerning the number of

man-dog teams that may be in service in the District.

The FBI crime index for our Nation's Capital for the first 6 months of 1964 showed an increase of 34.7 percent over the same period in 1963. This, of course, is a serious matter when you consider the fact that the rate of increase throughout the Nation for this period of time was only 15 percent.

Notwithstanding the fact that there are now 104 vacancies in the Police Department, we still believe that the taxpayers of our Capital City and our visitors to our Nation's Capital are entitled to good law enforcement and, therefore, we recommend the 100 additional patrolmen.

In order to have good law enforcement in the city of Washington, we must have the complete and full cooperation of the citizens of the District and also our courts. Our Police Department solves its cases and if the defendant is proven guilty, an adequate sentence should be meted out. There would be fewer crimes in the District of Columbia if the sentences were adequate. On page 576 of the hearings, you will find certain facts concerning only a few cases where adequate sentences certainly were not received by guilty defendants. From time to time inquiries have been made concerning the reasons for our failure to have better law enforcement in the District of Columbia and on each occasion, as chairman of this subcommittee, I have said that one of the major reasons is inadequate sentences.

We are not proud of the fact that during the year of 1964 we had 28,469 serious offenses committed in our Capital City.

Under no circumstances should children in our Capital City go hungry, or qualified welfare recipients suffer. Today our welfare program is one of our more serious problems. With unemployment in the metropolitan area totaling only 2.2 percent, certainly all welfare programs should be carefully considered.

This Department administers all public assistance programs in the District. This includes the four federally aided categories of the aged, the blind, the disabled, and dependent children. In addition, the Department of Welfare administers a program of general public assistance at District expense.

In this bill, we recommend the adoption of the program for needy children of unemployed fathers. At this time, the Department of Welfare has under its care some 6,000 children. This includes children in foster homes, under care in their own homes, and also children in institutions.

We recommend the sum of $79,485,000 for health and welfare programs in the coming year. This is an increase of $4,815,000 over current year appropriations and $1,834,000 less than the budget request.

Our committee recommends $27,984,100 for the Department of Public Welfare for fiscal year 1966. This is an increase of $2,447,525 over the current year and only $685,400 less than requested. We recommend a total of $341,753 for the program of aid for dependent children of unemployed parents.

We believe that every time money is appropriated to complete a new building at Junior Village, this, to that extent, admits defeat. Every consideration should be given to placing as many children as possible in foster homes. Institutionalizing children such as those at Junior Village is not conducive to making good citizens. Such an institution warps the very nature of the child and certainly every consideration should be given to reducing the population at Junior Village.

We recommend $50,757,600 for the Department of Public Health for fiscal year 1966. This is an increase of $2,346,175 over fiscal year 1965 and $1,088,600 less than budget estimates.

Venereal disease, tuberculosis, and infant mortality are a few of the major problems now confronting our Department of Public Health.

The drug situation at District of Columbia General Hospital is not fully under control and certainly every precaution should be taken to see that thousands of dollars worth of drugs are no longer stolen from this institution.

Our committee recommends an appropriation of $74,740,000 for the operation of the public school system during the next fiscal year.

This is an increase of $6,507,200 over the current year and $3,244,000 less than the budget estimates.

Our temporary teacher problem in the District of Columbia is one of the serious problems in the Department of Education. Today some 40 percent of our teachers are temporary and this means that they have not passed the qualifying examination for permanent status or their academic preparation is technically deficient under School Board rules.

Throughout the hearings we were confronted with terrific increases in the Department of Education. Upon questioning Dr. Hanson concerning this matter, he admitted that a number of increases were terrific. On pages 1098 and 1099 of the hearings may be found testimony concerning this matter. Increases of 98 music teachers and 99 teachers in the health and physical education department were only 2 examples of the terrific increases demanded by the Department of Education. Today there are 18 music teachers in the elementary schools and 98 additional were requested; 17 physical education teachers, and 99 additional requested. With the budget out of balance and with $90,863,122 expended for the Department of Education from 1956 through 1965 for new school construction and for permanent improvements, this is right unusual procedure.

In addition, the District of Columbia today has a much better pupil-teacher ratio than 5 years ago and ranks with the top 10 on school construction during the past 10 years. Unusual and terrific demands for increases in this department can mean only one thing.

Problems relating to education are serious in our Capital City and this certainly has been recognized by our committee down through the years. Fifty-eight new teachers were requested in the elementary schools for grades 1 to 6 and we recommend 58. Four additional kindergarten teachers for elementary schools were requested, and we recommend four. Nineteen additional basic and occupational teachers were requested and we recommend 19. In our elementary schools, 327 teachers were requested and we recommended 140. In our junior high schools, 45 new teachers were requested, and we recommend 37. For regular academic and art in our junior high schools, 28 new positions were requested and we recommend 28. In our senior high schools, 59 new teachers were requested for regular academic and art and we recommend 59. For shop and home economics, four new teachers were requested, and we recommend four. Of the total positions requested for fiscal year 1956, the 274 approved by our committee will be adequate for fiscal year 1966.

For parks and recreation, the committee recommends a total appropriation of $10,555,000 for operation and maintenance of the various parks and recreational facilities under the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia during the next fiscal year. This allowance is $532,000 less than requested, but $761,000 above the current appropriation.

For highways and traffic, we recommend the sum of $13,989,000 for fiscal year 1966. This is an increase of $411,000 over the current year and $24,000 less than the budget request. In this Department we have 173 vacancies. No additional positions are requested.

Mr. Chairman, in speaking of vacancies in the District of Columbia government departments, we find that as of January 31, 1965, there were 1,189 vacancies in all of the departments and the budget request for fiscal year 1966 called for 1,848 new positions. This is right unusual procedure, to say the least. The total positions authorized on January 31, 1965, totaled 29,242.

The problems relating to the highway program in the District of Columbia have again been thoroughly examined by our committee. We are still of the opinion, Mr. Chairman, that any effort to bring important highway projects in the District to a complete halt is a serious mistake. Further, we believe that in order to meet the tremendous day-to-day growth of traffic in Washington, we must carry the highway program along with any and all proposals concerning a rapid transit system. By virtue of delay, a number of highway projects will now cost hundreds of thousands of dollars more. In examining the Highway Department capital outlay request this fact was fully developed.

For sanitary engineering, we recommend a total of $22,498,000 for the operation of the Department of Sanitary Engineering and the Washington Aqueduct during the ensuing fiscal year. This is $748,000 more than was appropriated for fiscal year 1965 and is $476,000 below the 1966 estimates.

We recommend a total of $50,521,900 for capital outlay projects in the coming year. This is $8,140,100 less than the amount available for 1965 and $23,468,700 less than the budget request for 1966.

For public schools we had 37 requests for replacements, additions, permanent improvements, and site acquisitions. We recommend that the 17 capital outlay requests set forth on page 22 of the report be approved.

We recommend that the three capital outlay requests for the public library be approved.

We recommend that 6 out of the 16 capital outlay requests for the Recreation Department be approved.

For the Police Department, we recommend that the two capital outlay requests be approved.

For the Fire Department, we recommend that the two projects requested be approved.

For the Department of Public Health we recommend that the project for District of Columbia General be approved.

For the Department of Corrections, we recommend that two of the five capital outlay requests be approved.

Under Department of Public Welfare, we recommend that nine of the capital outlay requests be approved.

For the Department of Buildings and Grounds, we recommend that five of the six projects requested be approved.

For the Department of Highways and Traffic, we recommend that 12 of the 18 projects requested be approved.

For our Motor Vehicle Parking Agency we recommend that one of the two capital outlay requests be approved.

For the Department of Sanitary Engineering, we recommend that 14 of the 20 projects requested be approved. All of the capital outlay requests are set forth on pages 22–25 of the report.

Mr. Chairman, our committee recommends this bill to the members of the Committee.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to return to the statement of the gentleman regarding the increase in the crime rate in Washington, D.C. Do I understand that all over the Nation, in the big cities, small towns and country places, embracing the whole country, that the increase in the crime rate was 15 percent?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAHON. But the increase in Washington was 34 percent?

Mr. NATCHER. It is 34.7 percent.

Mr. MAHON. The point the gentleman makes is that the crime rate in cities comparable to Washington is much higher than the national average?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAHON. The increase in the crime rate is higher in cities somewhat comparable in size to Washington, such as St. Louis, Chicago, Los Angeles, or Houston, Tex., and has gone up faster in recent months than in the country generally?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct. In those cities they have the same problem we are having today in our Capital City.

Mr. MAHON. I want to commend the gentleman and the subcommittee for the very workmanlike job that has been done on this bill and the effort the committee has made to do the best possible job for the fine citizens of this community and the Congress.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There are two points that are commonly overlooked in regard to this crime picture. One is that the District is the core of a large metropolitan area. If you compare crime statistics here with those in the core area of other cities, it will be found that the crime rate is as bad in other cities as it is here?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Looking at crime statistics alone does not tell how good the Police Department is either because those crime committed statistics do not reflect the clearance of crimes by the Police Department. The crimes are committed, by criminals but the job of the Police Department is to apprehend the guilty parties. Because there has been an increase in crimes committed does not reflect badly on the Police Department necessarily?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct.

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

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

Mr. McFALL. In reference to the last statement made by the gentleman from Iowa, on page 575 of our hearings is a table showing percentage of crimes solved. The increase for the Police Department of the District of Columbia is far above the national average. The national average for cities of over 250,000, in percentage of offenses cleared, indicates the Police Department here is doing better than an average job.

Mr. NATCHER. I concur in the gentleman's statement.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to commend the gentleman from Kentucky and his subcommittee for the very fine job they did, not only this year, but in prior years, and for the thoroughness in which they have conducted the hearings and the fairness with which they have acted. The gentleman is on other subcommittees, including one on which I happen to serve. They take the time to do a good job for the people of the District of Columbia, including all of us who reside here, and it is a good job for the country as a whole. I do not know how they could be in better hands than in the hands of the gentleman from Kentucky and the members of this subcommittee.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman's comment about temporary schoolteachers strikes a responsive note. I cannot recall whether it was on a discussion of an appropriation bill or some other bill from the District of Columbia, but a year ago there was a discussion of giving increased fringe benefits to the teachers in the District of Columbia. At that time I raised the subject of 37 percent of the teachers in the District of Columbia holding temporary certificates.

Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that as of now the percentage has increased to 40?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman understood the statement correctly. I recall distinctly that the gentleman from Iowa took the floor and inquired about this matter several years ago.

Yes, Mr. GROSS, I hate to inform you that today 40 percent are temporary teachers.

Mr. GROSS. How in the world can this sort of situation go on? I was surprised the other day to read of the thousands of illiterates in the District of Columbia and I could not help but relate it, although I do not know exactly what effect it may have, to the teacher situation in the District of Columbia. It must have some effect on the situation.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is exactly correct.

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

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that the members of our subcommittee and our full Committee on Appropriations feel that this is one of the major problems confronting the Board of Education. We believe the children here in our Capital City are entitled teachers who can pass an examination and meet all of the requirements.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my distinguished friend from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman touched on a subject which arose last year when we had a bill to increase the compensation of school teachers in the District of Columbia. As I remember it, at that time 34 percent of the teachers were said to be noncredited public schoolteachers. When we went to conference with the other body on that bill—and I am sure the gentleman from Kentucky will remember our discussion at the time—some of us undertook to provide or to get the conferees to provide that noncredited teachers would not be eligible for the pay increases. We were not able to do that, but we did put into the conference report the statement that a study would be made in this session of Congress of this problem.

It was of interest to me to note—and I am sure the gentleman from Kentucky

heard this in his hearings—that many of these so-called temporary teachers have been teaching continuously for 20 or more years. Certainly, without being penal in our attitude, the time has come when we are going to have to take the position in order for a teacher to get pay increases and retirement and other benefits that now accrue to them, they are going to have to have enough energy and interest to meet these qualification standards which the school districts in most States of the Nation require the teacher to meet. I do not believe it will be any unfair hardship on the schoolteacher to say, for example, that you cannot teach for longer than 3 or 5 years unless you have attained the certification which is necessary to be a qualified teacher. I hope the gentleman will address himself to that in his committee in the future, and I am hoping Congress generally will pay some attention to it.

Mr. NATCHER. I want to thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL].

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I know of no information that was given to us in our hearings indicating that the Board of Education purposely hires temporary teachers when they can get fully certificated teachers. This is a problem in the District of Columbia as it is all over the country. There is a competition for good teachers. I am sure that the Board of Education would be hiring fully certified teachers if they could get them. They can only get so many and they have to fill in with teachers who are not fully certified.

Mr. NATCHER. As the gentleman from California knows, our subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations believe every assistance should be given to Dr. Hansen and the Board of Education to see that we no longer have temporary teachers.

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

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I should like to commend him for the energetic and thoughtful job which he and his associates have done.

I am concerned about the cut in the request for library books and for librarians for the District.

Recently my wife and I had occasion to present to one of the District public elementary schools an overage and obsolete encyclopedia that my children have outgrown and we were disturbed to find that the elementary school to which we presented these ragged old books not only had no library and no library books, but that the only place they could put these old encyclopedias was in the school boilerroom.

I have had the Library of Congress prepare for me some comparative figures on library books, and I find that in the District of Columbia each student, elementary or high school, has 1.3 library books. In St. Louis each student has 2 books; in Los Angeles 2.4 books; in New York 3 books; and in New Orleans 4.1 books.

That shows that the District libraries are indeed at the low end of the national totem pole.

I find, too, that only some 8 of the 140 elementary schools in the District now have libraries and that the annual District expenditure of 50 cents for an elementary pupil and $1 for a high school pupil per year for library books is drastically below the rockbottom minimum of $4 per student that the American Library Association recommends.

I am saddened, therefore, that the committee felt constrained to cut the request for books by about one-third and felt itself constrained to grant only 23 additional librarians out of the 71 asked. I well recognize the constraints under which the committee is operating, caused by the fact that a new tax bill for the District has, unfortunately, not been forthcoming.

I would ask the gentleman from Kentucky if, in the event that additional taxes are authorized for the District, he and his subcommittee will be in a position to take a new look at this real need of the children of the District.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin that certainly every consideration will be given to any request presented to our committee. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for his interest in our Capital City.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman and I hope that the alarming illiteracy rate in the District, the fact that "Johnny can't read" in so many areas, will be at least partly remedied in the future by a more meaningful contribution to libraries, librarians, and library books.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the legislative Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, first I want to congratulate personally the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations, and the members of his subcommittee for the fine work they have done in bringing this bill to the floor of the House where every penny can be explained and clear statements made as to how the funds will be expended by the District of Columbia. I know that the gentleman has a tough problem.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall that two Congresses ago you requested the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to submit proposed legislation to the House District Committee for specific authority for many items of expenditure which have been appropriated throughout the years but for which no authorization has been provided by statute.

We discussed this when the District of Columbia appropriation bill was before the House in the last Congress, at which time I reserved a point of order against the continued inclusion of these items when there is no specific legislative authority therefor.

A year ago we asked the Commissioners for submission of these items in detail, as there were more than 100 in number. Just within the last month or two have we started receiving from the Commissioners specific drafts of bills and recommendations giving us the necessary information, of which, of course, because of the late submissions to us by the Commissioners, we have not had an opportunity to legislate.

May I ask the gentleman how many of these more than 100 items are included in the present appropriation bill?

Is an item included for the Central Violations Bureau? If so, how much? Does this provide for any increase this year due to the additional burden being placed upon the Bureau and Corporation Counsel's Office in connection with the handling of traffic tickets for the Commissioners in their order of November 10, 1964? Is there an item included in this legislation for the Council on Home Relations? As you know this started as a private grant and subsequently was given sanction by the Commissioners, but has not been legally authorized by any proper legislative statute.

I do not intend to press a point of order at this time in spite of the fact that I have previously served notice. But, I am most concerned, and our committee is most concerned, about the continuing appropriation for matters not provided by authorization legislation.

The Comissioners have shown no cooperation whatsoever for nearly a year in helping the committee to solve the, in effect, illegal situation by which these appropriations are being made, and at the earliest opportunity our committee will have specific hearings on the many and various items involved. Many of these the Comissioners now contend no further legislative enactment is necessary.

This, of course, would have to be determined by the committee and, of course, by the Congress when these matters are presented by our committee for the consideration of the Congress.

I want to make it clear that neither I, nor the House District Committee, approve the continued practice of appropriating funds for agencies which have not been authorized by valid statute.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his statement.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. I feel that the RECORD ought to show at this point in connection with the number—the alarming number—of teachers holding temporary certificates in the District of Columbia. I feel that we ought to have these figures taken from the hearings which were held by the gentleman's subcommittee and inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The document follows:

Tenure status of teachers in District of Columbia public schools—School years 1956–57 through 1964–65 [1]

School year	Teachers in service in October each year						Total in service	
	Temporary		Probationary		Permanent			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1956–57	756	19.1	364	9.2	2,830	71.7	3,950	100
1957–58	912	22.2	359	8.7	2,838	69.1	4,109	100
1958–59	1,092	25.7	323	7.6	2,836	66.7	4,251	100
1959–60	1,250	28.6	303	6.9	2,815	64.5	4,368	100
1960–61	1,346	29.4	454	9.9	2,783	60.7	4,583	100
1961–62	1,531	32.1	499	10.5	2,732	57.4	4,762	100
1962–63	1,658	33.3	549	11.1	2,767	55.6	4,974	100
1963–64 Oct. 1963	1,625	32.2	580	11.5	2,836	56.3	5,041	100
1963–64 Mar. 1964 [2]	1,995	37.1	552	10.3	2,822	52.6	5,369	100
1964–65	2,258	40.0	410	7.3	2,970	52.7	5,638	100

[1] Includes counselors, librarians, research assistants, school psychologists, speech correctionists, and itinerant teachers, as well as regular classroom teachers.

[2] March 1964 figures show number of teachers for 1963–64, including those filling new positions appropriated in 1964 (positions which were not available until January 1964).

EXPLANATORY NOTE

Although the total number of full-time teachers in service has increased by 42.7 percent since 1956–57, the number on permanent status is more than it was 8 years ago. The number on probationary status, after declining steadily for 3 years, turned moderately upward for 4 years, and declined sharply this year. On the other hand, the number of temporary teachers is approximately three times the 1956–57 figure and now constitutes 40 percent of the entire teaching staff.

Many good teachers are temporary because they fail to meet one or more technical requirements and, therefore, have not taken the usual qualifying examinations, or because they do not expect to remain here long and so do not wish to attain permanent status. Also, some teachers must be employed on a temporary basis to fill temporary positions and to replace permanent teachers who are on leave of absence. Nevertheless, the proportion of our teachers on temporary status is too high for optimum service to the community, and steps should be taken to attract more teachers who can and will qualify for permanent service in our schools.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, in 1956 and 1957, which is less than 10 years ago, 19 percent of the teachers held temporary certificates in the District of Columbia as compared with 40 percent today. This is an unbelievable increase in the number of teachers holding temporary certificates in view of the amount of money that has been expended in the District of Columbia apparently for the education of teachers and for the education of those who would enter the teaching profession.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is quite right to say to this Committee that something ought to be done about the Appropriations Committee, because I do not believe that we can write legislation limiting the number of years, without it being subject to a point of order on the floor of the House. It seems to me that this is something that the District of Columbia Committee ought to get into, and promptly.

Mr. NATCHER. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for his statement.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a very detailed exposition of this appropriation bill by our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], which leaves very little to be said except by way of emphasis and by way of expressing support of the position of our subcommittee which he has so well outlined for us.

We have found this chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]—and I believe anyone who has served with the gentleman will back up these words—a man of great understanding. This understanding was particularly necessary this year because on our side of the aisle both of us were new Members with respect to the work of this particular subcommittee assignment. It took a great deal of patience on the part of the gentleman from Kentucky to permit us to get that groundwork information, much of which does not appear in the printed hearings at all, in order that we could arrive at conclusions which we believe are fair and just with respect to these various requested appropriations.

Our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, is a very liberal man when it comes to courtesy both with respect to those who appear before the subcommittee and with respect to his colleagues upon the subcommittee. He is a very rightist man when it comes to the judgments that need to be made with respect to money.

I use the word "rightist" not in any sense a connotation of the political spectrum, but rather in the connotation of right thinking. I believe his judgment has been proper in every instance where judgment has been required in bringing this bill before you today.

I think an examination of the committee report will serve to convince you it is a very detailed report, and a very explanatory report, and in it you can find the answers to a good many questions that it might otherwise be necessary to ask with respect to specific requests for appropriated funds.

The chairman has spoken for the entire subcommittee in all of the major areas of funding we have had to consider. There are a few things I would like to emphasize.

First of all, with respect to the highway program, you will note that the committee has indicated its desire to provide funds for the expediting of the interstate program as it affects the District of Columbia. I think we had an impression, and I guess we can only qualify that as an impression, that perhaps there has been a little griping from sources with respect to this program, some people taking the position that perhaps we will not need to go ahead with this now that we are going to get the rapid transit system. We do not have the rapid transit system, and I take it those who look upon this as an alternative to the orderly and timely completion of the Interstate Highway System as it affects the District of Columbia are taking a remarkably shortsighted point of view. This, after all, is the seat of our Federal Government. It is not just a place of residence of the people of the District of Columbia. The people of the entire Nation are entitled to expect rapid and direct ingress and egress to the seat of their Government. That does require the development of the Interstate System as it has been programed.

The only exception to our implementation of the interstate program as it affects the District is the so-called third 14th Street Bridge. The elimination of funds there does not reflect a desire of our subcommittee to overlook our difficulties there, but only a recognition of the fact they are not ready to proceed. The points of difference have not been resolved timely to permit construction in this upcoming fiscal year. I believe I am speaking for the members of the subcommittee in expressing the desire that we expect to see this request for funds come back in the next fiscal year so that there can be an implementation of this further step in the development of the Interstate System as it affects this area.

The chairman of the subcommittee spoke about the matter of crime in the District of Columbia. This is something about which men and women can become emotional, it is something about which there has been a great deal of publicity all over the country. We must face the fact that money alone is not going to solve the problem of crime prevention and deterrence here in the District of Columbia. Insofar as money will do it, this year's appropriation for the District of Columbia—at least, insofar as recommended by this subcommittee—assures it will be done. This was the philosophy that caused the approval of 100 new privates for the Police Department, and it caused some words to be put in the record and in the report to encourage a better lighting system as a deterrent to crime.

But I think there is a third factor, probably, that we cannot do anything about with money, and that is the removal of the sense of futility that sometimes does creep upon our enforcement officers—the sense of futility that arises in the minds of an original arresting officer—when so often, thinking that he is doing his duty, the officer makes an arrest but somewhere along the line the man or the defendant goes scot-free, or that somewhere along the line even though a person might be found guilty, he is given a very light tap on the wrist and then 6 months later comes back to

the same neighborhood to haunt the law enforcement officers in that particular part of the District of Columbia.

Another part of this appropriation which is most susceptible to emotional attack is in the field of education. There I think that those charged with the responsibility for the administration of this program have got to do a better job of dealing man to man across the table with the members of this subcommittee. It does not do their cause any good when we find a list of priorities or projects established for submission to our subcommittee, and then to read in the local press that a meeting has been held in some part of the District of Columbia and that some of the people high in the administration of the schools of the District of Columbia have encouraged these people to come in and put on the heat for low-priority projects.

In other words, these are high-priority projects and that is the purpose when they first come up but be sure that they do not limit themselves to that when they have a chance through the back door to come in and put the heat on for projects that cannot be justified as priority projects.

I submit to those charged with that responsibility that they will get much better cooperation and understanding from those of us who sit on the other side of the table when we feel that they are dealing with us as man to man and dealing with us as men. We think that we are dealing with them as men so far as we are concerned on our side of the table, when they deal with us in supporting and maintaining their priorities and their requests for education funds before this committee.

I think finally I would suggest that we could do a better job with this appropriation request if there were somewhere along the line a tighter system of budgetary controls for the District of Columbia. I could not help but feel that we had before us a number of requests that were put there at the insistence of people who are not charged with the daily responsibility of the management of the affairs of the District of Columbia. I think we frequently had the feeling we were not being dealt with in the candor to which we are entitled because instructions had come from someplace outside the government of the District of Columbia as to what these men who are charged with that daily responsibility in the District of Columbia should ask for.

Then there were instances, of course, where we had no control. This Congress had spoken in terms of authorizations that did not permit us to exercise what our judgment felt it should be. For instance, we find ourselves committed to paying $192,500 to the Redevelopment Land Agency, a Federal agency where the contract had been made and there just was not anything that we could do about it even though we felt quite resentful about it. But the Congress last year had said that this Federal agency was to be paid by the District of Columbia for providing expert help in finding places to live for people who might be dispossessed by reason of public projects here within the District of Columbia.

I should like to be accurate about this, Mr. Chairman, and I believe it is an accurate statement. It was quite surprising to me, at least, to find that we are paying just about as much for the experts to help people find places to live if they are dispossessed as we are paying for the actual expenses of moving those people physically with their household goods.

Is that a fair statement, I ask the Chairman?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It is something we could feel frustrated about, but we found there was nothing we could do about it.

I am certain that Members of this body have been subjected, in many cases, to the same pressures to which we on the subcommittee have been subjected. I hope, before Members yield to any such pressures and attempt to increase any of the funds which are included in the bill, that they will keep in mind another fact. We have already provided for the utilization of every dollar provided for fundraising under the present laws of the District of Columbia. In other words, there is only one way that Members of this body can increase the appropriations in this bill, and that is to increase the amount of the Federal payment included in it. I hope that anyone who may have believed there was some pretty good reason to increase an appropriation in this bill somewhere along the line, if he considers offering an amendment to do so, will consider offering a companion amendment to increase the Federal payment to the District of Columbia, because that is the only way it can be done.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the ranking minority member of the legislative committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. NELSEN. I noted from the report that additional money has been earmarked for vocational education. I should like to compliment the committee for the direction in which it is moving relative to that particular and very important phase of education.

I spent some time visiting some of the schools in the District of Columbia, and I wish to say that one area which I believe needs to be expanded—I feel sure that Members on both sides of the aisle would agree to support a move in that direction—is the field of vocational education. That field is expanding rapidly and the opportunities are extensive in that field. I hope that in the future we may give some thought to a junior college or to an expansion of vocational education in the school system.

I believe the gentleman might like to comment on that at this point. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I cannot comment from experience. As the gentleman knows, this is my first year on this subcommittee. I did receive the feeling from members of the subcommittee who had served before that this probably has been one of the more neglected areas in the development of a well-rounded educational program for the District of Columbia. Members who served on the subcommittee before—particularly the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky—recognize the need for development in this area to round out the program. They are the ones responsible for the increases in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say initially that as a new member of the Committee on Appropriations it has been a great pleasure for me to serve on this subcommittee with the distinguished chairman and with my ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin, as well as Mr. McFALL, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. GIAIMO.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with all of these colleagues in bringing the District of Columbia appropriation bill for fiscal year 1966 for the approval of this body today. It is a good budget that we are submitting to the House. It is a thoughtful budget and I would note it is an ample budget, greatly expanded from last year's appropriation.

In fiscal year 1965, a total appropriation for the District of Columbia came to $341,473,328. In fiscal year 1966 we are recommending an increase of $14,827,172 over last year's appropriation, exclusive of supplemental requests still pending.

I submit to the committee this is a substantial increase in the District's budget. The House and the committee has had before it the report we submitted for its study. I would merely point to a few items in this budget which I feel should be considered at this time.

In submitting its estimate, as the subcommittee pointed out, the District requested an increase in positions totaling 1,848. According to testimony presented, there are 1,189 vacancies in the work force at the present time. It was therefore felt that such a total increase was unnecessary and unwise.

In presenting this budget, as the report shows, the District showed a deficit of $21,800,000 based on an estimated Federal contribution of $50 million. This represents an increase in the Federal payment of nearly $12.5 million. The increase that we are recommending is an increase that is substantial—$3.5 million. We were particularly sensitive to the problem of crime in the District of Columbia, which is our Nation's Capital. Crime has risen in the District at the rate of 42 percent as against a 15 percent nationwide increase. In view of this disturbing situation, the committee recommended an additional 100 policemen to the District police force this year, just as the committee allowed the full number requested in 1963 and in 1964. There was no request for an increase in 1965. The committee expects, and this House, I am sure, will join in that expectation, that a program of recruitment will be initiated to get the necessary personnel for our Metropolitan Police force so that this rise in crime may be brought to a halt in our capital. It is our belief that more

work in the field of recruiting is necessary, and we hope it is pursued with diligence.

The committee was also conscious of the fact that education is vital, not only for the future of the individual children of the District but also in controlling the crime rate of today and tomorrow. I have already noted that an increase of 1,848 positions was requested while 1,189 vacancies still existed in the personnel rosters. In authorizing the total of 780 new positions it should be noted that 402 of these new positions, or more than 50 percent, will be created in the area of education. Two hundred and seventy-four of these will be teachers, an increase which will bring the teacher-pupil ratio more in line with desirable national standards.

In fiscal year 1965 the total appropriation of $68,232,800 was allotted for the administration and operation of the school system. The committee is recommending an increase of $6,507,200 in fiscal year 1966, or a total of $74,740,000 for the coming year. This represents an increase of approximately 10 percent from fiscal 1965 to fiscal 1966 in the area of administration and operation.

In the Department of Public Welfare, with a total budget of $27,984,100, an increase of $2,447,525 over the fiscal year 1965, the committee was particularly sensitive to the request to establish a program of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents.

As Commissioner Duncan remarked in noting that the District has a lower rate of unemployment than many States, you cannot determine hunger by the number of people unemployed. One hungry child is just as hungry as another child whether he is 1 of 100 or 1 of 1 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McDADE. As the representative of a district where many of our children have gone hungry because of unemployment, I am most sensitive on this point and would point to an item in the budget which provides for 32 positions in this work, operating under a budget of $341,753 for a 6-month period.

I shall not belabor the House with a detailed breakdown of each of the areas of the budget. The excellent summary of this budget is before this committee in the report. I would point out, however, that the Federal payments to the District of Columbia are substantially more than the $41 million noted in this appropriation.

There are 55 other programs in which both the Federal Government and the District government participate jointly. These range through school programs, public health programs, vocational rehabilitation programs, public welfare programs, highway and traffic programs, sanitary engineering programs, civil defense programs, urban renewal programs, library programs, and other miscellaneous fields of activity. These are programs with which all of the Members of the House are familiar. These are the same programs in which all of our States participate. The total contribution of the District of Columbia in these programs is estimated to aggregate $100,766,592 in addition to the $41 million already mentioned in my opening statement.

I would certainly recommend to all the members of the committee to study the report and the hearings on this appropriation bill. I believe they will join my colleagues and me in the belief that this is a prudent, good, and generous budget within the framework of which the District of Columbia should be able to operate very well indeed over the next fiscal year.

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

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

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I commend my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, my congressional neighbor, on the statement he has made and I should like to associate myself with his remarks. As a fellow freshman on the great Committee on Appropriations I have some knowledge of how hard the gentleman has had to work on this particular portion of the budget and how diligently he has performed his task. I know that he will go forward and make a worthwhile contribution to the work of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. McDADE. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend my colleague and chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, for his usual careful and considered work on this budget. This is my third year on his subcommittee, and I value highly the experience which it has afforded me.

Our subcommittee has produced a bill which I feel will adequately serve the District of Columbia. Of special importance is our continued insistence on the inclusion of the aid to dependent children of unemployed parents. As this House well knows, our efforts to include this provision have met with continued—and what I consider to be unreasonable—objections from the other body. It is my earnest hope that the objections to this program will be resolved this year and that the District will be able to fulfill its obligations to an important segment of its population. To me, it is senseless to deny the residents of the District benefits which are available to other U.S. citizens. This is a program which is in effect throughout much of the country, and there is no reason why it should not be in effect here, where it is sorely needed.

I would also like to call attention to the money provided for the Shakespeare Festival. This is a project which I feel is important, and most meaningful.

There are many other worthwhile projects which are included in this budget. I do not feel it necessary to detail them, since our distinguished chairman has already done so. I do wish, however, to urge my colleagues in this House to support this bill. Although each of us may wish to increase certain items, it is important to remember the budget as a whole. Our committee has endeavored to balance needs and means, and I believe that the result is basically a good one.

Again, my congratulations and admiration to our esteemed colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this is the first in the long series of appropriations bills that will occupy our attention almost weekly until late in June. We will have the 12 regular appropriations bills and one supplemental, and we will determine in large measure how more than $94 billion collected from the people of the United States—your constituents and mine—are going to be spent. We will determine how much more we are going to add to the debt of future American generations. The House has no heavier constitutional responsibility than its control of the purse strings of this Nation. We have no moral obligation greater than the obligation to exercise prudence in the expenditure of the public money. I hope we will have a good attendance during the debate on each of these appropriations so that all Members will have a thorough understanding of the magnitude of our expenditures. I pray that such an understanding will have a sobering effect on those who sponsor new spending programs, for I feel very strongly that we are too inclined in the House to embrace costly new programs, and many of them are very desirable indeed, without studying their relationship to the fiscal problems of our Nation. The time has come when we must learn to distinguish between our needs and our wants, and I should think that strict attention to the problems of financing our needs might induce a measure of self-restraint when we consider the new and very costly proposals that are supposed to lead us into a Great Society.

It seems to me that a word is in order about the extent of congressional control over the budget and over the expenditures that are made in any given year. An understanding of our limitations in these respects should also help us in controlling the urge to underwrite every expensive new service suggested for our citizens.

With regard to expenditures, we should always bear in mind that the President has a large bank account on which to draw—an account made up of authorities to spend granted in previous years. There is over $96 billion in that bank account today, and to the extent that the President will spend in any year amounts authorized in previous years, the current Congress has no practical control. It has

been almost 20 years since Congress rescinded any significant amount of obligational authority granted to the executive branch. In the so-called $99.7 billion spending budget for the next fiscal year, Mr. Johnson includes $27.6 billion, more than one-fourth, from his checking account of unspent authorizations from the Congress, and over this we have no control.

Our control is limited in several other respects. For example, interest charges on the public debt amounting to over $11½ billion in the next fiscal year must be paid. We cannot change this item in the appropriations process. Control is very limited insofar as the defense expenditures are concerned, and they account for about one-half the total budget. We are obligated to provide the sums necessary for veterans' benefits, the Commodity Credit Corporation operations and payments to the States for public assistance and related programs. These amount to another $12 or $13 billion. Taken altogether, these items make up about three-fourths of the budget over which we have little or no control in the appropriations process.

It seems to me that these facts emphasize the importance of a very critical examination of every other item in the budget, as well as the necessity for restraint when new authorizations are proposed.

I mentioned the $99.7 billion that the President proposes to spend in the next fiscal year. This is the administrative budget, and it is the figure that has been given headline treatment as proof of the prudence and economy of our President. I can well understand why citizens are pleased with the announcement that our spending will be under $100 billion for one more year, but it is very misleading to place undue emphasis on this figure. It is downright dangerous to do so if it encourages citizens or Members of Congress to relax and ignore the much larger figure that the President requests in new obligational authority.

He wants to build up that $96 billion checking account by $5 billion.

He proposes to spend $99.7 billion, but he asks us to authorize a total of $112.5 billion, $6 billion of it to be added to the authorizations already enacted for the current fiscal year by the last session of Congress.

As both the Director of the Budget Bureau and the Secretary of the Treasury agreed in our recent hearings, we are going to break the $100 billion barrier with a bang in fiscal 1967 and 1968 if we grant all of the new authority the President is requesting in this budget. If we think we have been on a spending spree in the past 4 years—and expenditures have risen at the rate of $5 billion per year since Mr. Eisenhower retired—just hold your hats and let the calendar turn a time or two. The trend of obligations incurred by the Federal agencies makes this quite clear. In recent years our obligations incurred have exceeded actual expenditures by relatively small amounts, $1 or $2 billion. But if the President gets his way, obligations for the current year will be nearly $11 billion greater than expenditures, and $8 billion greater next year, and if we permit the President to assume these obligations, some future session of Congress will have to pay the bills. There is every indication that the President intends to use his reserve spending authority at an increasingly rapid rate.

The Secretary of the Treasury foresees the possibility of a balanced budget in 3 years if business activity continues at its present level and if spending increases at the rate of only $2 or $3 billion. This is a rosy dream, indeed. It was my understanding that the leaders of the administration and the leadership in Congress pledged themselves to use the benefits of the tax reduction for reducing the debt. Instead, we are faced with a deficit of $6.3 billion this year and $5.3 billion next.

The theory behind the new fiscal policy seems to be that we must plan big budget deficits to prevent even bigger budget deficits. Nevertheless, on the argument that the "1966 administrative budget deficit of $5.3 billion is $1 billion lower than the 1965 deficit," the administration concludes that we are making "continued progress toward a balanced budget." This is the kind of progress we can get along without.

President Johnson's argument bespeaking a soon-to-be-realized balanced budget is unconvincing, and he is just playing ducks and drakes with the taxpayers to hold out any rosy hopes.

True, his estimated 1966 deficit is $1 billion lower than his revised estimate of the 1965 deficit. But it is $400 million more than his original estimate last year for the 1965 deficit. And if he has underestimated the 1966 deficit by the same amount, as I suspect he has, it will be $6.7 billion—or more than the $6.3 billion now estimated for 1965. Mr. Johnson's assurance may prove to be as much a will-o'-the-wisp as Franklin D. Roosevelt's of November 29, 1935: "We can look forward with assurance to a decreasing deficit."

At this stage of our national life nearly everybody is placidly accepting deficits as normal practice, in bad times and good. We are told they are necessary to assure "full employment." But in the past they have failed notoriously to meet that test. In each of the years from 1931 to 1940, inclusive, the Federal Government ran a deficit average 3.6 percent of the gross national product. During those 10 years there was average unemployment of 18.81 percent of the labor force. The same percentage of gross national product and of the labor force today would mean that even deficits averaging $22 billion a year could be accompanied by more than 14 million annually unemployed. Coincidentally, that was where the unemployment figure stood a few months before Pearl Harbor.

President Johnson in his Economic Report boasts that "unemployment dropped from 5.7 percent in 1963 to 5.2 percent in 1964 and was down to 5 percent at year's end." If he would project the comparison a little further, he would discover that the 4 Kennedy-Johnson years so far have averaged 5.5 percent, while during the full 8 years of the Eisenhower terms it averaged only 4.9 percent.

Another administration claim deserving of exposure involves the Nation's "new prosperity" geared to the reduction in taxes. The President's Council of Economic Advisers has called attention to the success of the tax cut in promoting a well-balanced expansion during 1964. Although the tax cut is said to have worked, nothing has been said to note that the tax cut went into effect along with a holddown on the rate of increase of Government expenditures. Originally the Council said that holding down expenditures while cutting taxes could eliminate much of the stimulative impact of the tax cut. Republicans conditioned their support of the tax cut on holding expenditures to $97 billion in 1964 and $98 billion in 1965, as was detailed in their recommital motion when the tax cut was before the House.

The Republicans on the Appropriations Committee during the 88th Congress, with important support from other members of the committee who deplored our rate of spending, were able to claim a large measure of credit for reducing the 2-year aggregate budget by more than $10 billion.

Many Republicans felt they could vote for the tax cut if they knew that strenuous efforts were being made to cut Federal expenses. If the tax cut had been accompanied by large increases in Federal spending on the order of the previous 3 years, it is likely that the Nation would have experienced a serious inflationary overheating of the economy. That danger still confronts us.

Despite a veritable floodtide of Federal revenue beyond the wildest dreams of the most extravagant, we are asked to continue to spend and spend and spend, indulging ourselves without restraint, piling up additional billions of debt upon which additional billions of interest must be paid every year. For the 14th consecutive year we are going to be asked to increase the ceiling on the public debt. If we fail to exercise some degree of prudence, we will end fiscal year 1966 with a public debt $36 billion greater than Mr. Kennedy inherited 5 years ago. This trend frightens me. As Jenkin Lloyd Jones asked in the Evening Star last week, I wonder whether a nation that boasts about its prosperity can tolerate endless deficits. Can we go broke?

That is a question that means a great deal to our constituents, and it seems to me that we should break these billions down to show what the burden really is on the man who ultimately pays all the taxes—the breadwinner who shares his earnings with Uncle Sam and finds these costly programs reflected not only in the taxes he pays directly to the Government but in the price he pays for everything he eats or wears or uses in everyday life.

I think he ought to make it plain that the $900 million or more the Johnson budget proposes to spend on the education of so-called deprived children, amounts to slightly over $20 for every family in the United States. That kind of figure would mean something to me if I were trying to scrape up the money

for glasses or shoes for my own children, and I think it means something to the average American man and wife.

The projected cost of the antipoverty program for 1966 comes to something over $75 for every American family. Congress voted to begin this program last year and there was considerable public appeal to the Job Corps, the work study program and all the rest, but we did not break it down into what it would cost the American family that pays its taxes and is struggling to protect itself from poverty.

We talk about $40 billion for the moon shot and scientists and philosophers argue about whether we should or should not go through with the program. What about our average family to whom that incomprehensible sum of money represents another $800 in tax burden.

How can we explain a Post Office Department that costs the average family over $80 a year in addition to the postage it pays every time it wishes to use the service, and how explain why so costly a service is so consistently unsatisfactory?

Foreign aid has cost that breadwinner and his wife and children nearly $2,500 since the end of the Second War, and it is not easy to convince a man in Canton, Ohio, that he got his dollar's worth.

The most staggering figure is the cost of debt service—$11.6 billion in fiscal 1966. In response to my question, Budget Director Gordon told the committee that this is the equivalent of $22,000 every minute, every day, the year around. A new house every minute, or four Cadillac automobiles—set your own standard of comparison. This is the amount—$22,000 per minute—that we are paying only to satisfy the interest charges on the debt we have accumulated through these years of extravagance.

Knowing these facts, I am confident the American people will renew their demands for real economy in Government.

And if we are to comply with those demands, we must begin now to seek an understanding of where we are so that we will be able to determine where we are heading. That means a careful examination of the budget.

Like any Government budget, this one is in some measure a political document. Every administration likes to put its best foot forward and sometimes this involves a good deal of budget juggling. This one is no exception, and some of the gimmicks that must be corrected before we really know where we are should be mentioned.

For example, the budget conveys the impression that substantial tax reductions are being proposed, with a cut of $1.7 billion in excise taxes to be effective July 1, 1965. Page 52 of the budget states "Excise tax liabilities will be reduced by $1.75 billion, of which $1.5 billion will be reflected in lower collections in fiscal year 1966"—actually, within the same fiscal year the proposed increases in taxes and fees levied on taxpayers and consumers will amount to about $2.8 billion annually. This includes almost $2.4 billion in social security tax increases to be effective January 1, 1966, and increases in highway user taxes, air fuel taxes, waterway taxes, patent fees, meat inspection, and other charges, all of which are ultimately borne by consumers.

Because its revenue estimates appear to be on the high side, the budget requires that a high level of business profits be maintained. It projects corporate income tax collections of $27.6 billion, based on $61 billion of profits before taxes. Any failure of profits to reach this figure would increase the budget deficit by about half of the deficiency. The administration's actions on wages and prices can affect this precarious situation.

The request for price support programs for the Commodity Credit Corporation for 1966 is probably inadequate, as was the budget request for 1965. CCC losses in 1964 were $3.2 billion. Under earlier practice the full 1964 loss would be the amount requested for 1966, so by this standard the request is inadequate by $926.8 million. However, the CCC may be able to defer most of this amount to 1967, or ask for a supplemental again early next year for part of it.

The budget proposes sales of loans and mortgages from Government agency portfolios to a total amount of $3.1 billion—compared with $2.2 billion in 1965 and $1.1 billion in 1964. No indication is given as to the amount of loss that will be taken on the sales.

New programs proposed for 1966 require initial appropriations of $3.2 billions. Of this amount only $920 million is reflected in expenditures for that year, the difference of about $2.3 billion therefore representing a bullt-in growth to be reflected in future year levels of expenditures.

The reduction proposed for Small Business Administration of $350 million in 1966 expenditures is based on proposed legislation to authorize the sale of participations in pools of loans held by Small Business Administration to fund 1966 program levels.

Supplemental appropriations of almost $6 billion are asked for 1965. In fact, about $3.6 billion of this is related to new programs or to program expansions that should normally be part of the 1966 budget. This has the dual result of putting 1966 in a favorable comparative appearance with 1965, and at the same time disguising the striking implications for higher spending in the years immediately ahead.

There is a "bookkeeping" reduction in the budget for the Rural Electrification Administration. The budget requests new obligational authority for $447 million but then reduces it by $345 million based on proposed legislation to permit loan receipts to be used as an offset. Expenditures are reduced by the same procedure. A "minus" item representing receipts appears in the 1965 expenditure column for $168 million and in the 1966 expenditure column another minus appears for $177 million.

These are some of the problems your Appropriations Committee is confronting as the individual bills come before us. I hope that we will, as in the past, recommend significant reductions in the appropriations requests, particularly with regard for new obligational authority, for this is the only way that the trend toward bigger spending and bigger debt can be turned. The buck stops here, as Mr. Truman used to say. We cannot blame the President for spending money when we give him the checking account. We cannot escape our responsibility for determining how the tax dollars are spent. And we will not escape the responsibility if our carelessness or lack of concern brings financial collapse and political disaster to this great Nation.

I include at this point in my remarks the article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones to which I referred earlier, "Is the Great Society Going for Broke?"

Can a nation that boasts about its prosperity tolerate endless deficits?

Can a "Great Society" go bust and remain great? Can it continue to deliver more education, more social services, more pensions, more job security by outshoveling baloney dollars? Or is all the talk about a richer and fuller life for the common man meaningless without a high degree of fiscal honesty and integrity?

Last month Senators ROMAN HRUSKA and CARL CURTIS of Nebraska introduced a snowball-in-hell bill. It calls for a constitutional amendment that would require Congress each year to collect as much money as it appropriates, except in case of war or other dire emergency.

In addition, the Senators want half a billion dollars in collections over expenditures so that it may be applied to the national debt. At the rate of half a billion dollars a year the national debt could be paid off in some 540 years.

This bill will be lucky if it even gets a laugh. The new think has it that the national debt may be ignored, that "controlled inflation" is necessary to provide maximum employment, and that as long as the gross national product in terms of dollars keeps rising everything is hunky-dory.

There is, fortunately, a brave minority of Congressmen who doubt this. Obviously, they are out of the "main stream," but they stubbornly wonder if the economic laws that have busted every other nation that practiced perpetual deficit financing have been repealed.

In a Senate debate last month on the deepening crisis over the American balance of payments, caused by our continued insistence on spending more abroad than we earn abroad, Senator PETER DOMINICK, of Colorado, called attention to a speech by Prof. Karl Brandt, economist of Stanford University.

Professor Brandt asserted that if we eliminate the last of the gold backing for the dollar, which has been seriously proposed, we will buy a little time, but unless we return to a balanced budget, devaluation of the dollar will be inevitable. He said:

"What is needed is a sober, deadly earnest, and courageous weighing of the moral issues that are at stake when inflation moves continually and persistently."

Inflation is one of the serious social and political diseases of the humane economy. Its causes have their roots in human nature. The appetite for substantial benefits without a share in the costs is a human trait which is being exploited by politicians everywhere.

In time of war, man can hardly be blamed for borrowing against his future in an effort to save his skin. But what can we say about a nation borrowing against its future at a time when its political leaders are pointing with pride to unexampled prosperity?

The last American balanced budget occurred in the final fiscal year of the Eisenhower administration—a surplus of $1.2 billion in 1960. Since then the annual deficits have run $3.8 billion, $6.3 billion, $6.2 billion and, last year, $8.2 billion.

Each additional billion adds to the debt service, the amount of money that must be allocated to the interest on Government obligations before a penny can be spent for the operation of the Government, national defense, and additional social services and public works.

Down this line, where do we go? Where has every other country gone that took this road?

An ever-easier money supply, created by an outpouring of public funds unrelated to the ingathering of taxes, creates a boom cycle. Powerful pressure by business and labor joins the overwhelming inclination of politicians to fuel the roaring flames. The cry arises that "deflation," meaning debt reduction or even a balanced budget, would create unemployment and misery.

At the point of no-return things begin to happen fast. Prices rise faster than wages. Investors flee from bonds or demand fantastic interest rates. Common stock prices go into orbit and people rush to buy tangible things like land and jewels. All who lent money in good faith are ruined.

Citizens holding Government securities or life insurance policies, and those who depend on fixed pensions and annuities find themselves holding nothing. The Government, unable to finance itself through the sale of low-interest obligations, is forced to resort to seizure and confiscation.

There goes the "Great Society," "the New Frontiers." All that's left is the last chapter of borrow, boom, and bust.

No promised land will be reached by broken promises. No security is to be achieved by national dishonesty. No man's future is safe in the hands of a political philosophy that is willing to buy today's popularity with tomorrow's agony.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I was interested in the comparison the gentleman from Ohio made between the estimates of spending for the new year, which amount to $99.7 billion, and the new obligational authority requested in the amount of $106 billion. To me the most significant item in the budget is neither of these figures but is the proposed obligations to be incurred in 1966. That sum amounts to $108 billion, which is the true measure of spending proposed by the President.

Would the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman completely. I appreciate his pointing it out. This is one of the items I have tried to make clear. It seems to me we do not understand this when this kind of a budget is before us.

Mr. JONAS. Let me see if I can use an illustration so that we can all understand it.

To estimate that the President proposes to spend $99.7 billion next year and then to state in the budget that he will obligate $108 billion reminds me of the case of a housewife who tells her husband at night that she went downtown to shop and spent $50 but, upon questioning, admits she paid out $50 in cash and charged $50. Although she paid out only $50 in cash, she actually spent $100—the only difference is that she spent $50 cash but charged another $50, which will be paid when the bills come in.

Mr. BOW. And obligated that much of its income.

Mr. JONAS. That is correct. We ought to quit talking about this fanciful estimate that spending will be held at $99.7 billion when, in the same budget, the President himself says that he will obligate $108 billion in 1966.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to my chairman.

Mr. MAHON. I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, for making this fiscal policy speech. I believe we ought to have more general discussion in as much depth as possible of the overall fiscal challenge to the people of the United States.

Many of the statements which the gentleman has made are very good indeed.

With respect to the question raised by our friend from North Carolina, it is true, I believe, that for the past 3 years we have appropriated more than $100 billion, but spending has not exceeded $100 billion. In some of the commodity loan programs in the Department of Agriculture we make recoveries. In other loan programs we make recoveries. So it is possible over quite a number of years to appropriate more than $100 billion and yet to spend less than $100 billion. There is an area here of flexibility.

I wanted to examine this thought with my friend from Ohio: I do not believe the gentleman feels, and I do not believe we would want the country to feel, that Congress does not have control over Federal expenditures. It is true that in previous years we have made appropriations and that certain of those appropriations have not been fully spent and are available for expenditure now.

Mr. BOW. About $96 billion at this time.

Mr. MAHON. But Congress had the control at the time it appropriated the money. If Congress said, "We provide this for an airplane," or "We provide this for some program which will extend over a period of years," we had the control then.

We have the control of the expenditures, but we do not have the control, I believe, over the rate of expenditure. Is that not really the fact?

Mr. BOW. That is true except in those cases, I point out, such as the Commodity Credit Corporation, the interest on the debt, and about three portions of this budget where we just about have to go along and write the checks for them.

Mr. MAHON. In short I do want to say I agree wholly with the gentleman that we should give the closest scrutiny to the requests made for funds by the administration and we should continue to make reductions whenever we can reasonably make them, as is being done in the case of the bill now before us.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I recall with regard to the comment made by our distinguished chairman, that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget stated in our hearings that the administration has the discretion over whether or not appropriated funds will be spent in any given year. He stated because of that discretion no point was made over the fact that there was a difference between last year and 1966 with regard to new obligational authority. I think that is borne out by what is happening in the $6 billion of supplementals asked for in 1965. Only $1.5 billion of that is to be spent in 1965 and the balance is to be spent in future years, by the exercise of that discretion.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with those who have commended the committee for having denied the full budget request but, having said that, I must add that $3.5 million more is coming out of the Federal Treasury and going into the coffers of the District of Columbia. This despite the fact that we were told yesterday by one of the members of the District Committee during debate on the crime bill that there has been a reduction in population totaling 40,000 in the District of Columbia. I wonder why, under the circumstances increased Federal funds are necessary for the District of Columbia. I can understand added costs for salary increases and that sort of thing, but it seems to me, with a drop of 40,000 in population in the District of Columbia, we ought to be holding the line on Federal contributions, perhaps reducing to some extent, and placing more of the obligation on the taxpayers of the District.

The tax figures that I have seen with respect to the District of Columbia indicate the property tax rate is applied least heavily upon those with high incomes. I suggest there are several problems, in addition to the unconscionable situation pertaining to the number of temporary teachers in the District of Columbia that need attention. I might say, apropos of the discussion earlier this afternoon with respect to the number of teachers holding temporary certificates, that some of these have taught in the District schools with temporary certificates for more than 15 years. This is not a transient thing. This has apparently been built up and built into the educational system of the District. Someone a little while ago was feeling badly about the lack of books in the schools of the District of Columbia. I submit that the $113,000 estimate—and I think it is a most conservative estimate, because I have seen other estimates ranging up to $130,000 a year expended to replace the window glass broken in the schools of the District of Columbia by virtue of wanton destruction—I submit that this would buy a good many books to go into the libraries and the schools of the District.

I note in the hearings of the committee that the cost of replacing window glass in the schools has gone from $1.25 or $1.35 per unit a few years ago to an average now of nearly $5.

This indicates that some people are no respecters of even the new and modern school buildings that have been constructed in the District. This means that they are knocking out the big windows in the new and modern schools with the same facility and ease that they knocked out window panes in the older school buildings. Some of these things, it seems to me, ought to be cured by the people within this city. I cannot understand why the people living near the school buildings cannot organize civic groups and put a stop to this kind of wanton destruction and waste.

The $113,000 annual cost of replacing the window glass does not take into account the damage done to the buildings themselves. I have seen some of them after the rain has poured in, floors covered with water, and its resultant damage.

I also noted in the hearings that the taxpayers of the Nation are making a contribution—the taxpayers of Iowa as well as Kentucky, Wisconsin, and other States—by way of the interest payment on the white elephant District Stadium. When that stadium was built I opposed the use of Federal funds and was assured time after time, and the bill was so written, that there would be no resort to funds from the Treasury of the United States to pay any of the costs. But now we find that District taxpayers are retiring none of the $20 million worth of bonds and are nicking the taxpayers of the country for approximately $133,000 of the annual interest payments; if Mr. Tobriner is correct in his statement that 16 percent of the interest costs on that stadium are borne by the taxpayers of all the country. It is time for this raid on the rest of the country to stop.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia on the very good statement that he made earlier in the day analyzing this bill and also to commend the gentleman upon the conduct of the hearings that were held. The gentleman stuck very closely to the subject matter. He went through this bill line item by line item throughout those long days until we had done the best job we could with the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any real objection or controversy in connection with the bill. Therefore, my closing remarks will be brief. However, I do want to make some supplementary remarks to those that are contained in the report concerning the hot lunch program in the elementary schools.

Mr. Chairman, we have in the District of Columbia 137 elementary schools. I wish to distinguish right now between elementary schools and the secondary schools.

Mr. Chairman, the secondary schools have hot lunch programs and have had hot lunch programs for many years. But in the 137 elementary schools we find that only 2,104 students out of 82,492 have a hot lunch available, and that hot lunch program has only been made available to them in the last 2 or 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken on this subject matter every year for the last 3 years but it does not seem as if enough progress has been made. We should move faster on this particular program.

We are now spending $132 million on hot lunch programs for 34 million students in 90 foreign countries.

We are spending $132 million for 34 million students in 90 countries of the world. Yet, we do not have a hot lunch program available for the students in the elementary schools of the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital.

In my opinion, this is a disgrace. The Superintendent of Schools has been in the past been opposed to this program but he now says he is for it; however, I have not observed much real effort on his part in getting it inaugurated and started. I believe this program should be accelerated immediately.

In submitting cost estimates for putting elementary lunch programs into some of these schools, the school administration estimates run as high as $40 per square foot to remodel rooms in which the children will eat. In each one of these estimates we find that the vast majority of this proposed expenditure would be for a room in which the children eat rather than for the kitchen or food preparation room.

In most of the school districts of the United States from which we come, they put such programs into effect in a matter of a few months by providing the kitchen facilities first. They provided a separate or special place to eat other than in school rooms later or whenever they could spare the space or budget the funds until all have a hot lunch available. They can eat a hot hamburger in the same place in which they now eat a cold jelly sandwich.

Also, Mr. Chairman, the elementary schools in the District of Columbia only make available one-half pint of milk per student per day. Pupils in the secondary school system are not limited to one-half pint. When we brought that subject up, the Superintendent said, "Well, I think they ought to have a hot breakfast." I think this kind of answer was merely a stall. They do not have a hot lunch as yet. At the rate they are going, it would be years before such a breakfast would be available and that is no reason to stall a milk program. The first thing we should do is to make more than one-half pint of milk available for them. That can be done immediately.

Mr. Chairman, at the rate they have been going, it will take 117 years to make a hot lunch available to all elementary students.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this represents a sorry record in the Nation's Capital, and especially when most of the local leaders have not shown enough interest in the question to push this program. The District secured last year $4.4 million in additional money, impacted area funds, that they had not expected to receive at the time the budget was approved. I believe they should have been included in the program to start with. But no plans were made for using any of these funds for either additional milk or for the hot lunch program, in spite of the fact that they have not been able to use nearly all of these funds in the months that they have had them.

Mr. Chairman, we earmarked in this bill $300,000 in impacted aid funds and in addition to that, another $90,000 for expanding a hot lunch program in elementary schools. I believe that undoubtedly they can secure at least 25 hot lunch kitchens with this amount of money. That will represent a good start and perhaps they can finish the program the following year or a year after that. The committee made it clear that we expect them to use the funds for kitchens rather than eating rooms.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that there are too many in the District of Columbia who are interested only in matters in their own bailiwicks and not interested enough in what happens to the little children. Too many people who come before our committee seem to be interested only in taking care of themselves. I feel that some of these programs which are included in this budget and some of the expenditures by the District are for less important functions than a hot lunch program.

Unless some great strides are made in the next year with reference to the hot lunch program I am going to see to it that the Congress gets a chance to reduce some of the appropriations to other departments until they become interested in what happens to the hot lunch program for little children. For example, the Commissioners all have Cadillacs, and a chauffeur. Maybe they need them, and I am not going to pass judgment on that today, but it is not as important as a hot lunch program for little children. If they do not show more interest in the need for food for these little children, I am going to give the Congress a chance to deny them their chauffeurs until we get a hot lunch program and more milk for these little children.

Last year there was a $37.5 million Federal payment. After the bill was passed the District, without having any idea at the time that the bill was passed, received an additional $4.4 million. This year there is a $41 million Federal payment, but the comparable figure really is $45.4 million, because we know they will also receive the impacted areas money. This shows a considerable increase in 1 year.

In allotting that money to functions and programs, we used the best judgment we could, but no priorities were given us by the school administration. If they had given us some priorities we may have looked a little differently at some of these items. But when the school administration failed to come forward with leadership in this area, we did the best we could to make priorities as we thought best. We just had to do the best we could in the time we had to work on the bill.

In this bill there is $16 million for school construction. There is no doubt at all but what they need probably $100 million worth of schools in the District. This is probably the only district in the whole of the United States of America where you have to pay cash for a building when you build it. Other school districts use the buildings as they pay

for them. The $16 million, the amount of money in this budget, could pay for $300 million worth of buildings if they were built under a bonding program like we do in other districts in the United States. Sixteen million dollars is a considerable outlay of money for capital expenditure per year and if they were permitted to bond for schools that would be enough to finance a big building program.

This bill may not be perfect and due to lack of local leadership in advocating priorities we may have made some mistakes but I think that under the circumstances, this bill is worthy of everybody's support, and I urge your support of the bill.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this time to commend the gentleman from Kentucky, chairman of the subcommittee, as well as the majority and minority members for the excellent hearings which they have provided the House of Representatives on this appropriation bill. I want to say to the other Members that there is a wealth of material available to them in these hearings on the operations of the District government. I recommend that the Members take a little time to read the hearings.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to see that the District of Columbia budget approved by the Committee on Appropriations recommends the approval of the full amount requested for participation in the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

The council of governments was formed for the purpose of promoting cooperative action among the local governments in the Metropolitan Washington area in order that a voluntary comprehensive approach could be made to the region's interjurisdictional problems.

Mass transit and highways, urban blight and suburban sprawl, economic and physical health, water supply and sanitation, are problems which disregard boundaries. The solutions for these problems cannot be found in individual jurisdictions pulling separately, but only through joint consideration.

In recognition of the important work carried on by the council of governments, the Committee on Appropriations has recommended the approval of the total request of $48,000 in funds. This is in happy contrast to the 1964 and 1965 budget recommendations when appropriations requests were cut. On both of these occasions, I expressed my concern on the floor of the House, and I feel it only right that I rise and congratulate the House Appropriations Committee on their farsighted action on this matter at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read.

Mr. NATCHER (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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

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 (H.R. 6453) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING DISPOSAL OF ZINC FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1496) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, together with amendments of the Senate thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, from either the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) or the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)), or from both such stockpiles, (1) approximately one hundred and fifty thousand short tons of zinc, (2) approximately one hundred and fifty thousand short tons of lead, and (3) approximately one hundred thousand short tons of copper (part or all of which may be supplied in the form of brass and bronze, taking into account only the copper content thereof). The disposals authorized by this section may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, but the time and method of the disposals shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

"SEC. 2. The Administrator is also authorized, without regard to the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, to make available an additional fifty thousand short tons of zinc and an additional fifty thousand short tons of lead now held in either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both such stockpiles, for direct use by agencies of the United States Government."

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and at this time I do not intend to object.

Mr. Speaker, I do think that the House should be made well aware of exactly what has taken place with regard to this legislation since it left the House of Representatives in its originally accepted condition.

Mr. Speaker, when this legislation went to the other body they combined the two bills which we sent over to them and then the other body stuck on another bill concerning the disposal of copper from the stockpile. The legislation comes back to this body at this time with three bills in one—with no opportunity of consideration by the House of Representatives to the matter of the disposal of 100,000 tons of copper and associated metals.

It is admitted by the producing industry that there is a need in the fabricating and processing industries for these materials. But it is also admitted by practically everyone who has ever studied this problem that the stockpiles were not provided in order to furnish materials for industry. The stockpiles were provided for purposes of national defense and national security. What is proposed in this particular bill which arouses the critical interest of many of us is that after having suggested that we would not be in opposition to the original bills that were considered by the House which provided for the disposal from the stockpile of 200,000 tons each of lead and zinc, the other body has now included in this particular legislation provision for the disposal of 100,000 tons of copper and has written the language, so far as the disposal of copper is concerned, in such a manner that brass and bronze can be disposed of as follows: "part or all of

which may be supplied in the form of brass and bronze, taking into account only the copper content thereof." This means that in the securing of 100,000 tons of copper, it will be possible unless we write the history of this legislation very carefully to add another 30,000 tons of zinc to the amount—200,000 tons—that we permit to be disposed of under the zinc provisions of the act.

I wish to say that I am very cognizant of the fine work which the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts, now handling the legislation, has done in this respect, and the oversight and fine work which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], chairman of the full committee, has accepted in the consideration of this—as well as other—legislation.

It is not only necessary, as we round out our economy, that we keep the interests of our consumers and our ultimate users in mind, but also that we keep in mind the interests of our producing industries in regard to these basic materials. As stated hereinbefore these basic materials are necessary for our defense. They are necessary for our security. If we permit our mines to be closed because of the fact that we take materials from the stockpile and place them into industrial channels, then we make possible the endangering of our national security.

I believe the 30,000 tons of zinc recovered, or used in the released bronze or brass, should be a part of the original 150,000 tons of zinc contemplated to be released from the stockpile for the use of the processors and consumers. I have stated my position on this proposition in the remarks which I have asked to have included in the RECORD. I hope that this will be the determination of the administering authorities.

I feel that it is necessary to keep close oversight control over this matter, because those who administer it from the bureau standpoint are inclined sometimes to say one thing in our hearings and then to seek to administer the law in accordance with their own interpretations and ideas.

I am placing a great deal of the confidence of the members of the committee of which I am chairman in the fine cooperation and understanding which has been shown by the gentlemen from Massachusetts and South Carolina.

I want to be sure, if possible, to see to it that the ultimate disposal of zinc under the provisions of this legislation does not exceed 200,000 tons. There is quite a difference between 150,000 tons of zinc, as originally planned and agreed upon, and 230,000 tons, which the legislation might permit, if we are not careful.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few points for the Members and for the record, not only for today's action but for future reference.

The history of H.R. 1496 demonstrates conclusively the need for extreme care in authorizing stockpile disposals. Right now we are in the uncomfortable position, in the terms of the vernacular, of being "over a barrel"; and the other body put us there. There are real acute shortages of zinc, lead, and copper required for use by our industrial economy. I do not want to block the release of some of these materials from our stockpile, and I know that no one else in this body would want to do so.

But, Mr. Speaker, the other body took H.R. 1496 which, as it passed the House February 23, 1965, provided for the disposal of zinc from the stockpile and added to it the authorization for the disposal of lead which had been approved in H.R. 1658, which had likewise passed the House February 23, 1965, and then the Senate also added authorization for the disposal of copper, a matter which not only has not previously been considered on the floor of the House but on which no hearings have been held by any committee of the House of Representatives. Bills relating to the proposed release of copper from the stockpile were introduced and were pending in the House but they had not been considered.

Now we are told, in effect, "take it or leave it" in a form which raises some very serious problems relative to, first, the stockpiling of copper; and, second, the zinc-producing industry.

While I had, and still have, some reservations about the amount of lead to be authorized for disposal, I have nothing to add to what I said on the floor during consideration of H.R. 1658, so I shall raise no objection to that portion of H.R. 1496, as it comes to us today, insofar as it pertains to lead.

We look to the Armed Services Committee to determine whether, and in what quantities, commodities should be stockpiled. But, the Armed Services Committee in the House held no hearing on the proposed release of copper. In testimony before the Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves, of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable Buford Ellington, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, pointed out that, while there is an excess of approximately 250,000 short tons of copper above the so-called conventional stockpile objective, copper will be an extremely important material in the nuclear postattack period. Governor Ellington made this very significant statement:

> This Office believes that the postattack demand for copper may be substantially larger than that required for conventional war, and that the nuclear war stockpile objective for this material may be higher than the total of present inventories.

Although he gave the administration's endorsement to the release of copper from the stockpiles, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning never backed away from this statement, as I understand it, but said that if "a decision is reached by the Congress to authorize the disposal of up to 100,000 tons of copper from the national and supplemental stockpiles," certain amendments should be made to the bill then before the committee. Those amendments basically provide for sale, instead of a loan, provide for adoption of the pattern of other disposals and, finally, affirmatively permit the disposal of copper contained in brass and bronze, in addition to refined ingots, and other copper.

The inference is that by disposing of certain forms of copper we will do less damage to our future security than by disposing of copper in other forms. Governor Ellington and his associates frankly acknowledged to the committee that, if the nuclear war studies indicate the need for additional copper, it will be necessary at a later date to make purchases to replace that which would be sold under H.R. 1496.

So, we have problem No. 1 on which the House is being asked to take the conclusion reached by the other body; namely, that our security is not threatened by releasing the 100,000 tons of copper. Members will recall that this is not a new matter of concern to me and to others of this body who believe that the stockpiles generally represent a great national asset that should not be indiscriminately dissipated. No release should be made from the stockpile except after careful consideration by the Congress and—under our bicameral system as I think it still exists today—this means consideration by each House of the Congress.

The second problem is one for which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has direct responsibility: What will the impact of the release be on our domestic mining industry? Up until March 4, 1965, when the hearings were held in the other body, we had no idea that the release of copper would or could involve the release of additional zinc. During consideration of the legislation in the other body, as I indicated a moment ago, the disposal of brass was brought into the picture; and brass, Mr. Speaker, contains approximately 30 percent zinc.

It is quite impossible to tell from H.R. 1496 whether we are being asked to authorize the release of 200,000 tons of zinc or a little under 230,000 tons. I think the limit is 200,000 tons but I have been told that others believe that it is closer to 230,000 tons. Therefore, it becomes necessary to review the entire situation, including the history of the bill, and make it clear to the agencies downtown what we in the House believe and how we react and will react.

Let us remember these facts:

First. The zinc contained in brass and bronze is carried in the stockpile inventory as zinc and, of the approximately 1.5 million short tons of zinc in the stockpile, approximately 28,764 short tons are contained in brass and bronze, as indicated in a letter that I have received from the General Services Administration, dated March 12, 1965, which, under permission previously granted, I include at this point in my remarks:

> DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: With reference to your letter of March 11, 1965, we confirm that, in compliance with directions from the Office of Emergency Planning, quantities of lead and zinc contained in brass and bronze held by General Services Administration in the national stockpile are carried in our inventory statistics as part of the lead and zinc stockpiles.
>
> For your further information in this connection, the records show that of the approximately 1.3 million short tons of lead in inventory, approximately 441 short tons are

lead contained in brass and bronze, and of the approximately 1.5 million short tons of zinc on hand, approximately 28,764 short tons are contained in brass and bronze.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. GRIFFIN,
Acting Administrator.

Second. The Strategic and Critical Stock Piling Act requires the express approval of Congress of any proposed disposal unless disposal is by reason of excess materials being obsolescent. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, which provides for the acquisition of materials and a supplemental stockpile, provides that releases may be made only in accordance with the procedure governing releases under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act. We are not dealing with obsolescent materials today.

Third. Following a pattern that has been established in the past, responsible executive agencies consulted with industry relative to the proposals to release zinc from the national stockpile. However, because of the uncertainty of the form that the legislation would take and the fact that the principal pending bills provided for direct loans to producers rather than for commercial sale, no consultations could be held with industry on the proposed copper disposals.

Fourth. The zinc producing industry, over the objections of some of its components, agreed to raise no objection to a release for sale of 150,000 short tons of zinc on the understanding that, following an initial release of 75,000 tons, the Administrator of General Services or his representative would once again consult with all segments of the industry to determine whether the sale of additional quantities of zinc should be undertaken.

Fifth. At this point, it was the understanding of all segments of the industry that the full Government proposal had been laid before them and that no changes would be made until after further consultation with industry. Despite this, when H.R. 1496 and H.R. 1658 were reported on by the administration, the executive agencies recommended that an additional 50,000 tons each of zinc and lead should be made available for direct use by agencies of the U.S. Government, thus raising the total release of each to 200,000 tons.

Sixth. The market prices of lead and zinc are such at the present time—after a long profit drought—to make it look feasible to conduct profitable mining operations if we can keep conditions from getting unbalanced and the market from deteriorating.

Seventh. Large releases from the stockpile could be disruptive of the normal markets.

Eighth. The proposed authorization to make copper available to the commercial market through the release of almost 100,000 tons of brass containing approximately 70,000 tons of copper results in an additional release of almost 30,000 tons of zinc. The brass will go to brass mills and foundries whose requirements were taken into consideration by the various segments of industry, producers, and consumers alike, as well as the Government agencies, in estimating the maximum commercial market requirement of 150,000 tons of zinc. Release of the brass will make it unnecessary for the brass mills and foundries to come in for a portion of the zinc being released, a fact which is doubly significant when considered in the light of the fact that the producing industry does not agree that the proposed allocation of 13,000 tons of zinc for alloyers, out of the initial 75,000-ton release, is necessary.

Ninth. Until the Senate committee reported out H.R. 1496 and the Senate passed it on the same day, March 11, 1965, there was no specific proposal that could be looked at by me and your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with a view to estimating the market impact.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, we are caught on the horns of a dilemma. If we say hold this up until we have an opportunity to study it, we are delaying the flow of much-needed materials to feed our industrial machines; if we were to merely accept H.R. 1496, as amended, we would be ignoring our responsibilities.

The Members of this body know me well enough to know that I will not ignore my responsibilities and that our committee will not ignore its responsibilities.

It is my own view that H.R. 1496, as amended, will, if enacted in its present form, require as a matter of law that the 30,000 tons of zinc contained in the brass be deducted from the approximately 1.5 million tons of zinc in the stockpile and therefore also deducted from the 150,000 tons of zinc authorized for release under section 1(1) of the act. I submit that both existing law, as referred to by me earlier in the factual situation that I have outlined, together with the language of H.R. 1496, make this abundantly clear. Being clear, it will be unnecessary for the administrators to look to the legislative history.

Nonetheless, in the event that they decide it is necessary to look at the legislative history, I am making this point here this afternoon and ask that the House, in passing this bill, specifically take this into consideration and that if anyone here disputes this stand he or she debate the matter with me now so that the record we make here on the floor will definitely be clear.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure all Members, and also our friends in the mining industry, that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will keep close watch on the sales of zinc, lead, and copper. After the initial releases have been made we will, if I think it is necessary, hold hearings to determine whether all of the materials authorized for disposal by H.R. 1496 should in fact be disposed of by the General Services Administration.

In this latter connection, let us keep in mind, and I am the first to recognize it, we do have built-in safeguards in the disposal legislation because, first, the legislation is discretionary in authorizing the Administrator of General Services to proceed; and second, the framework for exercising that discretion is spelled out in the act by requiring that the time and method of the disposals shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States without avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processers, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, confident that, with the cooperation of the administrative agencies, we shall be able to control the flow of materials so that they will not have an adverse effect on domestic industry, I shall not object to enactment of H.R. 1496 if the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], or the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], chairman of the subcommittee that handled this legislation, can assure us that in his opinion it will not be detrimental to our security to dispose of materials containing approximately 100,000 short tons of copper.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

While I will not object to consideration of this measure at this time, I want to serve notice that if the agencies downtown handling this matter do not keep faith with the Armed Services Committee and with our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that there will be no further dispositions from the stockpile in this manner.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Like the chairman, I will not object to this particular bill at this time in the context in which it reaches us, principally, I believe, because of the great respect all of us have for the judgment of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the chairman of his full committee. But those of us who represent areas which have substantial mining interests are most hopeful that in the future there will be hearings before the subcommittee over which the gentleman from Massachusetts presides, on the full content of these bills, before they are brought to the floor for agreement in this fashion.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to register strong support for H.R. 1496 which has been returned to this House with a very important amendment added. The original bill, as passed by the House, dealt with the disposal of lead and zinc from our national stockpile. As a result of hearings conducted by the Senate Armed Services Committee, the bill has been amended to include copper in that list of materials to be released.

I will confine my remarks to that portion of the bill relating to a problem with which I have the greatest familiarity, that being the present shortage of copper and the adverse effect this shortage is having on the economic welfare of my district.

For purposes of subsequent discussion, I would like to emphasize portions of what I feel is a vital amendment to H.R. 1496. In part, it says:

That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, from either the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) or the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)), or from both such stockpiles * * * (3) approximately 100,000 short tons of copper (part or all of which may be supplied in the form of brass and bronze, taking into account only the copper content thereof). The disposals authorized by this section may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, but the time and method of the disposals shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of procedures, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

Constituents, colleagues, and representatives of the copper industry have all expressed to me the great need for the release of copper from our national stockpile at the earliest feasible date.

In my district alone, the job security of about 5,000 production workers in 7 different plants depends on the availability of copper. The present critical copper shortage has forced these plants to curtail their operations by as much as 35 percent. And, of course, some workers have been forced to idleness, not by choice, but by chance.

On a national basis, many, many times that number of workers have their jobs in jeopardy and face even dimmer prospects for the future unless we, here in the Congress, take prompt and decisive action to provide assistance. Passage of H.R. 1496 will be a giant step in the right direction.

I have said this before and I would like to repeat it now:

At a time when all of us here on Capitol Hill are exploring new programs designed to create more jobs, let us not miss this opportunity to preserve existing jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I was the first Member of the House to introduce legislation to permit release of copper from our national stockpile. My bill, H.R. 2236, would have authorized the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile on a loan basis. The distinguished majority leader of the other body, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], introduced a similar measure.

When H.R. 1496 was in committee and originally before the House, we were not able to include provisions for the release of copper because we had not yet received the necessary reports from which we would base our decision. We passed the bill without reference to copper, hopeful that subsequently the reports would be in and that the bill could be amended by the Senate so that copper would be added to the list of materials. This is exactly what happened.

The bill before us differs from my bill with respect to the handling of copper in that it would authorize the release of the product on an outright sale rather than on a loan basis.

Originally, I had stipulated that the release be in the form of a loan because I wanted to make certain that we would not shortchange our national stockpile objectives. I am pleased to report that a determination has since been made that the Defense Production Act inventory contains a surplus of 257,184 short tons of copper from which the disposal contemplated in H.R. 1496 can be made.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw from a statement made by me in this Chamber on January 11 when I introduced H.R. 2236:

Favorable action on this bill will demonstrate our sincere interest in coming to grips with a serious problem and solving it without in any way endangering our national security objectives or expending vast sums of money. Clearly, the Federal Government has an opportunity, in fact an obligation, to help preserve jobs and strengthen our economy. I believe passage of this bill will do just that.

That same statement applies to the measure that is now before us. I again urge that we in the House give it favorable consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had understood that this matter had been cleared. The Chair does not wish to interfere, but has a responsibility in connection with another bill which has been programed. If the colloquy is going to take much longer, the Chair will have to suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts that he withdraw his request and take it up later in the day.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts to make any statement. I have about 2 more minutes, and that is all. Our committee certainly has the right to be heard on this, and we had an understanding there would be a colloquy.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes that, but the Chair has the responsibility and, in the light of this, the Chair suggests that the gentleman from Massachusetts withdraw his request and take the matter up later in the day.

Mr. PHILBIN. I will comply with the request of the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I request that the matter be withdrawn.

TOBACCO ACREAGE-POUNDAGE MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 280 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5721) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] and pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 280 provides for consideration of H.R. 5721, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

The tobacco program has been the most successful of all farm programs. In the 32-year history of Government farm programs, the tobacco program has cost only $38 million. And during these 32 years Federal and State governments have collected $52 billion in taxes on tobacco and tobacco products.

In recent years, however, excessive supplies have accumulated because of dramatic increases in the per acre yields of tobacco. Surpluses now endanger the tobacco program.

Moreover, the United States has failed to share in the increase in world tobacco trade.

In order to provide a more effective method of maintaining supplies in line with demand, to improve the quality of U.S. tobacco and to increase exports, H.R. 5721 would supplement the present acreage allotment program for Flue-cured tobacco by the addition of farm poundage quotas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 280.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think that, in conjunction with the discussion of the rule which would make in order the consideration of this bill, perhaps the most important point I would make is simply this: That at first blush this is a bill that would affect in reality only about five States of the United States, I believe. The States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, and Georgia are the five States that are the principal tobacco-producing areas in the country. Yet I think if the Members of the House have taken the time to read not only the committee report but in particular the minority views of the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Illinois, they will find out it is a far more important bill than that. Rather than merely affecting the possible destinies of the tobacco farmers in these five States, this bill, if enacted in its present form,

could have a real impact on the kind of agricultural legislation we may expect in the future. Because for the first time, as I understand it, from the hearings that were held before the Committee on Rules and from a study of this report, we would be introducing supply management with a vengeance. We would be putting into effect the idea of bushels and bales and pounds control in addition to acreage allotments, which is something, of course, the planners have had in mind for American agriculture for a long time. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat interesting at this point really to find a bill of this kind coming on the floor apparently with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department he heads, because, as I recall it, it was not many days ago that Mr. Freeman in one of his public utterances made reference to the fact that maybe the farmers of America were going to have to look to some other source than Government programs in order to share in the present prosperity and to get the kind of income they deserved.

He indicated that maybe the housewife was going to have to pay a little bit more for bread in the marketplace, or a little bit more for a quart of milk. And this was the area, the area of the marketplace, in which we were going to be able to bring some relief to American agriculture. Yet today in this bill we find the Johnson administration going back once again to a supply-management program with all that implies in the way of controls and Government regimentation.

I know that there are members of the House Committee on Agriculture on the Republican side of the aisle who are here today and are going to discuss this bill in detail. I would merely point out that even the majority in their report emphasize, on page 3, that this is not a simple bill. The formula which would be used to determine the poundage allotments and acreage allotments under this legislation is extremely complex and difficult. I would say that the majority report which accompanied this bill was rather unique in that it seems to be damning with faint praise the very program upon which they would now seek to embark. The majority report in a burst of candor points out that this is not the best plan; it is not the ultimate solution; it is going to have to be amended as we gain experience under this legislation. Indeed, if you read this particular report and if you listen to the debate you are going to wonder if it is not premature for the majority of the committee to be asking the House of Representatives to embark upon a program of this kind without further study being given to this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation is imprudent and basically unsound. It would serve as a precedent that administration planners could then use to establish similar supply management programs for feed grains, wheat, and all other agricultural commodities.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the present bill entangles us in an inconsistency so outrageous that I find myself quite incapable of supporting it.

It is true that consistency is not always a virtue, as for example when a man is consistently wrong. But consistency is a virtue when it causes one to act in accordance with the best light that he has. The trouble with this bill is that it acts in accordance with a light that has faded, and that it reflects the thinking of a point of view now completely discredited.

This bill continues to drag the Nation down the old tobacco road: a road which modern scientists have warned must be abandoned at the peril of serious national consequences.

Every year our ruts grow deeper, and our foolishness more apparent. Every year we find it more difficult to do what our commonsense tells us should have been done a long time ago. How many more lives will be blighted, how many more people will die unnecessarily, before we summon the courage to abandon this tobacco support program, and tell the public the truth?

A little over a year ago the Advisory Committee made its official report on tobacco to the Surgeon General. It appears in the Public Health Service Publication, No. 1103, and bears the title "Smoking and Health." The report merely put the official stamp of approval on what had been known and accepted by almost all knowledgeable scientists as well as the general public for many years.

The report reached the irrefutable conclusion that the use of tobacco, especially cigarettes, is causally linked to several diseases, including lung cancer, cardiovascular diseases, chronic bronchitis, and emphysema. This conclusion was corroborated by almost innumerable population studies, animal experiments, and clinical and autopsy reports. One epidemiological study showed that:

> The death rate for smokers of cigarettes only, who were smoking at the time of entry into the particular prospective study, is about 70 percent higher than for nonsmokers.

The report concluded:

> Cigarette smoking is a health hazard of sufficient importance in the United States to warrant appropriate remedial action.

The National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health estimates that 850,000 Americans will be under medical treatment for some form of cancer in 1965—550,000 of these will be new cases, diagnosed for the first time; 295,000 will die from this dread scourge this year, and the number is increasing alarmingly.

There will be 52,000 new cases of lung cancer this year, and overall deaths from this cause will reach 47,000. In 1962 the figure was only 41,000, but in 1930, only 3,000. The survival rate is less than 5 percent, among all lung cancer victims. This means that less than 5 percent of those who were diagnosed as having lung cancer 5 years ago, are alive today.

Tobacco, of course, cannot be considered the sole cause or even the principal cause of all types of cancer, but it has definitely been identified as the principal cause of lung cancer, and a substantially contributing cause of other types of cancer, as well as other diseases.

When we see these figures, our conscience becomes troubled. We decide to do something about it. This year we will spend over $150 million through the National Cancer Institute, to find out ways of resisting the spread of cancer. Other agencies, too, get in on the act. The Public Health Service, the Veterans' Administration and other agencies, in conjunction with the above referred to National Cancer Institute, spend a grand total of $267 million a year on cancer research. If you add to this figure the money spent by private agencies such as the American Cancer Society, the Damon Runyan Fund, the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, and others, you arrive at the staggering figure of $347 million, which represents the total money spent by this Nation every year for the purpose of cutting down the incidence of cancer.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, every person in this Chamber knows that there is a far more effective way to dramatically reduce the incidence of cancer. This way will not only not cost society hundreds of millions of dollars, but it will actually save society hundreds of millions of dollars. I am referring, of course, to the withdrawal of Government support from the tobacco program.

From the figures available to me, the tobacco program has cost the Government a net of $38 million since its inception. I cannot understand the logical justification for our spending untold millions of dollars to reduce cancer, on the one hand, and for spending additional untold millions of dollars to promote a program which will increase cancer, on the other. This is the outrageous inconsistency of which I spoke. This is the reason I cannot support this measure. This is the reason why I urge all Members to heed this warning.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5721) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5721, with Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, tobacco is grown in 21 of our Nation's States by some 750,000 farm families. About 3 million Americans comprise these farm families depending in whole or in part upon the growing of tobacco.

There are some 550 plants, employing around *100,000* workers in 30 States, engaged in the manufacture of tobacco products.

Approximately 1,500,000 businesses share in the tobacco trade.

Our Federal, State, and local governments collect annually about $3,500 million in taxes on tobacco and tobacco products.

Tobacco exports comprise one of America's principal stabilizing factors in our balance of payments with the rest of the world. Tobacco exports have brought in from abroad $10 billion since our tobacco program has been operating.

Domestically and in export, tobacco is an $8 billion annual business for the United States.

THE TOBACCO PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, the tobacco program has been the most successful of all farm programs. In the 32-year history of Government farm programs, the tobacco program has cost only $38 million. Compare this with the $52 billion in taxes collected upon tobacco in the same years. The revenues from tobacco have yielded to the Government substantially more than twice the cost of all farm price-support programs for all crops since these programs were inaugurated in 1933.

But, Mr. Chairman, in recent years excessive supplies of tobacco have accumulated because of dramatic increases in the per acre yields of tobacco. Surpluses now endanger the tobacco program.

Moreover, the United States has failed to share in the increase in world tobacco trade.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the reason we come before the House today with H.R. 5721, seeking the favorable consideration of this body.

In order to provide a more effective method of maintaining supplies in line with demand, to improve the quality of U.S. tobacco and to increase exports, H.R. 5721 would supplement the present acreage allotment program for Flue-cured tobacco by the addition of farm poundage quotas.

I shall give the House at this time a brief explanation of the bill. A more detailed analysis may be found in our committee's report.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF H.R. 5721

Farm poundage quotas would be established for all farms where Flue-cured tobacco is grown, beginning with the 1965 crop, if two-thirds or more of producers voting approve the shift from the present acreage to an acreage-poundage supply adjustment in a special referendum.

For more than 90 percent of the Flue-cured tobacco producers, the average yields of their 3 best years in the 5 years 1959–63 would become the base upon which poundage quotas would be computed. Those with average yields below 80 percent of the average of their township or other community divisions would have their base raised to 80 percent of the average community yield. Those producers with average yields of more than 120 percent of the community yield would be given a base equal to three-fourths of their average farm yield plus one-fourth of the national yield goal of around 1,854 pounds, but in no event would these higher producers be brought down below 120 percent of the community yield average.

A poundage quota then would be established for each farm by multiplying this yield by the farm's acreage allotment, and then reducing this figure by a percentage—estimated at 7 or 8 percent—sufficient to bring overall tobacco production to a level that would reduce the current Flue-cured tobacco surplus—now estimated to be in excess of 600 million pounds—by about 100 million pounds a year.

Special provision is made to give the poundage program flexibility, by producers being able to market more or less than their quotas in one year and have their quotas for the following year adjusted accordingly. This will protect farmers who suffer a crop disaster or overproduce because of favorable growing conditions, in any year.

This bill would restore Flue-cured acreage allotments to 95 percent of the 1964 allotments, wiping out most of the 19.5 percent acreage cut already announced for 1965, with the limit placed upon the poundage that may be marketed from this larger acreage.

While this bill is intended at this time to deal with the problems of Flue-cured tobacco producers, it provides that other kinds of tobacco may be brought into an acreage-poundage program, if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that this program would result in more effective production adjustments, and if two-thirds or more of the producers of any other kind of tobacco, voting in a referendum, approve a shift to acreage-poundage quotas.

BROAD SUPPORT FOR PROGRAM

The shift from acreage to acreage-poundage management of Flue-cured tobacco production has wide general support among producers. The tobacco program has been the difference between economic prostration and prosperity for these farmers, and they have been willing to make any sacrifice in years past, through severe acreage reductions, to protect this program.

However, while the general principle of poundage controls is broadly accepted, there are differences among producers on the method of establishing the poundage base for each farm.

At the next meeting of the House, after receipt of the President's farm message, I introduced H.R. 4532, the first acreage-poundage bill prepared by the Department of Agriculture at the request of a substantial number of tobacco producers and others in the tobacco industry.

Subsequently, the Tobacco Subcommittee held public hearings in Washington and in the Flue-cured tobacco producing area. Statements were received from more than 200 persons in these hearings. The subcommittee found that many farmers from the principal producing States—Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida—were not satisfied with the legislation. The subcommittee received their suggestions, and revised the legislation for the purpose of making it more equitable to producers.

H.R. 5721 embraces the revisions and refinements written by the subcommittee.

When the proposal for acreage-poundage quotas first was submitted it was certain then that writing a simple and equitable bill would be very difficult, even after the Committee on Agriculture had done the very best it could. The bill in its present form is far from simple. It represents the committee's best effort in the time at hand, in our determination to bring this legislation to enactment in time for poundage quotas to be applied to the 1965 Flue-cured crop, if producers so approve.

H.R. 5721 was endorsed by the Secretary of Agriculture, in a letter to the chairmen of the Committee on Agriculture, dated March 3, as embracing the best plan yet presented for acreage-poundage quotas. You will find the Secretary's letter printed in the committee report.

As we gain experience in the operation through poundage quotas, we certainly shall be able to improve this program by perfecting legislation in the years ahead.

WHY 1965?

A substantial number of farmers, while approving the poundage approach to supply adjustment, oppose the poundage program for 1965. They contend that planning for the 1965 crop of tobacco, including land leases, tenant arrangements, and production materials, is too far advanced, and this would impose hardships upon many producers.

On the other hand, those pressing for inauguration of the poundage program in 1965 stress that under the current acreage allotment program, with the continued explosion of per-acre yields, new tons of tobacco will be piled upon the present surplus heap, making immensely more difficult any shift to a poundage program in the future.

It has been the determination of the Committee on Agriculture from the outset to bring forward promptly an acreage-poundage bill, providing for a referendum in which farmers may freely make the decision for themselves.

H.R. 5721 NOT THE ULTIMATE ANSWER

Mr. Chairman, while this legislation proposes to protect the integrity of the tobacco program in the immediate years ahead, the committee does not deem it to be the ultimate answer for the tobacco producer. The tobacco farmer needs and must have broader markets, and these markets can be found in export.

The fortunes of American tobacco in the future, as in the past, will lie largely across the seas.

America and the tobacco industry grew up together. Tobacco was the economic base of the colonies that gained early

footholds in the New World. The world learned about tobacco from the American Indian. Jamestown, the first permanent English settlement in America, was the world's first tobacco export market.

Tobacco exports and domestic excises maintained the financial integrity of our Nation before the world during this Nation's formative years.

Our tobacco has been the hallmark of quality throughout the world. The reputation of our tobacco has enabled America to hold a dominant position in world markets for 350 years. Consumers around the world have demanded tobacco products containing high percentages of U.S. leaf with its characteristic flavor and aroma. The high quality of American tobacco has reflected the extremely advantageous conditions under which tobacco is produced in the United States.

We have the soil, climate, and good farmers with know-how to grow tobacco that is equaled in quality nowhere else in the world.

Nevertheless, our superior quality leaf, while maintaining its established volume in export, has not shared in the increased markets for tobacco around the world. Tobaccos of lower quality, produced in other areas of the world and offered at prices much below the American price, have moved into the expanding world markets.

Steps must be taken to make American tobacco more competitive around the world.

A PROPOSAL FOR TOBACCO'S FUTURE

Mr. Chairman, on January 6, I wrote to the President proposing that, of the billions of dollars collected through tobacco excises, the Federal Government plow back 1 cent of the 8-cent-a-pack levy upon cigarettes, in programs to increase America's share of foreign tobacco markets, to maintain the stability and prosperity of tobacco producers, and to undertake research in the field of smoking and health.

This proposal was discussed before the Tobacco Subcommittee during its hearings on the legislation presented by this report. The Under Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Charles S. Murphy, made a statement before the subcommittee giving this proposal his enthusiastic endorsement.

So that the Members of the House may be aware of this proposal, during the consideration of H.R. 5721, I am making this letter to the President a part of my remarks, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., January 6, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I commend your recommendation, presented in the state of the Union message, that family purchasing power be strengthened by a substantial cut in Federal excise taxes. Such an adjustment should contribute in a very sound and solid way to a growing economy and a strong nation.

You did not set forth, in your message, what precise excises you want reduced; but the press on December 27, 1964, reported that you would ask the Congress to repeal or cut all these levies except those upon tobacco products, alcoholic beverages, and highway use.

The tobacco tax is one of the oldest levies in our revenue system. Perhaps no tax is felt by a greater number of our citizens, from the tobacco producer, through workers in manufacturing plants, on to the user of tobacco products. Therefore, I respectfully submit a suggestion with respect to this tax, embraced in the context of these facts:

1. Since 1933, when the tobacco program and other farm programs first were inaugurated, Federal and State Governments have collected $52,019 million in excise taxes upon tobacco and tobacco products—the Federal Government $39,431 million and State governments $12,588 million.

2. The $39 billion from Federal tobacco collections alone during this 32-year period are substantially more than twice the grand total of $15,026 million expended by the Government through the Commodity Credit Corporation on all farm price support programs for all crops since these programs were inaugurated. The Federal tobacco levies have yielded more money than the combined costs of all these farm price support programs and the food-for-peace program through which this country has invested $12,486 million to lessen hunger among friendly peoples around the world.

3. While $52 billion has been collected in tobacco excises by Federal and State Governments, the cost of the tobacco program, which has protected the income of tobacco farmers since 1933, has been only $38 million.

4. Meanwhile, during these 32 years, our tobacco and tobacco product exports—without any export subsidy—have amounted to $10 billion, contributing substantially to our Nation's balance of payments with other countries. In this connection it might be well to mention that during the first 100 years of our history as a nation, it was the export of tobacco and cotton that maintained America's financial integrity before the world.

5. Tobacco is an $8 billion industry in the United States. Hundreds of thousands of farm families in 21 States are engaged in the growing of tobacco. There are some 550 plants, employing approximately 100,000 workers in 30 States, engaged in the manufacture of tobacco products. Approximately 1,500,000 businesses with many hundreds of thousands of workers are in the tobacco trade.

6. The $3 billion-plus now collected annually by Federal and State Governments from tobacco levies amounts to more than twice the income farmers actually receive each year for all the tobacco they produce. The total of these excises is 10 times the profits, after taxes, of all cigarette and other tobacco manufacturers.

7. During the Korean conflict, the Federal excise on cigarettes was increased from $3.50 to $4 per 1,000 cigarettes—or from 7 to 8 cents per pack. Under the revenue law approved October 20, 1951, the cigarette levy was to have reverted to $3.50 at the termination of the Korean hostilities; but the reversion to the prewar rate has been postponed year after year. Under the law, unless there is further legislation, the cigarette excise will drop back to $3.50 per 1,000 on July 1, 1965.

8. In recent years, great increases have been attained in the per acre yield of tobacco on our farms so that, despite severe restrictions upon acreage devoted to this crop, surpluses have accumulated and now endanger the operations of the tobacco price stabilization program. This program has been the most successful of all farm programs in protecting and improving, at the least cost, the incomes and standard of living of those farm families engaged in the production of a crop. Coincident with the increasing per acre yields of tobacco in the United States, other areas of the world have developed and expanded tobacco culture, and now are competing in world markets which have been dominated by our tobacco since colonial times. The quality of our tobacco is superior to any produced anywhere else in the world, and is preferred in world markets, but price competition has become intense. The severity of this competition can be measured by the fact that in 1963 the average export price of Fluecured (cigarette type) tobacco was: United States 82.1 cents, Canada 71.7 cents, Rhodesia-Nyasaland 63.3 cents, and India 36.1 cents. The world price competition has been much more severe in 1964, but average export prices for this year are not yet available. Our tobacco has been able to hold markets where superior quality is required, but the price-cutting by other exporting areas now is being severely felt.

9. The soundness of our tobacco economy, its ability to yield revenues to our Federal and State Governments, its contribution to the Nation's balance of payments, the continuation of the tobacco program that has meant so much to the many thousands of farm families producing tobacco, all rest in a substantial way upon the holding and expansion of our foreign markets for tobacco. The export of tobacco is a proper concern of our Government in the interest of our Nation.

10. New problems for tobacco developed early this year in the report of the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General on "Smoking and Health."

Now, therefore, in the light of the foregoing, I respectfully petition your serious and careful consideration of a recommendation which I have arrived at after the most searching deliberation.

If it is your judgment that the excise on cigarettes not be reduced from $4 to $3.50 per 1,000, as now is scheduled to occur on July 1, 1965, then let us by appropriate legislation assign an amount of money equal to the proceeds from the 50 cents difference between the $3.50 and $4 levy for these specific purposes:

(a) To enable and promote the export and marketing of American tobacco around the world;

(b) To bear all costs of the tobacco price stabilization program;

(c) To finance research and inquiry into smoking and health.

This proposal, in effect, would assign 1 cent of the 8-cent-a-pack levy on cigarettes—or about $250 million annually—to the above specified purposes.

Mr. President, since Federal and State Governments are collecting annually on tobacco products three times as much money as our farmers actually receive each year for their total tobacco crop, this proposition of plowing back a portion of the Federal excise collections makes sense to me.

It will make the tobacco price stabilization program self-sustaining, as the sugar program now is self-sustaining through a special sugar levy.

It will make certain that American tobacco will remain supreme in the tobacco markets of the world, thereby guaranteeing the continued effectiveness of our tobacco price stabilization program and decent incomes for those many thousands of Americans who produce tobacco.

It will assure proper and effective concern for the health of all Americans who use tobacco.

Moreover, it is my conviction that in going this route our Federal and State Governments in the long run will derive even greater revenues from tobacco, and tobacco's contribution to America's critical balance of payments with other nations will be greatly enlarged.

With high esteem and warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

SMOKING AND HEALTH

Mr. Chairman, I did not anticipate that we would meet the Surgeon General's report on "Smoking and Health" right at the opening of this debate, but I think in fairness to the House—in view of the remarks of a speaker, on the rule for consideration of this legislation—I should say when the Surgeon General's report was released to the public I introduced a resolution at the very next session of the House calling for a broad and comprehensive research program into the matters involved in the report of the Surgeon General.

We held hearings. The Surgeon General was called as our first witness and he stated at the hearing that he was wholeheartedly in favor of the resolution. He did not say that the report on "Smoking and Health" scientifically proved that tobacco was dangerous to health. That report is based upon statistics rather than upon scientific findings. We called other scientists and prominent men. The last one we called was the Director of the National Cancer Institute at Bethesda. We had numerous witnesses, experts and others, farm leaders and others, and not a single witness appeared in opposition to that resolution—not a single one advocated repeal of the price support program. Even at this time research is going on. Other research is necessary. But certainly the report on "Smoking and Health" is not sufficient cause for us to abandon a program which means so much to so many, yes, which means so much even to all the States of the Union, and to the Federal Government.

THE ORIGIN OF THIS LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, the farmers themselves started this bill. It did not originate in our committee. It did not originate in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It originated with the farmers. They swarmed into our committee room 2 days before I had even organized the committee, and they came from many Flue-cured tobacco-growing areas. They were almost unanimous, if not unanimous, in favor of a change from acreage to acreage-poundage.

Last year we took a reduction in the acreage and this year our farmers voted in a free and unfettered referendum by a vote of 96.5 percent to reduce their acreage by another 19.5 percent during the year 1965, thus showing their willingness to cooperate with the Government in minimizing the losses and to perfect and strengthen the program.

Now, even with the 19.5-percent reduction in acreage, we are told by the experts in the Department that this in itself would not be sufficient. So the farmers come forward now with a poundage program. This poundage program is supported, I would say, by a large majority of the farmers in the area, both large and small, because everybody agrees that something must be done. If nothing is done, we are told we will add another 200 million pounds of tobacco to our carryover at the end of the current year.

COSTS OF PROGRAMS

Mr. Chairman, just briefly here is what the program losses on various crops have amounted to. This is for the benefit of those of you from other areas. The tobacco program over the years has lost only $38 million; the corn program has lost $3,148 million over the years; wheat has lost $2,946 million; cotton, $2,188 million; dairy products, $3,852 million. Our total losses have amounted to $8,703 million on the basic crops in 32 years. On January 1, 1953—and that is a very significant date in the political life of the Nation because we had a very great change there—we had a profit of over $13 million on the price-support program for our basic crops through the Commodity Credit Corporation, whereas now we have losses amounting to over $8 billion.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I reemphasize that the long-range prosperity of the millions of our people in all phases of the tobacco industry will depend in very large part upon the expansion of our export markets, and I am hopeful the administration will see fit to follow the course I have suggested to the President for development of these outlets abroad. But today we are before the House seeking to deal with an immediate situation that endangers our tobacco program. And I must say again to this House that without this program a great number of our farmers would be bankrupted, and the millions of people who depend upon them, in their own families, and in the communities dependent upon a tobacco economy, would be destitute.

Our tobacco farmers are willing to do whatever is necessary to save their program.

H.R. 5721 embraces changes in this program suggested by a substantial segment of tobacco producers. It would bring about tighter controls on marketings to deal with the menacing surpluses. It would prevent large Government costs from accumulating against the tobacco program.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how many of our tobacco farmers will approve of this new program in all its details. But, Mr. Chairman, we do plead here that the House approve this bill, to give the farmers an opportunity, voting in a referendum, to determine for themselves whether they want to try this approach to their problems at this time.

I express to the Members my appreciation for their sympathetic consideration.

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me commend my good chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] for the manner in which he handled this bill in our full committee and for the type of hearings we had in the South where we actually visited people who are interested in tobacco legislation. I think this is a good practice to follow not only with regard to tobacco but with respect to other commodities. I also want to commend our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] for the admirable way in which he conducted our subcommittee hearings.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5721 is a bill which tobacco growers and taxpayers do not want. It is desired only by the advocates of poundage, bushelage, and bale controls. Notwithstanding the many statements which will be made here today in support of H.R. 5721, I can say without reservation that the only people clamoring for the passage of this type of legislation are those individuals who have been pushing for mandatory, strict, volume controls for agriculture over the years in an attempt to stifle the American farmers' ingenuity and initiative. The adoption of H.R. 5721 would set the precedent for the establishment of mandatory volume controls never before imposed on an American farmer.

My colleagues, let it be understood here and now that we are dealing with more than the tobacco growers today. The passage of this bill would become the precedent for imposing similar volume restrictions on the producers of wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, and other farm commodities. Nothing short of absolute Government ownership and management of the land could place greater restrictions on American agriculture. My colleagues, we certainly do not want nor do we need any such Government controls on agriculture. The establishment of volume controls would have a direct effect on land values, and this argument was heard many, many times in our committee while we were considering this legislation. Land would be valued on the basis of the past production of that land. If you had been fortunate to have a good tenant in the past who did a good job in farming your land, your land values would be high. On the other hand, if you had a poor tenant who did not get all the production from your land that it was capable of producing, your land values would be low.

I realize that this bill has been amended since the chairman indicated that he could not support it as it was. But the principle of volume control is still in this bill and for this reason it should not pass.

I am one of those who believe that if a bill is bad in principle you cannot improve it by adding some sweetening amendments, so long as it continues to embody that principle. Such a bill is H.R. 5721. It is admitted that we have a 950-million-pound surplus of Flue-cured tobacco, 600 million pounds more than required for a normal reserve, and that this surplus must be reduced. Forgetting for a moment the volume-control principle involved in this bill, let us determine whether H.R. 5721 of the present law will reduce this tobacco surplus more in 1965.

On page 2 of the committee report we find that the surplus would be reduced by an estimated 100 million pounds if H.R. 5721 is enacted. I, for one, am willing to take this 100-million figure. However, curiously, we do not find anything in the report telling us how much more this surplus would be reduced in 1965 under present law. We do read on page 2:

> This bill would restore Flue-cured acreage allotments to 95 percent of the 1964 allotments, wiping out most of the 19.5 percent acreage cut already announced for 1965.

Mr. Chairman, you will find that on page 2 of the majority report. I ask you to turn to it. Let me hasten to add at this point that this 19.5-percent acreage cut has already been approved by 96½ percent of those tobacco farmers voting in a tobacco referendum last December. How much would this tobacco surplus be reduced if we permitted this already voted 19½-percent cut to take effect? This depends on which set of Department of Agriculture statistics you want to use.

I might say at this point that I called the Department of Agriculture to get their estimate on this matter, and curiously enough they said they could not estimate it, so we are going to estimate it for them with their figures, their statistics. This cut could be estimated at a minimum of 153 million pounds of a maximum of 173 million pounds. Mr. Chairman, compare this with 100 million pounds reduction that this bill is supposed to produce.

In 1964, a 10-percent acreage cut was applied under existing law and according to the Department's September 1964 "Tobacco Situation," a 6-percent reduction in production was achieved.

And that happens to be found on page 3 of the Department's own Tobacco Situation Report of September 1964. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that if the 19.5-percent acreage reduction is accomplished, we could expect approximately a 12-percent cut in production.

Now, Mr. Chairman, applying this 12-percent reduction to the 1,277,000 pounds of Flue-cured tobacco produced in 1964, we arrive at a reduction for 1965 of a little more than 153 million pounds under the present law.

Compare this, my colleagues, with the 100 million pounds suggested under the committee's majority report.

Should we want to use the statistics found in the Department's January 29, 1965, "Tobacco Summary of Price Support and Related Information," we learn that a 6.8-percent reduction was obtained in 1964 by applying this same 10-percentage acreage cut.

Production was reduced from 1.371 billion pounds in 1963 to 1.277 billion pounds in 1964.

According to the Department's own figures this is a reduction of 94 million pounds from 1963 to 1964.

Now, doubling this 6.8-percent reduction achieved in 1964 by a 10-percent acreage reduction, we arrived at a 13.6-percent reduction in production.

Now, applying this 13.6-percent cut to the 1.277 billion pounds of production in 1964, we arrive at a reduction of slightly more than 173 million pounds for 1965 under the present law. Compare this reduction if you will with the 100 million-pound reduction which the sponsors admit will take place under this bill we are considering today. Now, how much would this additional surplus cost for 1965? Considering the support price for types 21 through 23 of Flue-cured tobacco of 40 cents per pound, which incidentally is not the highest but the lowest price for any Flue-cured tobacco, we arrive at an additional cost of $21.2 million, when we consider the 53 million-pound additional production as per the Department's September statistics and $29.2 million cost, when we consider the 73-million-pound additional production as per the Department's January 29 statistics.

Thus, my colleagues, the question of cost is squarely up to you. A vote for this bill will mean an extra $21 million worth of surplus tobacco and possibly as much as $29.2 million worth for 1965 over and above what the cost would be if we permitted the present 19.5-percent cut already voted by the tobacco producers themselves to take effect.

And, Mr. Chairman, I might at this point say that the committee report in paragraph 2 of page 1 states as follows:

The tobacco program has been the most successful of all farm programs.

Let us move on and examine some interesting features about this bill.

Under the bill tobacco farmers would be allowed to carry forward from year to year their unused quotas. This means that should a tobacco farmer fail to produce all of his quota in a given year he could carry forward the shortage and produce it in a later year. Not only is such a provision self-defeating as a control device, but it would be an advantage that would not—I emphasize the word "not"—be available to producers of other commodities, such as wheat and feed grains. Under both the wheat and feed grain programs a farmer who has a short crop one year cannot carry forward his loss of production to a subsequent year.

Another sweetener thrown into this bill would establish the farm yields on the basis of township or community averages. County averages are used for wheat and feed grains, for example. If it is more equitable to establish a tobacco program based on township and community yields in order to more accurately reflect the individual farmers' production, Why is it not more equitable to do so for other commodities?

I know you are asking yourselves, why these sweeteners in this bill. Could it be that the advocates of mandatory volume controls needed these sweeteners in their desperate effort to sell this program? That is my belief, and if you believe as I do, what safeguards do the farmers have that these same sweeteners will not be taken out in subsequent legislation once this program gets underway?

In conclusion, let me ask why all the hurry in making this program effective in 1965? All arrangements for the 1965 crops are already underway for this year. If this is a good program it will withstand farmer scrutiny until 1966. If it cannot, it should not pass.

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

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I know the gentleman does not want to mislead the House.

Mr. LATTA. I certainly do not.

Mr. COOLEY. In our production program last year we had an acreage reduction of 10 percent, but we actually produced 1 percent more tobacco in 1964 than in 1963.

Mr. LATTA. Where does the gentleman get those figures?

Mr. COOLEY. This is Flue-cured tobacco. You quoted some statistics in September. There could not be any accurate estimate or statistics at that time because we ran into the middle of the marketing season then.

Mr. LATTA. I not only quoted the figures of September; I also quoted the figures of January 29, 1965.

Mr. COOLEY. I know, but you said that the 10-percent acreage cut brought about a reduction in production in 1964.

Mr. LATTA. By some 6.8 percent by applying the 10-percent cut.

Mr. COOLEY. The record shows an increased production by 1 percent.

Mr. LATTA. I will read from the Department's own record of January 29, 1965. I quote this to the chairman, and I will let him see a copy of this.

> Flue-cured production is forecast at 1,277 million pounds compared with 1,371 million pounds in 1963, an average production of 1,216 million pounds.

These are the Department's own figures.

Mr. COOLEY. That was the forecast.

Mr. LATTA. This was the Department's own report of January 29, 1965.

Mr. COOLEY. You used the word "forecast."

Mr. LATTA. I am not saying anything. I'm merely quoting the Department's own report.

Mr. COOLEY. You certainly did.

Mr. LATTA. No, this report says that Flue-cured production is forecast at 1,277 million pounds compared with 1,371, million pounds in 1963.

Mr. COOLEY. Let me point out these figures. I have the record here before me. In 1963 we produced 1,371,462,000 pounds. In 1964 we produced 1,382,478,000 pounds. That is a 1-percent increase. I am reading these figures from the official 1964 crop summary published by the USDA Crop Reporting Board. This increase in actual production last year, when we actually cut acreage by 10 percent, is what is disturbing the farmers and disturbing to all of us—that this acreage reduction does not seem to bring about an overall reduction in production.

Mr. LATTA. If the chairman wants to dispute the Department's own records, that is all right with me. The figures that I just read were submitted by the Department as of January 29, 1965.

Mr. COOLEY. I am just pointing out to the House that you are talking about the forecast and I am talking about the net result.

Mr. LATTA. Let me ask the chairman this question. Is it not a fact that the production of Flue-cured tobacco for 1964 was 1,277 million pounds?

Mr. COOLEY. No—1,382 million pounds.

Mr. LATTA. You are talking about 1963, it was 1,371 million pounds in 1963

Mr. COOLEY. That is right—1,371 million in 1963. In 1964, 1,382 million pounds. So that we did not reduce production at all but we increased it by 1 percent.

Mr. LATTA. The chairman's figures do not correspond to the figures furnished by the Department in the two reports I have referred to.

Mr. COOLEY. These are the Department's official reports that I am referring to.

Mr. LATTA. I have been reading the Department's own reports and if he has later figures, I would be pleased to see them and add them to the two I have referred to.

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

Mr. LATTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. I just thought it might possibly help to clear up this donnybrook on statistics to point out that the carryover in Flue-cured tobacco, as I understand it, did increase by 1 percent which would correspond to the figure that the honorable chairman of the committee gave us. But that was the carryover figure which did increase and not in the production figure and, of course, they are two different things.

Mr. LATTA. They are two different things. The figures that I have given to the House are production figures and did not refer to any carryover figures as such. I was only comparing the production figures with what the production was in 1963 and 1964 based upon the two Department reports to which I have referred.

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

Mr. LATTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. There is certainly no doubt whatever that the cutback in acreage, as provided for in this bill, would be less than the cutback in acreage which would occur if we passed no bill. There is certainly no doubt on that point; is there?

Mr. LATTA. I do not think anybody would quibble with that and I do not think anybody would quibble over the Department's own figures as to the production.

Mr. FINDLEY. In other words, if this bill passes, more acreage will be in tobacco production than will be the case if the bill does not pass?

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

Mr. LATTA. I am happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not arguing with the figures and I am not arguing with my friend over the statements that he has made because we use the words "preliminary estimate" or something along that line. But here we have the actual official figures of the Department. Now, if we had accomplished what you think we did accomplish last year, I do not think this bill would be here today.

Mr. LATTA. That is exactly what I am saying. That is part of my argument, Mr. Chairman. If we let the 19.5-percent cut take place that the tobacco farmers voted last December, you would have a greater reduction in production than there would be under this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, no; I have checked with the Department's experts and they have assured me otherwise.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I first of all want to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], who has worked so hard and so effectively for the farmers of America.

I also want to pay tribute to the chairman of this Subcommittee on Tobacco, the gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable WATKINS ABBITT, who was just as fair as he could be in giving all of the farmers of America a chance to express themselves on this particular measure.

We from the tobacco area of this country are all united in the conviction that a tobacco program must continue. There is no argument about that. There is no argument about the fact that research must constantly be done to try to find out more about this charge that there is a link between cancer and smoking.

As the chairman of the committee pointed out, all of the tobacco farmers and the tobacco industry are just as interested in that research as they can be. As we know, the Department of Agriculture is now engaged in research on this important matter.

I would say to my colleague the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING], who suggested we do away with this program because of the charge that there is a link between cancer and cigarette smoking, that if we do away with this program all we will do will be to increase the production of tobacco.

In Rhodesia last year, where they had no control program, as we have, 350 million pounds, of extra, unneeded Flue-cured tobacco were produced, which sold for 10 cents a pound. So I would say that if we have no program the only thing we will do, believe me, is to increase the production of tobacco, which will certainly not help us solve this problem of reducing cancer incidence supposedly related to tobacco.

So, there are many areas of agreement. But, Mr. Chairman, those of us who were at the tobacco hearing in Moultrie, Ga., will recall that the tobacco farmers of Georgia and Florida were opposed to the acreage-poundage control proposal. As those who are familiar with the tobacco problem will recall, for some months the Flue-cured-tobacco farmers of Florida and Georgia have endeavored to get type 14 tobacco treated as a separate type of tobacco for stabilization administration. They took their case to the courts. They told the courts that type 14 tobacco, grown throughout the belt, is a different kind of tobacco. It is grown exclusively by the farmers of Georgia and Florida.

This tobacco was being sold. It was bought by the tobacco buyers. The tobacco producers of Georgia and Florida maintained that they followed the best instructions of their extension service agents. They planted the proper kinds of plants. They used the best cultivation suggestions. They produced for the market. So, although they have no argument with the Flue-cured tobacco growers in other areas about programs they might want to solve this problem, the tobacco growers of Georgia and Florida felt that they should not have to see their tobacco acreage reduced, because they were producing for the market. The courts have so far looked favorably on this presentation of the Georgia and Florida Flue-cured tobacco farmers.

About 2 percent of the tobacco grown in these two States goes into the stabilization corporation. So that is the problem we are faced with insofar as our tobacco growers are concerned.

Later on in this debate, I believe the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL] will propose an amendment to postpone this program for at least 1 year. Many of our farmers in Florida and Georgia have already planted their tobacco. They have already made arrangements to finance the production. They have bought their fertilizer. They have checked on the problems of lease and transfer.

I have the honor of being the author of that particular measure; and 23,000 farmers last year took advantage of the lease and transfer program. They are wondering what will happen to that program if this new type of control passes.

I hope that, at least, the House will pass the amendment to delay consideration of this bill for 1 year and give to those of us who are opposed to this bill a quid pro quo, as we face a solution to this important problem.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA].

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, as my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS], I rise in opposition to H.R. 5721, but in doing so I also would like to pay my tribute to the great chairman of this committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] for their kindness and fairness in the hearings and so forth which have been going on with respect to this measure.

I, also, recognize that we are united in trying to do something to help our tobacco program. The farmers of my district depend very much for their income on tobacco. Through the past years, as we have been getting into the spiral of increased production, there has also been a general deterioration in the quality of tobacco.

I hope the committee in its wisdom will consider the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL] for postponing this for another year so that we can get adequate and thorough hearings and give consideration to some type of program which can meet with the support of the industry with respect to this very serious problem. It is very evident and very obvious that throughout this program we have had a system which has been very successful through the years until we found ourselves in a situation where we have this great deterioration in quality. I think the fault with our program is basically in the lower grades of tobacco, and there are over some 100 grades. It has been generally priced too high in the marketplace and the superior quality has been priced too low. This led to farmers trying to grow more poundage in order to get more money for their tobacco. A farmer can grow poor quality tobacco and make more money than he can in trying to grow good qual-

ity tobacco. This program lent itself to this situation.

I hope that the committee will recommit this bill to the Committee on Agriculture so that in times of calmness we can give thorough study to the possibility of some alternative measure rather than this volume control. Farmers of our area of Florida are already planting their tobacco. I have had many people from the Production Credit Association call me as well as bankers and fertilizer people call me and say, "What are we going to do? We have already loaned the money to these farmers based on their ability to repay according to previous years. Now you are changing the rules in the middle of the game." That is what we are doing, gentlemen. We are changing the rules in the middle of the game. I hope that the Members of the House will be the sole judges of this and give equity to the people of my State of Florida who have already proceeded on this basis. It is less than 3½ months from now before the tobacco markets will open. By the time this can pass the other body, the machinery put into motion for holding a referendum, it will be too late, and our farmers will certainly suffer under this program. I might add in the State of Florida in past years and particularly in the past year we have had less than 2 percent of our tobacco going into stabilization. You can have all of the other arguments you want to make, but the fact is that we are producing quality tobacco and the amount going into stabilization is very evident when we have less than 2 percent. So the overall program does need some kind of study so that we can give thorough hearings to this.

I appreciate the gentlemen here going into the field to hold hearings so that the farmers can have an opportunity to be heard, but they will tell you, I think, the overwhelming majority of farmers are very much opposed to this coming in at such a late date and particularly when we just passed a referendum this past December. I imagine at the very time this referendum was being held the people in the Department of Agriculture were coming up with this idea of the acreage-poundage control with no mention being made until we get back into this session of Congress and then there is this tremendous rush.

I do not know why there is this rush on the part of the supporters and handlers of this bill. Maybe it is because there are certain court cases pending that would separate our type 14. I do not know and I will not judge their motives, but there is some reason why there is the urgency to come in at this time and try to change the rules while we are in the middle of the game.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman mentioned an amendment which will be offered. Will this be a recommittal motion to send it back to the committee, or will it amend the body of the legislation to delay for 1 year the poundage scheme? Can you clarify that?

Mr. FUQUA. Yes. It will delay it for 1 year.

Mr. FINDLEY. It will delay the whole business for 1 year?

Mr. FUQUA. Right.

Mr. FINDLEY. In other words, the 19½-percent acreage cut would take effect?

Mr. FUQUA. That would be my understanding.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of directing a couple of questions to the majority side. As I understand, the need for this legislation results from the excessive supplies that have been accumulated, as set forth on page 2 of the committee report. The excessive supplies have accumulated because of dramatic increases in the production of tobacco. Therefore the purpose of this legislation is to cut back this surplus accumulation. The farmers have approved the program under which a 19½-percent acreage cut will take effect this year.

Would the gentlemen on the other side have any objection to an amendment which would retain that 19½-percent cutback, still retaining the poundage formula they desire? It seems to me such would have the desirable effect of cutting back still more the total tobacco production, if that is the real purpose of this bill.

Would the gentleman have any objection to an amendment which would leave intact the provision of the present law which requires a 19½-percent cutback in acreage planted to tobacco even though it would still permit on the remaining acres this poundage formula? I would appreciate it if someone on the majority side would comment on that question.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman understands, of course, that if the bill is defeated you would take a 19½-percent acreage reduction. If you pass the bill, and more than two-thirds of the farmers affected do not vote in favor of the program, the 1965 acreage, embracing a 19½-percent cut, will remain in effect.

Mr. FINDLEY. If they do approve the acreage cutback it would be about 14½ percent?

Mr. COOLEY. If they approve the bill we get to an entirely different program. There is no side-stepping the fact, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] brought out, that those people who are supporting this bill are now and have been and will hereafter be in favor of strict controls.

Mr. FINDLEY. Am I then correct that even if this bill passes and the farmers approve it by the required two-thirds vote it would result in a cutback in acreage planted to tobacco compared with the planting of last year?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, but not as much as 1945.

Mr. FINDLEY. But would it not help to achieve this desired result of a cutback of tobacco production more effectively if we retained the 19½-percent figure instead of stepping back to what the gentleman has just suggested?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think such an amendment would be consistent with the bill itself, because we are changing the entire basis of the program.

Mr. FINDLEY. But the program as set forth in this proposal does provide for a cutback in acreage; and would it not help the cause of reducing the surplus if we retained this higher level of acreage cutback instead of the lower level?

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, the cut basically would be in poundage. Part of the acreage cut would be returned but the permanent cut would be in pounds instead of acres. Even the existing successful program for the last 25 years, with periodic acreage cuts, has hurt some tobacco farmers. With increased costs of production, many tobacco farmers have been forced to increase yields per acre in order to stay in business. They cannot continue to stand acreage cuts. This legislation will enable them to adopt a program consistent with their problems and needs and fair to the taxpayer.

Mr. FINDLEY. Why reduce the acreage cutback at all? If you are going to cut two-thirds, why not cut 100 percent as, in effect, approved by the tobacco growers in the latest referendum?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. May I also add that we are trying to provide a program that will produce quality tobacco for both home and foreign consumption. We are losing our export market; at least, we are not increasing our exports as we should—percentagewise.

Mr. FINDLEY. I get the feeling that one of the results of our tobacco program has been a reduction in the quality of the American tobacco.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Not necessarily. Farmers with reduced acreage from year to year have used culture practices and improved production methods which have enabled them to produce high yields—in some instances as high as 3,500 or 4,000 pounds an acre. They will not be able to market that many pounds per acre under this program.

Mr. FINDLEY. Our program has resulted in a reduction in quality of tobacco; is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. Some people say so and so differ.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, along with what the gentleman from North Carolina has said, in years gone by our farmers used to normally and steadily produce about 800 to 1,000 pounds of good tobacco per acre per year. Now, the 800-pound and 1,000-pound figure was about a normal production.

Over the years, as we have cut the quota, the acreage allotment, they have naturally, just like wise human beings are, tried to overcome the deficiency. They have made the rows a little closer together. They have used fertilizer to the extent where now as the gentleman from North Carolina pointed out so appropriately, it has reached the point

where some are able to produce 4,000 and 5,000 pounds per acre, and I have heard of one case where one farmer produced 6,000 pounds of tobacco on 1 acre.

Mr. FINDLEY. But was that inferior tobacco?

Mr. CHELF. If the gentleman will yield further, this is a very serious problem that means so much to our farmers.

Not very long ago we asked for and received a cut. We did not want to do that any more than I want to ask you to cut my throat right now. But it was the only reasonable and fair thing to do under the circumstances. However, it was a bitter thing to do, but we did it. We were desperate in order to try to save our entire tobacco program that had been so highly successful for over 25 years. A program that had literally saved our tobacco farmers. One that had produced a smile on the faces and a song in the hearts of all our tobacco growers—large and small. Yes, a program that had not cost the Federal Government. What more can one expect?

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I am disturbed at the indication that one of the effects of the tobacco program has been a reduction in quality.

I have one other question: If the purpose of this legislation is really to cut back on the surplus problem, why permit 110 percent of the poundage provided in this quota system to be marketed? Why not stick to 100 percent? Why permit this 10-percent slippage?

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will yield, as I pointed out a moment ago, we put that in as a tolerance. It does affect the overall program, because if a man markets 10 percent more this year, in 1965, he will just market 10 percent less in 1966. So, as I say, in 2 years the program should be well underway.

Mr. FINDLEY. But would you not have a greater production discipline if you stuck to the 100-percent figure?

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman mean he wants more strict controls?

Mr. FINDLEY. I assume that the purpose of this legislation is to control the production of tobacco.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. FINDLEY. Well, would it not be more effective if we stuck to the 100-percent figure?

Mr. COOLEY. As I recall we had that figure once at 5 percent and changed it to 10 percent.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would the gentleman from North Carolina object to an amendment to change the figure from 110 to 100 percent?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, I would. I would object to any amendment to the bill, except one or two that I believe would improve it. However, I do not think such an amendment as the gentleman refers to would improve it at all.

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

Mr. Chairman, since making my initial remarks, I have seen a third set of figures put out by the Department of Agriculture on the production of 1964. As the members of the committee might have discovered, in this matter we have three sets of figures. This set I have just seen, is 2 days later than the set to which I referred to earlier in my remarks. It shows the tobacco production in 1964 at 1,382 million as contrasted to their report of January 29 of 1.277 million pounds.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity, first, to publicly thank my distinguished chairman for his graciousness in permitting me to appear here at this time and also my distinguished subcommittee chairman for his graciousness and fairness in holding one of the hearings in my area.

Mr. Chairman, as has been mentioned by my colleagues from Florida, at the proper time I shall offer an amendment. The purpose of this amendment is to delete from the bill the requirement that the proposed acreage-poundage program be put into effect for the 1965 crop.

Paragraph (b) of section 317 is the portion of the bill which directs the Secretary of Agriculture to institute this program this year. It begins on page 7 at line 9 and continues through line 6 on page 8.

This amendment strikes out this paragraph—that is, paragraph (b)—and there is no reference to 1965 elsewhere throughout the bill. The amendment also reletters subsequent paragraphs in section 317 and changes internal reference to these paragraphs which appear elsewhere in the bill.

The amendment makes no change whatever in the rules that fix quotas. It keeps the same years 1959–63 for determining averages so that no one could be hurt or helped by another year. The farmer who pours on the fertilizer this year cannot increase his quota and the farmer who has a crop failure cannot be hurt by this amendment.

Now let us see why this amendment is desirable.

It is simply a matter of being fair to a large number of growers in Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and perhaps other States.

If this bill should pass it would be like changing the rules in the middle of the game. The bill itself is of doubtful and debatable fairness all the way through, but certainly no fairminded person would agree that the laws which bind the competitors should be amended in the process of the competition itself.

The game is underway in Florida and Georgia. The whistle has blown. Even if it has not blown a little farther north the preparations have all been made and a last-minute rules change is still unfair when the growers have been officially notified by the umpires that the rules would be those in effect.

To understand what I am saying, let me remind those of you whose interest in tobacco is somewhat more objective and academic, that for many years we have had an acreage allotment system.

The allotments have been voted by the growers themselves in referendums on proposals submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture well in advance of the crop year to be affected.

The farmers have taken six acreage cuts in 11 years. Within the past 2 years two acreage cuts have been imposed—one a 10-percent cut, and another a 19.5-percent cut.

The last such cut of 19.5 percent was voted by the growers last December 15, approximately 2 weeks prior to the convening of the 89th Congress.

The cut was proposed and the referendum was called so that it would affect this very 1965 crop, and all of this was done in ample time for the farmer, the banker, the tenant, and everyone concerned and affected to make his plans and know what to expect from the Federal Government.

The farmer, of course, did not like the cut, but he dutifully and perhaps wisely, from the standpoint of his own long-range interests, voted it upon himself.

And now what has happened? Before our seats are warm certain interests begin talking about changing the whole system—the U.S. Government in a sense contracted with the farmer for 1965 but certain parties want the Government to break that contract and force another one down the unwilling throats of those who might choose to vote against it.

This proposed bill was not conceived overnight.

It is too intricate for that. No doubt the planning was going on in the Department at the very time the December referendum was being conducted—but whether I am correct in this surmise or not, many tobacco growers relied upon the laws of the United States, the rules of the Secretary of Agriculture, and the referendum.

He relied on them when he talked to his banker, he relied on them when he entered contracts with his landlord or tenant, as the case may be; he relied on them when he bought his supplies, prepared his land, transplanted his plants and fully committed himself to a certain size crop in the year A.D. 1965.

It may be that because of the later season the farmer in Virginia or North Carolina can withstand this change, but with varying degrees of hardship the grower to the south cannot. Equity does not take into consideration how many people are being denied equity. A matter is either fair to the minority as well as majority of the growers, or it is unfair, period.

Now, what is the harm that is done, and how is it too late for the farmer who sent me up here to represent him before fair-minded colleagues?

I mentioned a moment ago that the farmer took six acreage cuts.

But strangely enough, as has been pointed out, this bill gives him a 14-percent acreage increase before cutting his normal or average poundage that he will be permitted to sell.

I do not believe anyone is really trying to fool the farmers. The theory is that in giving him more acres but cutting his pounds he will be more selective in what he takes to market and this bill will help him to be more selective. The quality is expected to improve. But what about

the competition in the quality market for the man for whom it is too late to increase his acreage? Tobacco farmers have a hard time staying alive. It is a borderline existence and many will be treated unfairly by being required to take an unfair rule change when it is too late for him to compete fairly with those who are his competition.

If it was a case of cutting acreage all could cut, but my farmers cannot increase this year. If you must pass this law of doubtful fairness in many other respects, I call on you to give those who enter the race an even start by postponing it until 1966. That is all the amendment does.

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

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, for his statement and associate myself with his remarks and the remarks of my colleagues from the State of Florida.

The people in Georgia, and I represent the biggest Flue-cured tobacco growing district in Georgia, are opposed to this legislation. As my colleagues have pointed out, we are already planting tobacco. Our seedbeds have been prepared and plants are going into fields now. We have worked out our lease agreements. This legislation so far as our farmers are concerned is entirely untimely. So I join my colleagues first in opposition to this bill and next I join my colleagues in the effort to try to get this bill amended to extend the effective date of it to 1 year from now.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS].

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, first I want to say this bill has no relationship whatsoever to the question of health and smoking. Whether this bill passes or not, we do have a tobacco program and we are going to have tobacco which will be supported at the same level of supports that it will be supported if this bill passes. So we can dismiss, so far as this particular piece of legislation is concerned, any reference to or any consideration of the health angle in connection with this particular piece of legislation because it does not touch it—top, side, or bottom.

Now let us deal with another subject. Is this an effort on the part of the great Federal Government and the Congress to force something on the tobacco grower? Let us look at the terms of the legislation. What does it say? It says that after this Congress passes this legislation and after the President signs it, it shall then be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to propose this problem back to the farmers in all sections, and of course that is the tobacco farmers. And, unless more than two-thirds of them approve it, it does not become effective.

So I do not see how you can make a sound argument that we are forcing anything on anybody because, goodness knows, I have always been willing to go along and when two-thirds of the people want something, I think they are entitled to it. That is the way all of our programs have been run. This legislation does not change that basic factor in any respect.

In other words, if the farmers do not want it, after we pass it, all they have to do is have one-third of them go out and say, "we do not want it," and they will not have it.

So those two questions should not be given much consideration so far as whether one supports or does not support this piece of legislation.

Why is this legislation here? It is here for two reasons.

I want to say first that I represent the largest burley tobacco district in the United States and, for that matter, in the world. I am a tobacco farmer. I have been producing tobacco ever since 1929. I know the problems. I know what the Department of Agriculture, in attempting to run the acreage program, has been faced with.

Every year when we got a cut in acreage, what did I do? What did all the other farmers do? We went to the fertilizer manufacturer and we bought some more fertilizer. We hauled out some more manure. We planted our plants closer together. As a result of that we offset to a good extent, and sometimes to a full extent, the effect of the acreage cut which the Secretary of Agriculture had put on us.

We have realized for a long time now that this is not the solution. We have been discussing this problem in the committee for more than 10 years, even while I was on it. We realize that it is not possible to control production solely on the basis of acreage, because farmers will not let us do it. They will put on more fertilizer. They will do better in their cultivation practices. They will crowd their tobacco. It just cannot be controlled that way.

This is the principal reason why we have piled up in the hands of the associations large stocks of tobacco which are on loan, on which the taxpayers may lose and are pretty apt to lose some money.

This bill was brought here in order to let the Secretary of Agriculture say how many pounds of a certain type of tobacco could be marketed, period. No matter what size acreage allotment a person has, if he can market only so many pounds he cannot continue to contribute to the large surplus we now have on hand.

I say to you this will be very beneficial for another reason.

When I was a boy, first starting to grow tobacco, we grew about 800 pounds per acre. We now get 4,000 or 5,000 pounds an acre. We have absolutely deteriorated the quality of our tobacco, to such an extent that when I made a trip to Europe as the head of a tobacco subcommittee to determine what was happening to our markets, particularly with reference to Flue-cured tobacco, I was told, "you have deteriorated your quality by overfertilizing, by using too much MH-30, and by overcrowding." This will allow the Secretary to give perhaps a few more acres than he would allow under the 19½-percent cut, but at the same time to set the top limit on the amount which can be produced. He can reduce the amount produced every year.

I say to everyone here, irrespective of what might be said, if you believe that the Secretary of Agriculture intends to honestly administer this program, he can reduce the production under it below the 19⅓-percent acreage cut. If you do not believe that he means to reduce the production of tobacco, he can turn around next year and, under the program we have, double it.

I will say this to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, who is going to offer an amendment: If the legislation is passed and if the amendment should happen to fail, if one-third of the farmers turn it down, it will not be in effect in 1965. There will be another opportunity to vote for it in 1966, and another opportunity in 1967.

I cannot see why anyone should sensibly argue that if two-thirds of the farmers vote for it in 1965 we should deny them the privilege of making this change and deny the taxpayers of this country the right to have the Secretary of Agriculture limit the production of tobacco so that consumption and production will get in line with one another and save everybody money.

I think it is a good bill and I think it ought to be passed.

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

Mr. WATTS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. The gentleman, in what he has had to say here, has been eminently correct, because not only does he represent the largest burley tobacco district in America, but he and I together, the gentleman standing in the well and I, are the two Members whose districts produce three-fourths of the total burley crop of the State of Kentucky, which, in turn, produces 65 percent of the total burley crop of the world.

Mr. WATTS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CHELF. Therefore, it means a great deal to the program. Would the gentleman not say for the purpose of the RECORD that last year we, and—our tobacco people—came in and voluntarily requested that our burley acreage be cut 10 percent and again this year did we not ask for that very same thing, which made a total of a 20-percent cut in order to try to save the program? In other words, this was done to police and to protect the entire tobacco program which has operated so well for over 25 years.

Mr. WATTS. The gentleman is correct, except even though we cut it 10 percent last year in acreage and 10 percent the year before, we made very little of a cut in the amount of tobacco produced.

Mr. CHELF. I agree. The gentleman so correctly stated that by this chemical fertilizing we are unfortunately and unwittingly destroying our own tobacco crop and thereby ruining our oversea market. I ask the Members of this House to go along with this bill, because we need it and we need it desperately.

Mr. WATTS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. FUQUA. We shall overcome.

Mr. CHELF. As the gentleman says, we shall overcome.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to conclude by repeating again that all in the world this bill does is to allow the farmers to say whether they want this or not. If they want to keep what they have, they have the right under this legislation to do it. All in the world that they have to do is for one-third of them to go to the polls and say that this does not suit me, and then you just will not get it. However, if they want to clean up their own house and put it in order, which is costing the taxpayers many, many millions of dollars, and want to balance production against consumption, then we will give them the opportunity to do it. I think Congress would be unfair if they said to the farmers, "You are in a box here where you are going to ruin yourself and ruin the tobacco program" when we can give them the opportunity to put into effect a program whereby the Secretary of Agriculture can control production. I thank you.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN].

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult for me to attempt to follow such an able speaker as my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS].

I rise in opposition to H.R. 5721 which also is an unusual occurrence for me as regards my distinguished colleague from North Carolina and my beloved former chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture [Mr. COOLEY]. However, I do so, Mr. Chairman, at the request of and with the concurrence of at least 98 percent of the tobacco growers in the First Congressional District of Georgia.

Under the provisions of the current law, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, Congress has established guidelines to be followed by the Secretary of Agriculture in determining the amount of the national marketing quota on Flue-cured tobacco in that he is required to: First, determine the amount of normal supply which consists of a normal year's domestic consumption and exports, plus 175 percent of the normal year's domestic consumption and 65 percent of a normal year's exports; second, after determining the amount of the normal supply, the Secretary then must add 5 percent of the amount of the normal supply in order to determine the reserve supply level; third, after determining the normal supply and reserve supply level of tobacco, the Secretary must announce a national marketing quota which may be marketed which "will make available during such marketing year a supply of tobacco equal to the reserve supply level."

Under the provisions of H.R. 5721, Congress sets no guidelines to be followed by the Secretary in determining the national marketing quota for Flue-cured tobacco and leaves the matter entirely to his discretion. H.R. 5721 provides: First, that the Secretary estimates the amount of Flue-cured tobacco which will be utilized during the marketing year; second, plus the amount that will be exported during the marketing year; third, that these amounts are to be adjusted upward or downward in such amount as the Secretary, in his discretion, determines is desirable for the purpose of maintaining an adequate supply of Flue-cured tobacco or for effecting an orderly reduction of excessive supplies.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of H.R. 5721 and if this legislation is adopted, the Secretary can do as he sees fit without any control from Congress nor will the individual tobacco farmers have any standing in Federal court to complain or protest relative to the discretionary acts of the Secretary of Agriculture.

H.R. 5721, section 317(a)(2) provides:

> National average yield goal for any kind of tobacco means the yield per acre which on a national average basis the Secretary determines will improve or insure the usability of the tobacco and increase the net return per pound to the growers. In making this determination, the Secretary shall give consideration to such Federal-State production research data as he deems relevant.

It is noted that the national average yield per acre is not based on the historical yield per acre nationwide, but is based solely on what the Secretary determines will improve or insure the usability of tobacco and increase the net return per pound to the growers. At the present time, the figure of 1,854 pounds is being used as a national average yield per acre, however, if the Secretary determines that this should be cut to 1,284, he is authorized to do so. Again, he uses his unfettered discretion without any guidelines or restraints. The fact that an individual farmer may have individual yield of 3,000 pounds per acre for the past 5 years will be of no benefit to that farmer and he will have no assurance that he will be allowed to grow anything like 3,000 pounds of tobacco per acre because the Secretary is not bound by the 1,854 pound national average yield per acre and he can change this 1,854 pound national average yield per acre to any figure which he individually determines.

The national average yield per acre is one of the factors used in determining the individual farm yield and by manipulating the national average yield goal, the Secretary is empowered to juggle the individual farm yield in any manner he sees fit. Further, under H.R. 5721, the Secretary, in making this determination, is specifically relieved from complying with the terms and provisions of 7 U.S.C.A. 1301(16)(c) which provides:

> The latest available statistics of the Federal Government shall be used by the Secretary in making the determinations required to be made by the Secretary under this chapter.

Under H.R. 5721:

> The Secretary shall give consideration to such Federal-State production research data as he deems relevant.

It is not mandatory for the Secretary to use any particular production research data, such as the latest available statistics of the Federal Government, and again the individual tobacco producers would have no recourse in the Federal courts seeking relief from the Secretary's determination regardless of how unfair or unequitable his determination may be.

This gets to the heart of the current lawsuit brought by the three tobacco farmers against the Secretary of Agriculture where they alleged, and the courts have so ruled, that the Secretary failed to comply with the mandatory provisions of the acts of Congress requiring him to keep and use the latest available Federal Government statistics in making determinations pertaining to the various factors of Flue-cured tobacco production including whether or not there was such a difference in supply and demand conditions for type 14 Flue-cured tobacco as to warrant it being treated as a kind of tobacco. It was the Secretary's failure to comply with the mandatory provisions of the act of Congress that gave the Federal Courts jurisdiction to require the secretary to do those things which the court decision has ordered him to do. Under the provisions of H.R. 5721, the Federal courts would not be empowered to issue any such order against the Secretary of Agriculture for any future determinations which he might make pertaining not only to the national average yield goal but also to the national marketing quota.

For this and other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to H.R. 5721.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have not been privileged to hear all of this debate. But I will say for the benefit of the Members of the House I have certainly enjoyed that which I have heard. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that I ever heard of the tobacco hitting the fan. Always before, during the 14 years and 3 months that I have served on this committee, the chairman and the various members of the Tobacco Subcommittee would always get up and say, "Your wheat program, your feed grains program ought to be like the tobacco program. We never have any problems with tobacco. Whenever production exceeds consumption, we just cut back our acreage. We cut back 19 percent, we cut back 10 percent, and we balance it. This tobacco program has never cost the Federal Government a dime. The fact of the matter is we take in more money than we ever spend."

Now, Mr. Chairman, today for the first time I have heard just how unfair this tobacco program is. I have never heard the terms "inequitable," "unfair," "unjust," and "an abuse of power" inferred on the part of the Secretary as many times on an agricultural bill since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I did not know that those tobacco boys ever would fall out. I did not know they mistreated each other that way. I did not know that tobacco farmers would deliberately go out and try to outsmart the Secretary of Agriculture to the extent that they de-

creased the value of their tobacco so much that they were not able to sell it to anyone. Then, to think that two Members of this House of Representatives, two distinguished Members, would both come down here in the well of the House and admit to that kind of conduct.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia just complained about the power given to the Secretary of Agriculture. Well, my land, this bill does not give any power to the Secretary of Agriculture compared to that omnibus farm bill that was introduced during the early part of the Kennedy administration. Before the Secretary of Agriculture had been a Secretary 90 days, the majority side of this committee wanted to turn the entire legislative power of the U.S. Congress over to the Secretary of Agriculture. All he needed to do was just write on the back of an envelope—an old envelope at that—the kind of program he wanted.

He would send that down to Congress, and if the Congress did not within a period of 20 days repeal his act, it became the law of the land. Then to think these boys from Georgia would just complain about the fact he could set it at a thousand pounds or 2,000 pounds as a limit on the amount of tobacco to be produced. I wonder where you gentlemen were when this omnibus bill was up for consideration back there when we were fighting for our lives? I am glad to know, though, that the tobacco program has its problems, too.

I have not taken any part in this argument. I have not cared very much one way or the other, because I quit smoking cigarettes 20 years ago, and I quit chewing tobacco when I quit playing first base in baseball. They do not raise a single pound of tobacco in my district. Since that time I have not had very much interest in the tobacco program. I always felt it was a good thing to stay out of things that you had no business in, and I figured I did not have any business getting into this tobacco program. I am not going to get into it today, but I hope the chairman of the committee, and I am very proud of him and the committee, it is one of the great committees of the House, and the chairman of the Tobacco Subcommittee, will not so grossly mistreat the Members on that side of the aisle and have them come down here and say inequitable, unfair, unjust, abuse of power, and so forth. Why do you not treat these fellows fair over there?

There is one more thing I would like to say. I do not care about this poundage business. You can set it up on poundage, acreage, or any other thing you want to. But I would like to ask just one question of my Chairman: Is this going to be a precedent for feed grains, wheat, dairy products, and all other products—and I refer to this poundage business?

Mr. COOLEY. I am not in a position to say whether it will be a precedent or not, but I can say to the gentleman, as he knows, this has been a very controversial matter in the committee for 10 or 12 years. The only reason the bill is here now is because the farmers themselves have asked for the bill. They want this bill.

Mr. BELCHER. I did not refer to the unfairness and inequity. That is their statement. But I did not want to get that poundage business started here as a precedent, because I have always understood that the tobacco program was a program entirely different from all other programs. One of the reasons was, it always worked, and all of the other programs did not. So, therefore, if it is necessary for you to have poundage now to solve and cure those sins you have been committing all these years in your tobacco program, I am perfectly willing for you to have whatever you need. I am not going to get into an argument with the one assurance you are not going to try to put this over into other products.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. We are not admitting we have committed any sins over all of these years in this tobacco program. This has been a very successful program for 25 years. It happens just that from necessity, the tobacco farmers are producing more pounds per acre. We are engaged in competition with the rest of the world; for example, Rhodesia, Canada, and so forth. But even with control this program has been successful for 25 years. We are trying to exercise an ounce of prevention now rather than a pound of cure later. If the farmers are willing to adopt an acreage-poundage control program, which will have the effect of reducing their income while looking after the interest of all the taxpayers of America, I think they ought to be commended for their altruism, even though they know it is in their own self-interest in the long run. This legislation just gives them the "right to vote" for this new approach. Since it is so late in the year, they may vote against it, but basically they now know the acreage-poundage approach must be tried. Of course, there are other things which must be done as I will point out in my own remarks later.

Mr. BELCHER. Far be it from me to throw even one chunk under the wheels of a program that has worked as good as you say the tobacco program has worked. I hope it continues to work. I hope this bill, if you get it passed, cures all of your evils. I have had a lot of fun for the first time in 14 years. I have got to talk about the tobacco program. I have had to defend the wheat program and the feed-grain program and the dairy program and everything else. I just could not pass up the opportunity to have just a little fun with the tobacco boys since they have had so much fun with me.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Let us all hang together or we will hang separately. Now I have stayed with you in the past; now, dear boy, you stay with me today.

Mr. BELCHER. I will tell you what—if you quit treating those Georgia boys so darn unjust, maybe I can go along with you.

Mr. CHELF. It will be like St. Paul on the road to Damascus. Suddenly they will see the light and they will join with us.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT], chairman of the Tobacco Subcommittee, the entire membership of the Agriculture Committee, and members of the staff for the expeditious manner in which they have handled this legislation and brought it to the floor for consideration by this body.

While proposing legislation designed to help our farmer protect the integrity of his tobacco program in the immediate years ahead, the committee clearly states that it is not intended as the ultimate answer for the tobacco producer. We all know that. It does, however, offer the farmers another major choice—another important step in what I hope is the right direction. Of course, the choice is theirs at the ballot boxes. This legislation does not force anything upon anyone. Otherwise, I would not support it.

This legislation simply gives our tobacco farmers the choice of keeping their 25-year-old acreage-control program for the next 3 years or of going to the acreage-poundage program proposed by this legislation.

No one can deny that this has been an extremely critical and crucial year for the entire tobacco industry. It is extremely important that everyone interested in the tobacco industry and in its future, especially tobacco growers, appreciate the many tobacco danger signs appearing on the horizon.

We all know the facts. The existing program has worked well for many years with balanced supplies, favorable prices and little or no cost to the Government. It has been rightly called the most successful farm program we have. For a number of years, the steadily increasing demand for tobacco used in the manufacturing of cigarettes tended to offset increased per-acre yields and prices trended upward.

In more recent years, however, for many well-known reasons, problems have developed. High yields have more than offset acreage cuts. There has been a decline in the quality of tobacco and a loss in export trade. Accelerated increase in per-acre yields of Flue-cured and burley tobaccos, which constitute about 90 percent of the tobacco produced, have by no means reached a limit. Records show many yields of 3,500 pounds per acre and higher, and research shows that these yields can be substantially increased. Along with such yields, tobacco has deteriorated in quality. U.S. Department of Agriculture figures show that in 1946–50, 31 percent of U.S. Flue-cured tobacco graded in first, second, and third qualities. In 1962, it was only 10.3 percent. We have failed to share in the increase in world tobacco trade primarily, we are told by foreign

manufacturers and importers, because of a decline in the quality of U.S. Flue-cured tobacco.

Let us take a look at some of the trends that have developed to create our problem. In 1954–58, Flue-cured tobacco yields averaged 1,509 pounds per acre. In 1964, estimates are that the average yield will turn out to be 2,203 pounds per acre. With continued reductions in acreage allotments, it is only natural that farmers will seek to increase their yields. Many of them have been forced to do so. They cannot be blamed, for without increased yields per acre, some of them could not have survived all of the acreage cuts they have sustained. In fact, some have not been able to survive. They have left the farm. Nonetheless, such increased yields have resulted in excessive supplies of tobacco and these supplies now endanger the tobacco program in many ways.

Let us take a look at some figures indicating how Flue-cured tobacco production has generally risen while acreage allotments were being reduced. The 1964 crop was larger than the 1954 crop, while the 1964 acreage allotments were 40 percent below those of 1954.

To make this unpleasant picture a little clearer, in 1940 the marketing quota in poundage was proclaimed at 618 million pounds; 758,210 acres were allotted for this production. That year—the year 1940—the Flue-cured States produced 760 million pounds for an average yield of 1,025 pounds per acre. This was 142 million pounds in excess of the marketing quota.

The 1964 marketing quota in poundage was 1,134,997,830 pounds and the allotted acreage for such production was 638,240. On this acreage allotment in 1964, which was 119,970 acres less than in 1940, we produced 1,383 million pounds of Flue-cured tobacco for an average yield of 2,203 pounds per acre. Note that the 1964 yield, with 119,970 less acres than in 1940, was more than double that of 1940.

I said earlier that we are not keeping up on world trade. Notwithstanding the increased demand for Flue-cured tobacco in the world markets, U.S. exports have remained rather constant at 450 million pounds. Let us take a brief look at this picture. In 1950–54, 670 million pounds a year of Flue-cured tobacco moved from the free world countries with the U.S. share being 66 percent. In 1955–59, the amount was 780 million pounds per year with the U.S. share being 60 percent. In 1960–64, our U.S. share was a little over 50 percent. In 1964 alone, the latest preliminary figures I have indicates our share to be only 45 percent. Last year Rhodesia, India, and Canada all had record exports of Flue-cured tobacco.

The upshot of all these statistics indicates that excessive supplies of tobacco have accumulated in this country to the serious detriment of our existing tobacco program. Every producer is certainly aware of the fact that acreage yields of tobacco are increasing faster than market outlets both at home and abroad.

Improved scientific knowledge of cultural practices, in spite of cutbacks in some nations—such as here in the United States and Canada—have resulted in huge surpluses of Flue-cured tobaccos in many of the principal Flue-cured nations—such as the United States, Southern Rhodesia, India, Canada, and the Philippines. The resultant surpluses have had a significant impact in the world markets.

Long recognized as one of the giants in the tobacco world, Southern Rhodesia has inherited from the now-defunct Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, the title of the world's second largest tobacco producers and exporter. As you here know, Southern Rhodesia is our strongest competitor in the international market.

In this connection, I think it is of interest that Rhodesian farmers began to grow tobacco 70 years ago and by the time of World War II, experts were averaging, I am told, 30 million pounds a year as compared to the U.S. total then of 421 million pounds.

A recent Government report, called to my attention, stated that the harvest of Flue-cured tobacco in Rhodesia was 60 percent above the harvest a year earlier. It was by far the largest harvest of tobacco on record in Rhodesia—nearly all of which is destined for world markets—and sold at an average price of 32 cents per pound. This was one-third lower than the average price for the previous crop and a little more than one-half of recent U.S. prices for Flue-cured tobacco.

Turkey has a record tobacco crop this year and the crop in Greece is above average. The Philippines also have a surplus of Flue-cured tobacco this year.

I am advised that the U.S. exports of Flue-cured tobacco is in competition primarily with exports from Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Canada, and India. Turkey and Greece are the main producers and exporters of oriental tobacco, which also is, to a certain extent, competitive with Flue-cured.

I do not want to confuse you or myself with a lot of statistics, but a few figures tell the story of increased competition in world markets faced by U.S. producers.

The production of Flue-cured and oriental tobacco in the major exporting countries, in 1964, was 70 percent greater than in the 1950–54 period, 10 years earlier. It was almost one-third larger than the average for the more recent years 1956–60.

Not that misery always loves company, but it is of interest to note that tobacco production in other parts of the world is also in financial difficulty as a result of this big upsurge in production. Canadian growers had difficulty in selling their large 1963 crop and cut back acreage 25 percent this year.

In view of the large crop and low prices in Rhodesia in 1964, the Flue-cured tobacco growers adopted a voluntary-control scheme, designed to reduce production in 1965 by 20 to 25 percent.

Earlier I stated that tobacco problems involved many a paradox and I referred to the surpluses resulting from improved cultural practices and their impact upon world markets.

Paraphrasing one U.S. cigarette advertisement, another paradox is found in the fact that more people the world over are smoking more, but the tobacco farmer is enjoying it less.

In spite of substantial gains in the number of cigarette smokers in the United States and also throughout the world, the U.S. tobacco farmer is enjoying a smaller share of the world market than the 1951–55 average.

Of course, there are many factors responsible for this, but there are two, beyond control of the farmer, which obviously contribute to such a situation. They are:

First. An upsurge in the popularity of filters, which require less tobacco per cigarette than regular cigarettes. Filter-tip production last year accounted for about 36 percent of the total free world output, compared with 33 percent in 1962, and less than 10 percent in 1955.

Second. All manufacturers now have facilities to make many more cigarettes from a given quantity of tobacco through the general practice of processing sheet tobacco, or so-called "homogenized" tobacco.

Another important problem over which the tobacco grower has no control involves the countless attacks being made by antitobacco groups in this country, Canada, and elsewhere throughout the world. They seem to increase in intensity and frequency.

Government activity in the current tobacco-and-health controversy is another matter of great importance to the tobacco grower and the tobacco industry.

As we all know, the report of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on "Smoking and Health" contained the judgment that "cigarette smoking is a health hazard of sufficient importance in the United States to warrant appropriate remedial action."

We remember the rash of antismoking activity in the public press which followed hard on the heels of the Surgeon General's report.

The antismoking campaign's latest demonstration was the announcement by the Federal Trade Commission that it intended to issue regulations requiring that cigarette packages be labeled with an appropriate device to warn smokers of their probable danger. Incidentally, this matter must be disposed of before July 1 this year in view of the effective date of both the "labeling rule" and the "warning in advertising" requirement in connection with cigarette packages and cigarette advertising.

The U.S. Public Health Service, the Office of Education, and the Children's Bureau, the American Medical Association, the National Education Association, and many voluntary and professional health agencies are initiating so-called educational and informational programs about smoking. Unfortunately, some of those so-called education programs are designed to treat the report of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee as the final authority on the subject of "Smoking and Health."

Being neither a doctor, a scientist, a chemist, a pathologist, a statistician, nor any other kind of tobacco expert, I do not pose as an authority on the technical and scientific aspects of this problem.

However, I am convinced that the subject matter is of such transcending importance to this country—in fact, to the entire world—and affects so many millions of people in such a variety of significant ways, that any action which might be found necessary should be taken by the Congress of the United States, composed of the duly elected representatives of all the people.

It is regrettable that so many people do not realize that this giant of our native creation, which saved Jamestown and became the taproot of American commerce, has so grown, multiplied and developed that it is a primary economic factor in the affairs of our Nation and the world.

It is nurtured by 750,000 farm families in 21 States. Approximately 1.5 million businesses share in the tobacco trade, supplying materials, equipment, transportation, distribution, and merchandising services. I am advised that there are about 578 plants, big and small, in 30 States that manufacture tobacco products. It is estimated that some 17 million people depend on tobacco for all or part of their livelihood.

Federal, State, and local excise taxes on tobacco products in 1963 yielded $3.3 billion. In the 32-year history of Government farm programs, the tobacco program costs have been less than $100 million, while Federal and State Governments have collected approximately $52 billion in taxes on tobacco and tobacco products.

The tobacco industry, from the producer to the consumer, involves, I am told, $8 billion in annual business. In North Carolina alone, of the $1.2 billion in total farm receipts last year, $600 million came from tobacco sales—approximately one-half of North Carolina's farm income.

As my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS], pointed out during legislative committee hearings last year, the approximate $3.3 billion annually in taxes on tobacco means that the tobacco farmers are, in a sense, underwriting or offsetting, the cost of all price support programs for the whole country. I am sorry Mr. MATTHEWS is not supporting this particular bill, although I understand his position.

I believe all of us associated with the tobacco industry share the concern of our people over questions regarding "smoking and health." As human beings, we are interested in the health of our fellow men. As tobacco growers and representatives of growers, we have a natural interest in their present and future welfare. In fact, to bring it even closer home, we are concerned about our own health and the health of our children.

No one will or should argue against government warning the consumer in an appropriate and proper way that he is jeopardizing his health, if, indeed, that is the case, by smoking cigarettes or otherwise using tobacco.

But the real question here is, whether, in an age of science, we should accept as final proof of tobacco's danger, findings based on statistical correlation.

The Surgeon General himself, after having read and carefully studied the report of his Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health, has stated that intensive research is needed to determine the charges against cigarette smoking, and to make smoking safer. I think this is an appropriate attitude on the part of the Surgeon General—especially when we look at some of the serious economic facts to which I have already alluded.

If thereafter research determines that tobacco is indeed as dangerous as some have said, and that nothing can be done to make cigarettes safe, then will be the time for such labeling as the Federal Trade Commission has proposed.

In my talks with tobacco producers in recent months, the concensus is that the current No. 1 tobacco problem is to find a way to bring U.S. production of tobacco more nearly in line with demand just as soon as possible. As I have previously pointed out, each year the mounting increases of surplus crop receipts present a serious threat to our entire tobacco program.

The concensus among farm groups seems to be in support of some kind of acreage-poundage control program; a program to improve quality, limit the poundage that may be marketed—thus bringing supply more nearly in line with demand—and increase exports. This legislation which the House Agriculture Committee has reported for our consideration contains such a proposal which the farmers should be permitted to accept or reject as they see fit.

Although tobacco growers are faced with many problems from all sides, as I stated earlier, I believe there is substantial agreement among them right now that our most immediate need is to take a comprehensive look at our tobacco program with a view of determining what needs to be done to bring our supply of all types of tobacco in line with demand.

Cuts in either acreage or poundage or both will not alone solve our problem. In fact, many farmers would be out of business if we simply adopted the acreage-poundage program proposed in this bill as a means of bringing the annual supply in line with demand, and stopped there.

In addition to this legislation and the program it offers, serious consideration should be given to every possible avenue to improve the quality of our tobacco and to increase the sales, both at home and abroad.

How can the quality of harvested Flue-cured and other tobaccos be increased?

How can the production of low quality tobaccos be discouraged or prevented?

Have we made full use of all of the means at our disposal to increase the sales of tobacco, both at home and abroad?

Has an all-out positive educational campaign among growers through every available knowledgeable communications media been attempted?

In thinking of our agricultural export trade, has full and adequate use been made of section 32 funds and of the provisions of titles I, II, III, and IV of Public Law 480?

Have we made full use of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 with its "kit" of negotiating powers?

Have we placed enough emphasis upon sales for dollars?

Have we sought wherever possible and wise to remove trade restrictions which now limit sales of U.S. leaf?

Have we made all-out efforts to have sales made under the provisions of special trade programs when feasible?

It seems to me that the above are some of many questions which need to be answered by action in one or more areas to supplement any action which may be taken through this legislation to reduce our annual production of tobacco.

In my opinion, the answer to the health scare is more and more research. When the U.S. Public Health Service appeared before the House Agriculture Committee earlier this year to testify on behalf of appropriations and health research, I was dumbfounded to learn that at that time the Public Health Service was spending only about $1.2 million on research toward understanding and controlling such elements in smoking as may be discovered to be injurious to human health.

Of this total, only $345,000 represented research which was being conducted in the Public Health Service's own laboratories and other facilities.

Notwithstanding the fact that for years we have known that tobacco might be injurious to health, depending upon the age of the individual using it and the extent of its use, hearings before the tobacco subcommittee in January 1964, revealed that the Federal Government had been spending less than one-tenth of 1 percent—0.072—of the revenue collected from tobacco products on health research.

In passing on this legislation, remember that countless thousands of Americans are dependent upon tobacco and a sound tobacco program for their livelihoods.

We have had problems before. We have solved them before. Tobacco growers have successfully dealt with many problems in the past. It was 352 years ago that American colonists found they could grow tobacco profitably in the New World.

Within a few years tobacco was so profitable that it was planted almost to the exclusion of food crops. The governing authorities ordered each person "to plant at least 2 acres of corn for himself and for each male servant" in order to assure an adequate harvest of food crops.

Then, 23 years later, tobacco production had become so excessive in relation to available markets that a production restriction and price maintenance agreement was worked out between the local government and the tobacco buying merchants.

We are told that as a part of this early agreement, production in 1639, 1640, and 1641 was to be limited to 1,200,000 pounds of good quality tobacco a year and the merchants agreed "to accept 40 pounds for each 100 pounds of indebtedness due them."

Tobacco was to be purchased at not less than 3 pence per pound. The quality problem was handled by appointing "viewers" to destroy inferior tobacco. If

necessary the viewers were directed to burn excess crops.

I mention these problems which American tobacco producers encountered and dealt with more than 300 years ago because they are so similar to the problems they are wrestling with today.

This legislation, while far from perfect, as the committee report points out, does give our tobacco farmers an opportunity to freely choose for themselves to retain their existing acreage control program or to adopt the acreage-poundage proposal contained therein.

It is true there are differences among producers concerning the method of establishing the poundage base for each farm. In addition, a substantial number of farmers, while approving the poundage approach to supply adjustment, oppose the poundage program for 1965. They contend that planning for the 1965 crop, including land leases, tenant arrangements and production materials is too far advanced, and that this would impose hardships upon many producers. I am sure there is much truth in this position. On the other hand, those farmers who are anxious for the inauguration of a poundage program this year supported by the USDA, stress that under the current acreage allotment program, with the continuing explosion of present acre yields, many new millions of pounds of tobacco will be piled upon the present surplus heap, making immensely more difficult any shift to a poundage program next year or thereafter.

Notwithstanding these differences, and even though a bill of this kind will of necessity contain some inequities that cannot be eliminated, the safety valve herein contained is the provision for referendum in which tobacco farmers may freely make the decision for themselves. When this bill is considered in the Senate, I am sure the Agriculture Committee of that body will carefully consider any remaining objections and suggestions which are not satisfactorily disposed of by the House Committee and by this body. It is regrettable that the minds of even fair men such as we have on the House Agricultural Committee and in this body cannot perfect legislation which will anticipate all eventualities and eliminate all possible inequities. Of one thing I am sure. If this legislation is passed and our farmers adopt the acreage-poundage approach, as we gain experience in the operation through poundage quotas, I know every effort will be made to improve this program and perfect the legislation in the years ahead.

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

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. In the final analysis, it will all be decided by the farmers themselves and if two-thirds of them want it, they can have it and if they do not want it, they can kill it.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. The gentleman is absolutely right. They can take it or leave it.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio if he knows the views on this legislation of the farm organizations or groups representing farmers such as the American Farm Bureau?

Mr. LATTA. The Grange and the Farmers Union are both for the bill.

The American Farm Bureau is against it. In fact, I have a copy of a letter dated February 24, 1965, from the American Farm Bureau Federation addressed to the Honorable WATKINS M. ABBITT, chairman of our subcommittee. That letter is as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
February 24, 1965.

The Honorable WATKINS M. ABBITT,
Chairman, House Agriculture Subcommittee on Tobacco, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ABBITT: We appreciate being asked to express the views of the American Farm Bureau Federation at a hearing of your subcommittee on H.R. 4352 and similar bills that would provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco.

The voting delegates of the member State farm bureaus to the AFBF annual meeting have for many years opposed poundage controls on any commodity. They reaffirmed this policy at our annual meeting in December 1964. Therefore, the organization must oppose the enactment of this legislation.

Would you please make this letter a part of the hearing record?

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President.

Mr. MATHIAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield me 1 minute?

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am pleased that Ohio has on the Committee on Agriculture my colleague from northwestern Ohio [Mr. LATTA]. I should like to ask the gentleman this question: We grow in our district in Ohio, believe it or not, rather large quantities of binder and filler-type tobacco. Can the gentleman tell me whether those people who grow and market that kind of tobacco are for or against this particular legislation?

Mr. LATTA. In answer to the gentleman's question, I might say that for 1965 they would not be included in this program, though for subsequent years they could be. A letter from one of your good constituents, Mr. Eldene Lambert of Arcanum, Ohio, was received by our chairman and I would like to read it, if I may. The letter follows:

ARCANUM, OHIO,
February 26, 1965.

Hon. WATKINS M. ABBITT,
Chairman, Tobacco Subcommittee, House Committee on Agriculture, Room 1310, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We tobacco growers of type 42, 43, and 44 would like to be exempt from the poundage legislation for reasons as follows: We can control acres but cannot control pounds because of the weather factor involved. If we have rain with moderate temperature we have a very good crop. If we have a hot dry summer our crop will fall short by 500 to 800 pounds per acre.

Therefore we do not want the poundage control for western Ohio.

Yours truly,
ELDENE LAMBERT.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this bill is not as complicated as you might have been led to believe, I say to those who are not familiar with our tobacco program. I am not sure whether those who are not familiar with the tobacco program know any more about it now than they did when we started, because of the various positions that have been taken.

This bill, in simple language, provides, if enacted into law, that within 30 days after its enactment the Secretary shall call for a referendum in 1965 for the Flue-cured producers to vote whether or not they desire, for the years 1965, 1966, and 1967, to go on an acreage-poundage allotment.

Before this program can go into effect it must be approved by two-thirds of the producers participating.

I hear a lot about voting these days around the Capitol. I assume that a lot of people are in favor of voting. I am surprised that some of our people would be opposed to the farmers expressing their views and opinions as to the type and kind of program they desire.

This is not a question of Congress acting to make a change. It will simply permit the referring of the matter to the producers, and before the program can be changed and a new program put into effect, two-thirds of those participating in the referendum will have to approve the change.

Something was said about hurrying up. This is no new program. It has been before us for many years. The chairman designated a subcommittee to hold hearings on a poundage bill some 8 or 10 years ago. The committee went through the tobacco-producing areas. It held a hearing in Virginia. It held a hearing in North Carolina, and on down the line. At that time the people were not convinced we needed the program.

Something was said about the Department, to the effect that at the same time the growers were voting on the program for 1965, representatives of the Department were probably up here working on this legislation. That is simply a mistake. This is not a Department idea. It is not a proposal of the Congress, or of the subcommittee or the committee.

Soon after January 1, the Flue-cured tobacco producers got together. They realized what had happened in the past. Those who take the lead in these matters got together and determined among themselves that unless progress was made in the program and unless the program could be changed to meet the needs, we might have some hard times in our tobacco program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ABBITT. These growers came before our committee. Even before the committee was organized, the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], called us together informally and heard them. They were insistent that they be given the opportunity to explain this program to the producers and let the producers decide whether or not the acreage-poundage program was needed. Frankly, in 1963 they produced 1,371 million pounds of tobacco. They took a 10-percent cut in 1964 and produced 1 percent more tobacco. That demonstrates that we have to have poundage controls.

In 2 years we took a 15-percent cut in all. We have had a tremendous cut in acreage year by year and the farmers have always stood by that program, but they realized that poundage was what sold. We are endeavoring to fix it so that our producers can have better quality, and in doing that we came up with this program. Somebody said what are we doing restoring acreage? We simply restore it so our people can have a better chance and a better opportunity to grow better tobacco. We have drawn our rows together. We have drawn our plants together. In this way we have seen that our quality is not what it should be. That is the only purpose of giving them the additional acreage; that is, so that they can space the tobacco plants properly and produce a better quality tobacco.

Something was said here about the Georgia boys planting their tobacco. That is true, but they are given a 10-percent poundage overage or carryover. If they are not able to get all of that this year, they can have the 10-percent carryover next year. The whole purpose of that carryover, which was criticized a while ago, is to give the farmer protection, because you cannot expect them to produce the exact allotment pounds right on the head. They may go a few pounds over or a few pounds under. This is simply a protection to the farmers. I hope that you people will give the farmers the opportunity to decide whether or not they want this change.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, and colleagues, under the present tobacco program there is an incentive for the grower to produce as many pounds per acre as possible. In many instances it may have been done with the full knowledge that tobacco, regardless of its market acceptability, can be disposed of by using stabilization as a dumping ground for unmarketable tobacco. This does no one any good—neither the tobacco grower nor the American taxpayers. In order to curb tobacco production and reduce the flow of tobacco stocks into stabilization, the practice in recent years has been to reduce drastically the number of acres on which tobacco may be grown. What has been the result? Growers have made every effort to increase their yields per acre. Growers cannot be blamed for having done so. The difficulty is with the system itself.

The opponents of this bill make a poor argument when they say that acreage reductions promulgated last year will solve the problem, because the history of the program shows otherwise. All we have to do is look at the record. The record shows conclusively, that notwithstanding acreage reductions, yields per acre have risen drastically and total production of tobacco has not been materially affected. Further acreage reductions are not the answer. If the avowed purpose of the opponents of this legislation is to drive farmers off the farm, then certainly further acreage reductions will accomplish that purpose. The prime purpose of this legislation is to save a program which means so much to great numbers of small family type farms.

Let us look at some of the advantages of acreage-poundage proposals. Failure to modify the present program will put increased incentives on yields per acre. We will see a repetition of 1964 so far as the amount and the kind of tobacco flowing into stabilization is concerned. A national quota will be set which will permit an orderly tobacco marketing system.

We will be able to produce the exact amount of tobacco needed. In addition, this program will give the grower incentive to follow growing practices that will tend to produce tobacco with market acceptance throughout the world.

Another is that the individual grower will have opportunity to reduce production costs. With emphasis today on ways to improve the income of all American citizens let us pass this bill so that the tobacco farmer will have the opportunity to maintain his economic position in his community.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCK].

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the legislation now under consideration for a referendum, although, as I shall point out later, I would have preferred for the proposal to have been in a different form.

I want to take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation of the worth and merit of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY. He is, as every Member of this body knows, one of the outstanding Representatives in the Congress. He is well informed, a diligent and prodigious worker, a capable and skillful legislator whose heart and mind are both attuned to the highest public good and who is particularly interested in the American farmer. He has sought earnestly to assist in the solution of their problems.

I would especially like to make note of the manner in which he took an early interest in the proposed tobacco legislation. Before his committee was formally organized, he and the present chairman of the Tobacco Subcommittee, my colleague and longtime, warm personal and political friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT], began to hear and consult with witnesses and to collate the facts and information relative to the problems of the tobacco farmer. They held public hearings in Washington and in at least three of the tobacco-growing States to which the farmers and others interested in the tobacco economy were invited and given an opportunity to be heard.

The legislation, as I said in the beginning, is not in the form in which I would like it. Along with my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT], I labored diligently to amend the bill, both in the subcommittee and in the full committee, so as to substitute the national poundage average of 1,814 pounds as the base for the formula, but all of these efforts were fruitless and we were not successful. Also, I have considerable misgiving as to whether or not it is practicable for the legislation to become effective in 1965 in view of the time element involved. I am likewise concerned with respect to the attitude of tobacco growers with reference to the above two aspects of the legislation.

Nevertheless, the tobacco legislation in the past has been successful and has proved to be a great boon to the economy, not only of tobacco producers, but also to thousands of others who are interested in tobacco and who derive their income in whole or in part from this source.

The success of the program has been due largely to the fact that our farmers and others have exhibited a unity of interest and purpose, as well as a unity of action. I know that, unless we stand together in these matters, the whole program may be destroyed. Some legislation is essential, if not indeed indispensable, to the thrift and financial success of our farmers, merchants, tobacco warehousemen, manufacturers, and others. We must not have a cleavage within our ranks. Hence, I am supporting this legislation.

Tobacco is one of the basic American commodities. It should not be necessary for me to remind the Members of the Congress of the importance of tobacco to the economy of this Nation. It is the heaviest taxed of all of our farm commodities. The tobacco industry probably constitutes the largest segment of taxpayers in America.

Tobacco is one of the major farm products in the district which I have the honor to represent. Thousands of families depend upon it for all or a part of their livelihood.

It is a difficult crop to grow. To produce high quality tobacco successfully requires the exercise of the most painstaking diligence and skill. The growing of it is a laborious task, extending from one end of the year to the other. There are also many weather hazards and risks which the farmer must assume, and thus disaster attends his way and he does not produce a successful crop every year.

The history of tobacco is entwined with long and glorious history of our country, beginning with the Jamestown Colony and continuing to span the years to the

present day. The quality of tobacco grown in the bright-leaf, Flue-cured area of America is, and its aroma too, of such a character that it is known all over the world and relished by lovers of the weed from the crowned heads of Europe to the barefoot savages of the jungle. Thus, in the consideration of this legislation, I hope that the Members of Congress who represent districts in which no tobacco is grown will not overlook and be unmindful of the vast importance of this subject and of this legislation.

The tobacco growers should certainly have the opportunity to pass upon the subject and to decide for themselves whether or not they favor the acreage-poundage program and whether or not they wish to have it take effect for the year 1965. If by chance they should disapprove the program, I hope the Congress will promptly pass other legislation for a referendum along these lines, but with a different formula, and to take effect in the year 1966.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to oppose in principle a continuance in any form of Federal subsidy on the raising of tobacco.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we ought to be taking concrete steps toward facing up to the health hazards of tobacco. This is the place to begin.

The other day, Mr. Chairman, the Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. Luther Terry, asked Congress for an appropriation of $1,875,000 with which to publicize the health hazards involved in the use of tobacco.

Only in the United States can we find the Government on both sides of the tobacco issue, spending the taxpayers' money to foster effective production and at the same spending the taxpayers' money to publicize the harmful effects of the tobacco produced.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5721, a bill to provide acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco. Coming from a State which grows no tobacco, and having considered this measure as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I do hope I can contribute objectively to the discussion.

History tells us that in 1613 John Rolfe sent the first shipment of Virginia tobacco from Jamestown to England. Rolfe, as we all know, was the husband of the famous Indian princess, Pocahontas.

From that time to the present day, tobacco has been closely linked with our Nation's history and economic well-being. The growing of tobacco and the manufacturing of tobacco products have been one of our leading industries. Some 21 States are now engaged in the growing of tobacco, which has become an $8 billion industry. It has contributed substantially to our balance of payments with other countries. We are informed, too, that tobacco levies totaling over $3 billion are now collected annually by Federal and State Governments.

The industry is now in difficulty and needs our help. In spite of severe restrictions upon acreage devoted to the tobacco crop, surpluses have accumulated which now endanger the operations of the tobacco price stabilization program. It is noteworthy that the appeal for congressional assistance has come not only from the Department of Agriculture, but from tobacco growers as well.

Clearly, the acreage quota system, irrespective of its merits in the past, is today very inadequate.

The acreage-poundage marketing quotas set forth in H.R. 5721 are intended to reduce the present surplus and place the entire industry on a more sound economic footing. We should recognize that the acreage-poundage formula is not a panacea. It is a definite improvement, however, over the present system which has produced a condition of grave concern to the Nation.

The proposed legislation provides for restrictions which will not be the result solely of deliberations by the Congress. Rather, by means of the special referendum which is provided, it affords farmers engaged in the production of Flue-cured tobacco the opportunity to determine whether they favor or oppose the establishment of marketing quotas on an acreage-poundage basis. This, in my opinion, is eminently fair. Unless 66⅔ percent of the farmers voting in the special referendum approve, the marketing quotas on an acreage-poundage basis will not go into effect.

It is most urgent that we enact H.R. 5721 immediately in order to carry out the provisions of the special referendum and, if approved by the required percent of producers, apply the acreage-poundage quotas to the 1965 Flue-cured tobacco crop.

I urge a favorable vote for this important bill.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the so-called acreage-poundage tobacco bill, H.R. 5721, will set a precedent that may be used in the future in connection with other control crops, including cotton, rice, wheat, and peanuts. In connection with cotton and rice, the acreage allotment system has worked well and will continue to work successfully. Producers are cognizant that in order to obtain the benefits of price supports from their Government they should keep their acreage in line with the demand at home and abroad for the products they grow. Reductions in acreage allotments have been invoked from time to time on cotton and rice farmers. They plant the reduced allotments and comply with the programs of these crops.

I cannot subscribe to a control program which is based upon pounds, bushels, and bales. While I would like to favor legislation by my colleagues from the Flue-cured tobacco areas, I cannot support a system such as contained in H.R. 5721 establishing farm poundage quotas.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, hereinafter referred to as the "Act", is amended by adding immediately following section 316 a section 317 to read as follows:

"ACREAGE-POUNDAGE QUOTAS

"SEC. 317. (a) For purposes of this section—

"(1) 'National marketing quota' for any kind of tobacco for a marketing year means the amount of the kind of tobacco produced in the United States which the Secretary estimates will be utilized during the marketing year in the United States and will be exported during the marketing year, adjusted upward or downward in such amount as the Secretary, in his discretion, determines is desirable for the purpose of maintaining an adequate supply or for effecting an orderly reduction of excessive supplies in order to achieve the policy of the Act.

"(2) 'National average yield goal' for any kind of tobacco means the yield per acre which on a national average basis the Secretary determines will improve or insure the usability of the tobacco and increase the net return per pound to the growers. In making this determination the Secretary shall give consideration to such Federal-State production research data as he deems relevant.

"(3) 'National acreage allotment' means the acreage determined by dividing the national marketing quota by the national average yield goal.

"(4) 'Farm acreage allotment' for a tobacco farm, other than a new tobacco farm, means the acreage allotment determined by adjusting uniformly the acreage allotment established for such farm for the immediately preceding year, prior to any increase or decrease in such allotment due to undermarketings or overmarketings and prior to any reduction under subsection (f), so that the total of all allotments is equal to the national acreage allotment less the reserve provided in subsection (e) of this section with a further downward or upward adjustment to reflect any adjustment in the farm marketing quota for overmarketing or undermarketing and to reflect any reduction required under subsection (f) of this section, and including any adjustment for errors or inequities from the reserve.

"(5) The 'community average yield' means for Flue-cured tobacco the average yield per acre in the community designated by the Secretary as a local administrative area under the provisions of section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, which is determined by averaging the yields per acre for the three highest years of the five years 1959 to 1963, inclusive, except that if the yield for any of the three highest years is less than 80 per centum of the average for the three years then that year or years shall be eliminated and the average of the remaining years shall be the community average yield. Community average yields for other kinds of tobacco shall be determined in like manner, except that the five most recent crop years for which data are available shall be used instead of the period 1959 to 1963.

"(6)(A) 'Preliminary farm yield' for Flue-cured tobacco means a farm yield per acre determined by averaging the yield per acre for the three highest years of the five consecutive crop years beginning with the 1959 crop year except that if that average exceeds 120 per centum of the community average yield the preliminary farm yield shall be the sum of 75 per centum of the average of the three highest years and 25 per centum of the national average yield goal but not less than 120 per centum of the community average yield, and if the average of the three highest years is less than 80 per centum of the community average yield the preliminary farm yield shall be 80 per centum of the community average yield. In counties where less than five hundred acres of Flue-cured tobacco were allotted for 1964, the county may be considered as one community. If Flue-cured tobacco was not produced on the farm

for at least three years of the five-year period the average of the yields for the years in which tobacco was produced shall be used instead of the three-year average. If no Flue-cured tobacco was produced on the farm in the five-year period but the farm is eligible for an allotment because Flue-cured tobacco was considered to have been produced under applicable provisions of law, a preliminary farm yield for the farm shall be determined under regulations of the Secretary taking into account preliminary farm yields of similar farms in the community.

"(B) 'Preliminary farm yield' for kinds of tobacco, other than Flue-cured, means a farm yield per acre determined in accordance with subparagraph (A) of this paragraph (6) except that in lieu of the five consecutive crop years beginning with 1959 the five most recent crop years for which data are available for the kind of tobacco shall be used. In counties where less than five hundred acres of the kind of tobacco for which the determination is being made were allotted in the last year of the five-year period the county may be considered as one community. If tobacco of the kind for which the determination is being made was not produced on the farm for at least three years of the five-year period, the average of the yields for the years in which the kind of tobacco was produced shall be used instead of the three-year average. If no tobacco of the kind for which the determination is being made was produced on the farm in the five-year period but the farm is eligible for an allotment because such tobacco was considered to have been produced under applicable provisions of law, a preliminary farm yield for the farm shall be determined under regulations of the Secretary taking into account preliminary farm yields of similar farms in the community.

"(7) 'Farm yield' means the yield of tobacco per acre for a farm determined by multiplying the preliminary farm yield by a national yield factor which shall be obtained by dividing the national average yield goal by a weighted national average yield computed by multiplying the preliminary farm yield for each farm by the acreage allotment determined pursuant to paragraph (4) for the farm prior to adjustments for overmarketing, undermarketing, or reductions required under subsection (f) and dividing the sum of the products by the national acreage allotment.

"(8) 'Farm marketing quota' for any farm for any marketing year shall be the number of pounds of tobacco obtained by multiplying the farm yield by the acreage allotment prior to any adjustment for undermarketing or overmarketing, increased for undermarketing or decreased for overmarketing by the number of pounds by which marketings of tobacco from the farm during the immediately preceding marketing year, if marketing quotas were in effect under the program established by this section, is less than or exceeds the farm marketing quota for such year: *Provided,* That the farm marketing quota for any marketing year shall not be increased for undermarketing by an amount in excess of the number of pounds determined by multiplying the acreage allotment for the farm for the immediately preceding year prior to any increase or decrease for undermarketing or overmarketing by the farm yield. If on account of excess marketings in the preceding marketing year the farm marketing quota for the marketing year is reduced to zero pounds without reflecting the entire reduction required, the additional reduction required shall be made for the subsequent marketing year or years. The farm marketing quota will be increased or decreased for the second succeeding marketing year in the case of Maryland tobacco, and for any other kind of tobacco for which the Secretary determines it is impracticable because of the lack of adequate marketing data, to make the increases or decreases applicable to the immediately succeeding marketing year.

"(b) Within thirty days after the enactment of this section the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall determine and announce the amount of the national marketing quota for Flue-cured tobacco for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1965, and the national acreage allotment and national average yield goal for the 1965 crop of Flue-cured tobacco, and within thirty days after the announcement of the amount of such national marketing quota shall conduct a special referendum of the farmers engaged in the production of Flue-cured tobacco of the 1964 crop to determine whether they favor or oppose the establishment of marketing quotas on an acreage-poundage basis as provided in this section for the marketing years beginning July 1, 1965, July 1, 1966, and July 1, 1967, in lieu of quotas on an acreage basis in effect for those marketing years. If the Secretary determines that more than 66⅔ per centum of the farmers voting in the special referendum approve marketing quotas on an acreage-poundage basis, marketing quotas on an acreage-poundage basis as provided in this section shall be in effect for those marketing years and the marketing quotas on an acreage basis shall cease to be in effect at the beginning of such three-year period.

"(c) Whenever, during the first or second marketing year of the three-year period for which marketing quotas on an acreage basis are in effect for any kind of tobacco, including Flue-cured tobacco, the Secretary, in his discretion, determines with respect to that kind of tobacco that acreage-poundage quotas under this section would result in a more effective marketing quota program for that kind of tobacco he shall at the time the next announcement of the amount of the national marketing quota under section 312(b) of this Act determine and announce the amount of the national quota for that kind of tobacco under this section of the Act and at the same time announce the national acreage allotment and national average yield goal and within thirty days thereafter conduct a special referendum of farmers engaged in the production of the kind of tobacco of the most recent crop to determine whether they favor the establishment of marketing quotas on an acreage-poundage basis as provided in this section for the next three marketing years. If the Secretary determines that more than 66⅔ per centum of the farmers voting in the special referendum approve marketing quotas on an acreage-poundage basis as provided in this section, quotas on that basis shall be in effect for the next three marketing years and the marketing quotas on an acreage basis shall cease to be in effect at the beginning of such three-year period.

"(d) If marketing quotas have been made effective for a kind of tobacco on an acreage-poundage basis pursuant to subsections (b) or (c) the Secretary shall, not later than December 1 of any marketing year with respect to Flue-cured tobacco, and February 1 with respect to other kinds of tobacco, proclaim a national marketing quota for that kind of tobacco for the next three succeeding marketing years if the marketing year is the last year of three consecutive years for which marketing quotas previously proclaimed will be in effect. The Secretary, in his discretion, may proclaim the quota on an acreage-poundage basis as provided in this section or on an acreage allotment basis, whichever he determines would result in a more effective marketing quota for that kind of tobacco, and shall conduct a referendum in accordance with the provisions of section 312(c) of this Act. If the Secretary determines that more than one-third of the farmers voting oppose the national market quotas the results shall be proclaimed and the national marketing quota so proclaimed shall not be in effect. If the Secretary proclaims the quotas on an acreage-poundage basis he shall determine and proclaim at the same time the national marketing quota, national acreage allotment, and national average yield goal for the first year of the three years for which quotas are proclaimed. Notice of the farm marketing quota which will be in effect for his farm for the first marketing year covered by the referendum insofar as practicable shall be mailed to the farm operator prior to the holding of any special referendum under subsections (b) or (c) or a referendum on acreage-poundage quotas under this subsection. The Secretary shall determine and announce the national marketing quota, national acreage allotment and national average yield goal for the second and third marketing years of any three-year period for which national marketing quotas on an acreage-poundage basis are in effect on or before the December 1 with respect to Flue-cured tobacco and the February 1 with respect to other kinds of tobacco immediately preceding the beginning of the marketing year to which they apply. Whenever a national marketing quota, national acreage allotment, and national average yield goal are determined and announced, the Secretary shall provide for the determination of farm acreage allotments and farm marketing quotas under the provisions of this section for the crop and marketing year covered by the determinations.

"(e) No farm acreage allotment or farm yield shall be established for a farm on which no tobacco was produced or considered produced under applicable provisions of law for the immediately preceding five years. For each marketing year for which acreage-poundage quotas are in effect under this section the Secretary in his discretion may establish a reserve from the national acreage allotment in an amount equivalent to not more than 1 per centum of the national acreage allotment to be available for making corrections of errors in farm acreage allotments, adjusting inequities, and for establishing acreage allotments for new farms, which are farms on which tobacco was not produced or considered produced during the immediately preceding five years. The part of the reserve held for apportionment to new farms shall be allotted on the basis of land, labor, and equipment available for the production of tobacco, crop rotation practices, soil and other physical factors affecting the production of tobacco and the past tobacco-producing experience of the farm operator. The farm yield for any farm for which a new farm acreage allotment is established shall be determined on the basis of available productivity data for the land involved and farm yields for similar farms.

"(f) Only the provisions of the last two sentences of subsection (g) of section 313 of this Act shall apply with respect to acreage-poundage programs established under this section. The acreage reductions required under the last two sentences shall be in addition to any other adjustments made pursuant to this section, and when acreage reductions are made the farm marketing quota shall be reduced to reflect such reductions. The provisions of the next to the last sentence of such subsection pertaining to the filing of any false report with respect to the acreage of tobacco grown on the farm shall also be applicable to the filing of any false report with respect to the production or marketings of tobacco grown on a farm for which an acreage allotment and a farm yield are established as provided in this section. In establishing acreage allotments and farm yields for other farms owned by the owner displaced by acquisition of his land by any agency, as provided in section 378 of this Act, increases or decreases in such acreage allotments and farm yields as provided in this section shall be made on account of marketings below or

in excess of the farm marketing quota for the farm acquired by the agency. Acreage allotments and farm marketing quotas determined under this section may be leased under the terms and conditions contained in section 316 of this Act, except that (1) the adjustment provided for in the last sentence of subsection (c) of said section shall be based on farm yields rather than normal yields, and (2) any credit for undermarketing or charge for overmarketing shall be attributed to the farm to which transferred.

"(g) When marketing quotas under this section are in effect, provisions with respect to penalties for the marketing of excess tobacco and the other provisions contained in section 314 of the Act shall apply, except that:

"(1) No penalty on excess tobacco shall be due or collected until 110 per centum of the farm marketing quota for a farm has been marketed, but with respect to each pound of tobacco marketed in excess of such percentage the full penalty rate shall be due, payable, and collected at the time of marketing on each pound of tobacco marketed, and any tobacco marketed in excess of 100 per centum of the farm marketing quota will require a reduction in subsequent farm marketing quotas in accordance with paragraph (a)(8): *Provided, however,* If the Secretary, in his discretion, determines it is desirable to encourage the marketing of grade N_2 tobacco, or any grade of tobacco not eligible for price support, in order to meet the normal demands of export and domestic markets, he may authorize the marketing of such tobacco in a marketing year without the payment of penalty or deduction from subsequent quotas to the extent of 5 per centum of the farm marketing quota for the farm on which the tobacco was produced.

"(2) When marketing quotas established under this section are in effect the provisions with respect to penalties contained in the third sentence of subsection 314(a) shall be revised to read: 'If any producer falsely identifies or fails to account for the disposition of any tobacco, the Secretary, in lieu of assessing and collecting penalties based on actual marketings of excess tobacco, may elect to assess a penalty computed by multiplying the full penalty rate by an amount of tobacco equal to 25 per centum of the farm marketing quota plus the farm yield of the number of acres harvested in excess of the farm acreage allotment and the penalty in respect thereof shall be paid and remitted by the producer.'

"(3) For the first year a marketing quota program established under the provisions of this section is in effect, the words 'normal production' where they appear in the fourth sentence of subsection (a) of such section shall be read 'farm yield' and the said fourth sentence shall otherwise be applicable. For the second and succeeding years for which a program established under the provisions of this section is in effect, the provisions of subsection (a)(8) shall apply when penalties, if any, on carryover tobacco are computed, and the provisions contained in the fourth sentence of subsection 314(a) shall not be applicable."

SEC. 2. Subsection (j) of section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as added by Public Law 361, 84th Congress, approved August 11, 1955, is amended by inserting immediately following the language "(g) hereof" wherever it appears in said subsection the language "or section 317".

SEC. 3. Section 106 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) If acreage-poundage farm marketing quotas are in effect under section 317 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, (1) price support shall not be made available on tobacco marketed in excess of 110 per centum of the marketing quota for the farm on which such tobacco was produced, and (2) for the purpose of price-support eligibility, tobacco carried over from one marketing year to another to avoid marketings in excess of the farm marketing quota shall, when marketed, be considered tobacco of the then current crop."

Mr. COOLEY (interrupting 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUBBLEFIELD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STUBBLEFIELD: On page 8, line 24, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided, however,* That the Secretary shall not make any such determination with respect to any kind of tobacco except Flue-cured tobacco unless prior thereto he shall conduct public hearings in the areas where such tobacco is produced for the purpose of ascertaining and taking into consideration the attitudes of producers and other interested persons with respect to acreage-poundage quotas."

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely directs the Secretary to hold hearings in the area in which other types of tobacco are grown before he makes any determination as to quotas on a poundage basis.

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

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have considered this amendment, and it is entirely agreeable to me.

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

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I have seen this amendment before it was offered. I made the suggestion that the gentleman include any kind of tobacco except Flue-cured. The gentleman has accepted my proposal, and we have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STUBBLEFIELD].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. O'NEAL OF GEORGIA

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

1. Strike out paragraph (b) of section 317 and redesignate paragraph (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) as (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively.
2. On page 3, line 1 change "(f)" to "(e)".
3. On page 3, line 3 change "(e)" to "(d)".
4. On page 3, line 7 change "(f)" to "(e)".
5. On page 6, line 5 change "(f)" to "(e)".
6. On page 9, line 9, strike out "or (c)".

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the able gentleman from Kentucky points out that this bill will not go into effect this year unless the growers themselves approve it by referendum and that a two-thirds vote is required.

On the surface this sounds like a fair proposal or a magnanimous gesture, but it seems to me to be neither when you look at the eligibility requirements for voting and the geographical distribution of the votes.

As I pointed out previously, this is competition for quality and for money in the marketplace.

The growers who will have the unfair headstart in 1965 are the ones who will dominate the referendum. The Library of Congress did a little research for me on this, and the results will surprise you as much as they did me.

Instead of one vote per farm or one vote per tobacco allotment, we have an intricate and complicated law of eligibility in the referendum. I cannot explain it to you—certainly not in a few minutes—and I do not charge that anyone votes illegally or that anyone else is denied the right, but I do say that the way it comes about does not provide a fair forum for this issue to be decided.

Florida has 6,922 allotments and 7,318 voters, or an increase of 396 over the allotments. Georgia has 25,889 allotments and 29,854 voters, or an increase of 3,965. South Carolina has 25,252 allotments and 44,520 voters, or an increase of 19,268, but hold onto your hats: North Carolina has 117,102 allotments and 305,822 voters, for an increase of 188,720.

North Carolina completely dominates the referendum. They have roughly 75 percent of all the votes and they are not worried about a 66⅔-percent requirement.

Gentlemen, I remind you this law puts all of the growers in a straitjacket except as to quality. That is all that is left. I doubt that Russian farmers have much more regimentation than this.

Will those who compete for quality be permitted to change the rules in the middle of the game? How would you like to play in a game where the rules were changed by the opposing team—and after you had gone to bat?

I call on you in the spirit of fairplay to vote for my amendment.

There is one other thing—I will not have the concluding argument but it probably will be argued that under the bill the farmer can choose to keep his bad tobacco this year and not sell it in the hope and expectation that he will make better tobacco next year. I remind the gentleman and I remind this House that the tobacco farmer is a little farmer. He is having a hard time and he has to make this year's living this year.

I appreciate the provision in the law that protects him against a crop failure. But he cannot play a game. He and his family must eat with whatever is available this year.

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

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I think that we should think about and necessarily have to give some consideration to where historically the preponderant majority of Flue-cured tobacco has been produced in this country

of ours. For more than 100 years 90 percent of the Flue-cured tobacco produced in the United States has been produced in the States of South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia.

Now I can understand and sympathize and I fully appreciate the position of our distinguished and beloved friends from Florida and Georgia. But then again, gentlemen of the House, I must say to you that those gentlemen doing the great job that they are, represent in round figures approximately 10 percent of all the growers in the continental United States. But that is not the reason why I stand on my feet to oppose the gentleman's amendment which would delay this matter another year.

More than 10 years ago many tobacco growers throughout the five States that produce Flue-cured tobacco recognized that you could no longer relate marketing quotas in poundage to acreage production. Let me illustrate.

In 1964 we produced more tobacco in pounds than we did 10 years before 1954. Yet, we had 40 percent less acreage.

Now this question is settled. If, as my friend the gentleman from Georgia said, the real reason why we put in the two-thirds vote rather than the simple majority vote was to be equitable with our friends from Florida and Georgia.

If he had simply said that the majority of the growers would make this determination at the ballot box, then they may have had some reason to complain and they may have had some reason to offer this amendment. But we went all the way. We said it is a fact that more than two-thirds of the farmers who are interested and want this program now this year are entitled to go to the polls within 30 days from the passage of this act and say whether they want it.

Since more than two-thirds of the farmers are in the States of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, we said, "Yes, we will go to two-thirds to give the few farmers of Georgia and Florida an opportunity."

Let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL], and to my other friends of Florida and Georgia, that if the growers themselves say they do not want this program in a referendum then the amendment will have been adopted by the growers themselves. It ought not be adopted on this floor.

I ask the membership of this House to vote down the gentleman's amendment and to let the growers of these five Flue-cured tobacco States, in the democratic process, at the ballot box, by a two-thirds vote, decide what is best for their interests.

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

I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL] if the purpose of his amendment is to delay the bill for 1 year.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. The gentleman is correct. It will do nothing except delay the effectiveness of the act until the 1966 crop.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I say to the gentleman from Georgia that I am certainly in favor of his amendment. As he has so well pointed out, and as others of our colleagues from our section have pointed out, is it not true that much of our tobacco has already been planted this year?

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. That is absolutely correct, Mr. Chairman. The growers normally transplant after March 15. This is already after March 15.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

I certainly believe the House should pass the amendment. In my section of Florida and in the section represented by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA], our farmers have already planted their tobacco. It takes a lot of planning to figure exactly how much money one will get, to make arrangements for fertilizer, and to go into all the myriad details concerning production. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is the quid pro quo about which I was talking—just a little tit for tat, just a little concession.

I certainly hope the House will pass the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I rise in support of the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL] to put this legislation off for 1 year so that the farmers will have an opportunity to at least vote on this measure before they have their plants in the ground.

As my esteemed friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] mentioned, the States of North Carolina and Virginia do grow a large majority of this tobacco. But I point out to the other Members of the House that the farmer in my district, who has only a small allotment of tobacco, or in the district of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS], or in Georgia, is in a position where his tobacco is worth just as much to his family as it is to the families in North Carolina, where the majority of it is grown.

I appeal to the Members of the House to show some fairness to these people who have already started planting tobacco, and not to change the rules in the middle of the game.

This has been mentioned many times, and I do not wish to be repetitious, but the people of our States have already planted their tobacco. If this program is so important, and if it has the magnitude and graveness it is contended to have, and will have such an effect if we do not pass it, why was it not presented last fall, or some other time, when at least we would have known what the estimated crop would be? No, they waited until this Congress came into session, after the farmers already were making preparations, and then suddenly there is a great big rush. It is said that we have to ram this through the House, rush it through the Senate, and try to hold a referendum, after our people have already planted their crops.

In the interest of fairplay, I plead with my colleagues to please adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia so that our farmers, in Florida and Georgia and other parts, will at least have an opportunity to consider the legislation on its merits and not have to rush into it after they already have their plants in the ground and are ready to proceed with cultivating of this very important crop to them.

I plead with you, in the interest of fairplay, to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia.

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

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I rise in support of this bill. I come from one of the oldest tobacco-growing areas in the country, the northern part of the State of North Carolina. My district is filled with a large number of rather small tobacco farmers. I would say the average is somewhere around 3 acres. It is a question of how long can the farmers in my area and in other areas of the tobacco-producing country continue to suffer cut after cut after cut in acreage. They got a cut of 5 percent 2 years ago, 10 percent last year, and 20 percent this year. As a result of these cuts, as a result of the constant increase in the number of pounds going into stabilization, the farmers themselves, I might say, have gotten together in the realization that something must be done if they are to keep the tobacco program which has worked so well in years gone by. There are some things about this bill which I do not like. There are some things about this bill I would like to change. But I say to you, my friends, that this tobacco program is so important to my people and to the people of all the tobacco-producing areas of the country and to the country as well that this bill should be voted on today and passed. In my opinion, this bill and what it will do and the shape it will put the tobacco program in is far more important than some of the little misgivings that we might have about various sections of it.

I also oppose the amendment offered by my very good friend from Georgia. This matter was first brought to the attention of the public back in November of last year, as I understand it, from a committee which was appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Of course, this bill had not been drawn then. Of course, many of the features in the bill were unknown at that time. But the public was put on notice that there was considerable thought in this country that there would be and there was a good possibility that there would be a shift in controls from acreage only to a system of acres and pounds. This bill is necessary this year, my colleagues, because there are now about 950 million pounds of tobacco in stabilization. Last year 286 million pounds were put in. The year before 277 million pounds were put in. If this crop year is a bumper crop, as it was last year, that will be just about the straw that breaks the camel's back. With all due deference to my good friend and with understanding of his position, this program is far too important to the economy of his area and my area and the whole United States to let it go down the

drain because of the failure of the Congress to give the farmers the right to vote. This is not an effort to put it upon the farmers but merely to give them the privilege of saying whether they want to live under this program. If they do not like it, they ought to vote it down. If they want the tobacco program and think well of it, they ought to vote for it.

One more thing. My good friend from Ohio said he opposes the bill because of the health scare in connection with tobacco. Let me tell him and anyone else who is of like mind in this body that he ought to take exactly the contrary position because if you eliminated the tobacco program, you would not be able to park an automobile in certain areas of the State of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia and some of those other places that will be growing tobacco. Why they will be growing tobacco in flowerpots down there. Therefore, it would actually result in a tremendous increase in the amount of tobacco grown in this country and, of course, if it is consumed, it will amount to an increase in the consumption of it. The tobacco program has meant a lot to this country and to my district and to my State and to my area. I urge all of you to consider this matter carefully and seriously because it is of extreme importance to each and every Member of this House.

The tax revenue figures from tobacco are tremendous. People are smoking now and have smoked since the days of Sir Walter Raleigh, and they are going to continue to smoke. I understand about 70 million people are smokers. I urge you to support this bill.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KORNEGAY. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. As I understand the bill, if this bill is defeated today, tobacco growers will still be under the old bill they are operating under now.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Yes. I did not mean to leave the impression that to vote this bill down would do away with the whole program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief. I want the record to show that we officially received a proposed tobacco bill from the administration on February 4, which I think was a Friday. On the following Monday I introduced a bill. We had hearings in the field and when the subcommittee returned to Washington we had further hearings and further conferences. We have put out a lot of labor; we worked long and hard to bring this bill to the floor of the House and we met with some delays which were unavoidable.

The bill is now here and it should be enacted and sent over to the other body so that the farmers may freely conduct a referendum and express their views. If they approve the amendment offered by our friend from Georgia they can vote down this program when the referendum is called.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge all of the Members to vote against the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia) there were—ayes 13, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. EDMONDSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5721) to amend the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 280, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LATTA. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LATTA moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5721 to the Committee on Agriculture.

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

The motion was rejected.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the "ayes" had it.

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

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

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 206, nays 170, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—206

Abbitt	Brademas	Celler
Abernethy	Brooks	Chelf
Addabbo	Broyhill, N.C.	Clark
Albert	Broyhill, Va.	Clevenger
Annunzio	Burke	Colmer
Ashmore	Burleson	Cooley
Aspinall	Byrne, Pa.	Craley
Bandstra	Cabell	Culver
Barrett	Callan	Daddario
Beckworth	Carey	Dawson
Bingham	Carter	de la Garza
Boggs	Casey	Delaney
Denton	King, Calif.	Rhodes, Pa.
Diggs	Kirwan	Rivers, Alaska
Donohue	Kluczynski	Roberts
Dorn	Kornegay	Rodino
Dow	Lennon	Rogers, Colo.
Dowdy	Long, La.	Rogers, Tex.
Downing	Long, Md.	Ronan
Dulski	Love	Rooney, N.Y.
Duncan, Oreg.	McGrath	Rooney, Pa.
Edmondson	McVicker	Rosenthal
Edwards, Calif.	Machen	Rostenkowski
Evans, Colo.	Mackie	Ryan
Evins, Tenn.	Madden	Satterfield
Fallon	Mahon	St. Onge
Farnsley	Marsh	Scheuer
Fisher	Matsunaga	Schmidhauser
Flood	Meeds	Scott
Foley	Mills	Secrest
Ford, William D.	Mink	Senner
Fountain	Mize	Shipley
Fraser	Monagan	Sickles
Gallagher	Moorhead	Sisk
Garmatz	Morgan	Skubitz
Gettys	Morris	Slack
Gilbert	Morrison	Smith, Iowa
Gilligan	Morton	Smith, N.Y.
Gonzalez	Moss	Smith, Va.
Gray	Multer	Staggers
Green, Pa.	Murphy, Ill.	Stalbaum
Greigg	Murphy, N.Y.	Steed
Griffiths	Murray	Stubblefield
Hagen, Calif.	Natcher	Sullivan
Hanna	Nedzi	Sweeney
Hansen, Iowa	O'Brien	Tenzer
Hardy	O'Hara, Ill.	Thompson, La.
Harris	O'Hara, Mich.	Thompson, Tex.
Hathaway	O'Konski	Thomson, Wis.
Hays	Olsen, Mont.	Todd
Hechler	Olson, Minn.	Trimble
Helstoski	O'Neill, Mass.	Tuck
Henderson	Passman	Udall
Hicks	Patman	Ullman
Holifield	Patten	Vanik
Hull	Pepper	Vigorito
Hungate	Perkins	Waggonner
Huot	Philbin	Walker, N. Mex.
Ichord	Pickle	Watts
Johnson, Calif.	Poage	Weltner
Jonas	Poff	White, Idaho
Jones, Mo.	Pool	White, Tex.
Karsten	Powell	Whitener
Karth	Price	Whitten
Kastenmeier	Pucinski	Williams
Kee	Purcell	Willis
Kelly	Randall	Yates
Keogh	Redlin	Young
	Reuss	Zablocki

NAYS—170

Adair	Cramer	Horton
Anderson, Ill.	Cunningham	Hosmer
Anderson, Tenn.	Curtis	Hutchinson
Andrews, George W.	Dague	Jacobs
Andrews, Glenn	Davis, Ga.	Jarman
Andrews, N. Dak.	Davis, Wis.	Joelson
Arends	Devine	Johnson, Pa.
Ashbrook	Dingell	Keith
Ashley	Dole	King, N.Y.
Ayres	Duncan, Tenn.	King, Utah
Baldwin	Dwyer	Krebs
Bates	Dyal	Kunkel
Battin	Edwards, Ala.	Landrum
Belcher	Erlenborn	Langen
Bell	Farbstein	Latta
Bennett	Farnum	Lindsay
Berry	Fascell	Lipscomb
Betts	Feighan	McCarthy
Boland	Findley	McClory
Bolton	Fino	McCulloch
Bow	Flynt	McDade
Brock	Fogarty	McDowell
Broomfield	Ford, Gerald R.	McEwen
Brown, Ohio	Fulton, Pa.	McMillan
Buchanan	Fulton, Tenn.	Macdonald
Burton, Calif.	Fuqua	MacGregor
Burton, Utah	Gathings	Mackay
Byrnes, Wis.	Gibbons	Mailliard
Cahill	Goodell	Martin, Ala.
Cameron	Green, Oreg.	Martin, Nebr.
Cederberg	Grider	Mathias
Chamberlain	Griffin	Matthews
Clancy	Gross	Michel
Clausen, Don H.	Grover	Minish
Clawson, Del	Gubser	Minshall
Cleveland	Hagan, Ga.	Moore
Cohelan	Haley	Morse
Collier	Hall	Mosher
Conte	Halleck	Nelsen
Corbett	Halpern	O'Neal, Ga.
Corman	Hanley	Ottinger
	Harsha	Pelly
	Harvey, Ind.	Pike
	Harvey, Mich.	Pirnie
	Hawkins	Quie
	Herlong	Quillen

Race	Saylor	Tunney
Reid, Ill.	Schneebeli	Tupper
Reifel	Schweiker	Tuten
Reinecke	Selden	Utt
Rhodes, Ariz.	Shriver	Van Deerlin
Rivers, S.C.	Sikes	Walker, Miss.
Robison	Smith, Calif.	Wilson, Bob
Rogers, Fla.	Springer	Wilson, Charles H.
Roncalio	Stafford	Wyatt
Roush	Stanton	Wydler
Roybal	Stephens	Younger
Rumsfeld	Stratton	
St Germain	Talcott	

NOT VOTING—57

Adams	Giaimo	Moeller
Baring	Grabowski	Nix
Blatnik	Gurney	Reid, N.Y.
Bolling	Hamilton	Resnick
Bonner	Hansen, Idaho	Roosevelt
Bray	Hansen, Wash.	Roudebush
Brown, Calif.	Hébert	Schisler
Callaway	Holland	Taylor
Conable	Howard	Teague, Calif.
Conyers	Irwin	Teague, Tex.
Curtin	Jennings	Thomas
Daniels	Johnson, Okla.	Thompson, N.J.
Dent	Jones, Ala.	Toll
Derwinski	Laird	Vivian
Dickinson	Leggett	Watkins
Ellsworth	McFall	Whalley
Everett	Martin, Mass.	Widnall
Frelinghuysen	May	Wolff
Friedel	Miller	Wright

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Laird.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Wolff with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Toll with Mrs. May.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Daniels with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. McFall with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Curtin.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Gurney.

Mr. Irwin with Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Conable.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Holland.

Mr. Miller with Mr. Everett.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Moeller with Mr. Schisler.

Mr. Leggett with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Vivian with Mr. Hamilton.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Adams.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado and Mr. O'KONSKI changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL, WITHOUT REGARD TO THE PRESCRIBED 6-MONTH WAITING PERIOD, OF ZINC FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 1496) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, from either the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) or the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)), or from both such stockpiles, (1) approximately one hundred and fifty thousand short tons of zinc, (2) approximately one hundred and fifty thousand short tons of lead, and (3) approximately one hundred thousand short tons of copper (part or all of which may be supplied in the form of brass and bronze, taking into account only the copper content thereof).

"The disposals authorized by this section may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, but the time and method of the disposals shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

"SEC. 2. The Administrator is also authorized, without regard to the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, to make available an additional fifty thousand short tons of zinc and an additional fifty thousand short tons of lead now held in either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both such stockpiles, for direct use by agencies of the United States Government.

"Amend the title so as to read: 'An Act to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc, lead, and copper from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both.' "

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

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to take a moment to inform the Members of the House that I would like to associate myself with the remarks that were made by the chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] earlier in the day and to say that if it does not work out the way he hopes it will work out, I am sure the gentleman from Colorado will have the unqualified backing of his entire committee, if he decides to review the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PHILBIN. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague, the Representative from the State of Colorado and distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, WAYNE ASPINALL, has raised certain serious questions in his discussion on H.R. 1496, as amended.

Chairman ASPINALL was kind enough to inform me last week that he was going to make a statement concerning this bill, and furnished me a copy of his statement. Because of his courtesy in so doing, I, too, would like to read a statement to the House concerning the matters raised by the distinguished gentleman from Colorado.

He has asked me, as chairman of the subcommittee that handled this legislation, to give the House my assurance that the disposal of 100,000 short tons of copper will not be detrimental to the security of our country.

I believe that it is not possible to give "absolute assurance" regarding this point because I am told there is no firm information on which a categorical response can be based at this time. There are now a little over 1 million short tons of copper in all Government inventories, exclusive of that portion of the Defense Production Act inventory that has already been authorized or committed for direct Government use or commercial sale. After pointing this out in his testimony before the Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable Buford Ellington, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, also indicated that the present conventional war stockpile objective for copper is 775,000 short tons and that there is, thus, an excess of approximately 250,000 short tons above the conventional war stockpile objective.

But as my friend, Chairman ASPINALL, has stated, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning went on to point out:

Because of the many complex and variable factors involved, studies on which an official and firm nuclear war stockpile objective for copper can be based may not be completed for some time. Preliminary estimates indicate that copper will be an extremely important material in the nuclear postattack period. This Office believes that the postattack demand for copper may be substantially larger than that required for conventional war, and that the nuclear war stockpile objective for this material may be higher than the total of present inventories. The general standards and criteria for developing nuclear war stockpile objectives are now under review and, as I have stated, we will have no firm or official figures for possibly 12 to 15 months.

In recognition of this situation, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning then pointed out:

Thus, the disposal of copper at this time could make it necessary to repurchase the equivalent of the released copper at some later time if the nuclear war stockpile objectives justify such action.

There is no way, therefore, to reach a firm and supportable answer to the question about the impact of the proposed disposal of 100,000 short tons of copper upon our security in the event of a nuclear attack upon the United States, and there will not be until such time as the supply requirement studies for nuclear war and reconstruction have been completed. But at this point, I think it should be made perfectly clear that while nuclear stockpile objectives could conceivably result in higher objectives than those established for conventional war needs, they will be established ultimately on the basis of general criteria currently under study within the Federal Government. Until such time as those criteria are available, conventional war stockpile objectives have been considered in determining the Government's excess holding of stockpile items.

In essence, this means that all previous disposal actions approved by this body have been based on conventional stockpile needs. The suggestion by my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] is that we treat the disposal of copper on a different basis than we have treated any other. I am unable, as is everyone else in the Government connected with this matter, to give a definitive answer to his question based upon the results of future studies. However, following the criteria that we have utilized in the past, my answer to his question based on conventional stockpile needs, is a definite "yes".

The second major question raised by my distinguished colleague, relates to the amount of zinc to be disposed of under the Senate version of H.R. 1496.

When S. 296, the bill originally introduced by Senator MANSFIELD to dispose of 100,000 short tons of copper on the basis of a loan from the national stockpile, was under consideration by the Subcommittee on National Stockpiles and Naval Petroleum Reserves of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning proposed that the bill be amended to provide for the release of brass and bronze as well as copper. In this connection, he pointed out that it would be necessary to keep in the stockpile and available for conventional war needs, copper of the appropriate type and quality and available in forms required for the most immediate and flexible use in the event of an emergency.

He stated that this meant "that all of the wire bars and all of the electrolytic cathodes—amounting to a total of 642,001 short tons—must be retained and that no copper of this type will be available for disposal." The Director then indicated that in the interest of national defense, copper in brass, copper in bronze, copper in other alloys, and some fire-refined alloys should be considered initially for sale. This amendment was adopted in substance by the Subcommittee, and was incorporated by in H.R. 1496 as amended.

In connection with this proposed amendment, the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator SYMINGTON, inquired about the amount of zinc in the brass and bronze that would thus be made available, and the record indicates that he was informed that about 30,000 tons would thus be included in that material. The chairman then inquired about whether this quantity of zinc would be in addition to that provided in the other bill then before the committee authorizing the release of 150,000 tons of zinc for commercial sale and 50,000 tons for direct Government use. The response of the Office of Emergency Planning representative was, in effect, that this amount could be in addition to that authorized in the other bill or if there were substantial objection to this, it could be charged against the other bill if that should be found necessary.

In its report on H.R. 1496, as amended, the Senate Committee on Armed Services, in commenting upon the amendment, stated:

Another effect of this change is that an additional quantity of approximately 30,000 tons of zinc and smaller quantities of lead and tin would be made available for disposal. The committee has not charged these additional quantities against the zinc and lead authorized to be disposed of in other parts of the bill because the stockpile objective for lead and zinc is zero and it seems desirable to dispose of additional quantities of these materials at a time when they are in great demand.

In view of this background, I believe it is apparent that it was the intent of the Senate Armed Services Committee to authorize the disposal of an additional 30,000 short tons of zinc. There was no discussion of this matter in the Senate at the time it passed H.R. 1496, as amended by the committee, and, therefore, the record is silent. While I admit that the language of the bill itself is confusing, I do not believe that it would be proper for me to suggest to the House that the interpretation of the bill as made by my friend from Colorado, reflects the intent of the Senate.

As I understand the reservations of the gentleman from Colorado, it is not in the disposal of copper per se but, rather, in the zinc content of the bronze and brass which will be disposed of under the copper disposal action. While it would be uneconomical to melt down these items to obtain zinc as a separate material, the release of these materials will eliminate the requirement for fabricators of brass and bronze to purchase zinc for these products.

In the hearings which the subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee held on the disposal of zinc, representatives of the General Services Administration outlined a plan authorizing the immediate disposal of 75,000 tons of zinc. Thereafter, they would consult with industry and other governmental agencies to determine when additional releases of zinc would be made. There was no time limit established for the additional releases.

I think I can give assurances to the gentleman from Colorado that if the bill is interpreted to mean "release of an additional 30,000 short tons of zinc," this will be done at a time so as not to be disruptive of the market. In fact, the bill itself provides "the time and method of the disposal shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets."

To interpret the bill as suggested by the gentleman from Colorado might confuse those responsible for the disposal action because it would be obvious that the two Houses of the Congress reflected differences of opinion as to the meaning of the statute. For these reasons, I cannot agree with the interpretation of the gentleman from Colorado.

While we appreciate the cooperation and suggestions of any and all Members of Congress and other committees of the Congress, and especially of the very knowledgeable gentleman from Colorado, the disposal of zinc, lead, and copper as provided in this bill, still remains the responsibility of the Armed Services Committee after the initial disposal of each of these metals.

While it is true that the Armed Services Committee or any subcommittee thereof held no special hearings on the disposal of copper from the national stockpile, we carefully read the record prepared in the Senate on this matter, and feel confident that full consideration was given by the Members of the other body concerning this disposal action.

In times past, through a close working relationship between the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House, the other body has accepted the hearings and the reports of the House Committee without formal hearings, and have authorized the disposal of various surplus stockpile items.

My good friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], has stated that "we are on the horns of a dilemma." With this, I completely agree. I think it is readily apparent that thousands of workers employed in industries utilizing these metals are on the verge of unemployment because of the severe shortages.

To delay action on this measure would undoubtedly result in needless unemployment, and could shut down important segments of major industries affecting our entire economy.

The following Members have introduced legislation to authorize the disposal of copper from our national stockpiles: The gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE]; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY]; the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN]; the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN]; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUTCHINSON]; the gentlemen from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN and Mr. IRWIN]; and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Therefore, I urge you to accept H.R. 1496, as amended.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support the bill brought before the House by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

I approach this bill from the point of view of the fabricators of metal who are represented in such great volume in my district. The brass industries in Connecticut are starved for copper and this need is emphasized by management and labor alike. Both have been in touch with me constantly about the need for an adequate supply of copper to keep production moving.

For this reason, the passage of this bill is welcome since it will provide from the national stockpile 100,000 short tons of copper which is badly needed to keep the wheels of industry rolling.

Although it is true that a more extended legislative route might have been taken with hearings and greater publicity, nevertheless, I think that we must view this situation as one of crisis. The lead and zinc bills had hearings, and it would have been appropriate to have had hearings on copper legislation at the same time. The other body took certain steps which have complicated the problem by the provision of permitting copper to be supplied in the form of brass and bronze. While this is not objectionable from the point of view of brass fabricators, it does raise certain questions as to the other alloys involved.

At any rate, the bill is before us today with the support, or consent, of everyone involved and I sincerely hope that it will pass and thereby give much needed material support to Connecticut industry. If it does pass, it will be due in a large part to the strong and heroic effort of the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. PHILBIN], who has watched over this legislation constantly and has moved it with great dispatch in view of all the difficulties. He is certainly to be commended for his role.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

RECORD OF SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON ON GIVING THE RIGHT TO VOTE TO 18-YEAR-OLD CITIZENS

Mr. MACGREGOR. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last, the President of the United States, in a news conference from his ranch in Texas, gave the American people another example of his inconsistency. Mr. Johnson told the assembled news men and women, and the American people via radio and television, that he wished he could have included giving the vote to 18-year-olds in his recommendations to the Congress on voting rights legislation.

Mr. Speaker, some of us have checked the record. We found that on May 21, 1954, Lyndon Baines Johnson, then a Senator, voted against the very proposal that he now says he favors. In Senate Joint Resolution 53 in the 83d Congress an amendment to the Constitution was proposed granting the right to vote to citizens who have attained the age of 18. This proposition was presented by a Republican Senator. All 27 Republican Senators present and voting voted "yea." More than three-fourths of the Democratic Senators, including Senator Lyndon Johnson, voted "nay." The resolution thereby failed to get the necessary two-thirds approval.

Is the President saying that he would favor establishing now by legislation a proposition which he was unwilling to submit to the American people for their acceptance or rejection through the constitutional amendment ratification process?

SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. TRIMBLE. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, several Members of the House have called attention to the Budget Bureau proposal that would reduce technical assistance funds of the Soil Conservation Service and require our farmers in soil and water conservation districts to pay one-half of the cost of such help.

I join in the growing opposition to this proposal. I believe that is not in the national interest. It is certainly not in the interest of my State of Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, if the proposal is adopted it would mean that the farmers of my State would have to raise $744,000, nearly $10,000 per district, to maintain the present rate of technical assistance. The application of conservation practices and the rate that cropland is being converted to other uses would both be reduced by 50 percent. There would be a reduction of nearly $10½ million in the income of Arkansas business people who supply seed, fertilizer, herbicides, tree seedlings, equipment, gasoline, and other materials, and in farm labor used.

The general assembly of my State, the house of representatives and the senate concurring, has expressed its opposition to this proposal by formal resolution. Gov. Orval E. Faubus in a letter to the President dated March 8, 1965, also expressed his opposition to the revolving fund and the provision for charges for technical services.

The Arkansas Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts has prepared an analysis and a press release that highlight in first-rate fashion the wrongness of the proposal. I commend a careful reading of these documents to the Members of the House.

EVALUATION OF PROPOSED REVOLVING FUND ON SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION IN ARKANSAS

The recommended 1966 fiscal year budget for the U.S. Department of Agriculture contains a provision that legislation be enacted establishing a revolving fund to facilitate landowners' paying for part of the technical assistance provided by the Soil Conservation Service through soil and water conservation districts. It is proposed that the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service be reduced by $20 million and the fees paid by landowners be used to offset part of this reduction.

This proposal, presumably directed toward releasing Federal funds for new programs, was apparently predicated on the erroneous assumption that the chief purpose of soil and water conservation is to increase production. Since American farmers can now produce more of certain crops than the public uses, the soil conservation effort, in view of the Budget Bureau, can be safely reduced or deferred.

The proposal to charge for technical services cannot realistically be expected to offset a reduction of this size. Arkansas has been a leader in the soil and water conservation movement. The State passed the first soil and water conservation district enabling law and in March 1965, became the first State to modernize this law to fit present day conservation programs and problems. The State has made a generous appropriation to soil and water conservation districts and the watershed program for several years. More than one-half the county governments are making appropriations and contributions to local soil and water conservation districts for speeding up conservation. Even with this splendid cooperation and effort, the conservation job in Arkansas is only about one-half completed. The conservation program was never more important than now.

Officials of the Arkansas Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts are very much concerned about how badly the proposed revolving fund will hurt the conservation program in the State. To help determine the effect of the proposal, the information secured from each soil and water conservation district in the State, past records and projections were thoroughly evaluated and analyzed. These are the significant findings of this survey:

1. Only 56 of the 76 soil and water conservation districts said they would be able to contribute to the revolving fund. Twenty said they would not. Overall the districts could make only a very small contribution to the proposed fund in comparison to the amount of technical assistance used in 1964.

2. Few landowners are financially able to pay for the technical assistance they need to apply conservation measures. This means that low-income farmers would apply very little conservation—and they are frequently the ones who need the help most.

3. If Federal funds pay one-half the cost of technical application assistance, soil and water conservation districts in Arkansas would have to contribute $744,000, nearly $10,000 per district, to maintain the present rate of application assistance to landowners.

4. The proposed reduction in appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service, combined with the recommendation to reduce the agricultural conservation program appropriation, could mean a total of 93 fewer Soil Conservation Service technicians assigned to soil and water conservation districts in Arkansas. A location-by-location survey made in December 1964 showed that 52 additional technicians were needed at that time.

5. The application of conservation practices on private land would decrease about 50 percent.

6. The rate that cropland is being converted to other uses would be reduced about 50 percent.

7. There would be a reduction of nearly $10½ million in the income of Arkansas business people who supply seed, fertilizer, chemical herbicides, tree seedlings, equipment, gasoline, and other materials, and in farm labor used. The attached material on how the $20 million reduction will affect land use changes and vegetative treatment provides detailed estimates on this item.

8. Contractors who do conservation work for farmowners in Arkansas would lose about $8¼ million in business. The attached sheet on water conservation and control practices explains this estimated reduction in construction work.

9. The quality of the conservation work done by landowners would degenerate.

10. Many of the conservation practices already applied could be expected to deteriorate and be wasted.

11. Many soil and water conservation district supervisors who have given their time and energies for several years to promote soil and water conservation believe that the Federal Government is breaking faith with them by reducing the amount of technical assistance when more help is needed.

12. This onerous burden would discourage and confuse the landowners, the many volunteer workers in and out of soil and water conservation districts, and the small businessmen and small contractors who are an effective part of the team. District leaders and landowners cannot understand why the effective Federal-State-local teamwork that has been a model of success for 25 years should be destroyed.

It should be pointed out that a slowdown of the soil conservation program, as would certainly result from the revolving fund procedure, would have adverse effects upon a number of related programs of high current interest and importance. Some of these are:

(a) Reduction of water pollution, since sediment from soil erosion is one of the primary stream pollutants.

(b) Recreational development on private lands, so urgently needed to meet the pyramiding needs of Americans for more places to engage in wholesome, healthful outdoor play and relaxation.

(c) The fight against poverty, since soil and water conservation practices are an essential base for profitable agricultural production and for many communitywide enterprises that depend upon ample, clean water supplies, freedom from floods, and stable agricultural production.

(d) Efforts to beautify the American landscape, since erosion control and revegetation are an essential and primary step in improving the appearance of rural lands.

The establishment of the revolving fund would in itself be costly. Procedures and governmental structure would have to be developed to collect and disburse the private funds. Landowners who may want to install conservation systems but who would be burdened by the charges for technical help will tend to demand additional help from the Federal credit and cost-sharing programs.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the use of a revolving fund as a source of financing technical assistance in conservation could cause many problems related to State or regional competition for Federal help and possible political intervention in a program which has thus far been administered on the basis of needs of the land and people rather than upon the ability of any community or State to pay.

HOW A REDUCTION OF $20 MILLION IN FUNDS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WITH APPLICATION WILL AFFECT LAND USE CHANGES AND VEGETATIVE TREATMENT IN ARKANSAS

1. Agronomic practices: It is estimated that pasture and hayland plantings, pasture and hayland renovation, brush and weed control (pastureland), cover and green manure crops, ditch bank seeding, grasses and legumes in rotation, and grassed waterways and outlets will be reduced to such an extent that the following conditions will result:

(a) Annual reduction in sales and services:

(1) Seed: 6,400,000 pounds, $1,150,000.

(2) Fertilizer: 92 million pounds, $2,600,000.

(3) Limestone: 170,000 tons, $1,020,000.

(4) Contractual services (custom work): $475,000.

(5) Chemical herbicides. $7,000 gallons, $28,000.

(6) Equipment, gasoline, oil, etc., normally purchased by landowners incident to the application of these practices will be reduced proportionately as will the amount of hired farm labor; $2,015,600.

(b) Reduce by about 50 percent, or 50,000 acres, of cropland permanently converted to other uses annually.

(c) Much of the cropland that would normally be converted to grass will continue to be used for the production of crops in surplus.

2. Biology practices: It is estimated that wildlife wetland development, wildlife habitat development, fishpond stocking, fishpond management, field border planting, and fish-crop rotation will be reduced to such an extent that the following conditions will result:

(a) Annual reduction in sales and services:

(1) Fish sold for restocking: 17,300 pounds, valued at $8,650.

(2) Fish foods: 600 tons, valued at $57,600.

(3) Fish fertilizer: 110 tons, valued at $6,050.

(4) Planting seed: 200,000 pounds, valued at $100,000.

(5) Planting fertilizer: $58,000.

(6) Equipment, gasoline, oil, etc., normally purchased by landowners incident to the application of these practices will be reduced proportionally as will the amount of hired farm labor: $177,600.

(b) The best habitat is on conservation treated land—any reduction in conservation practices will adversely affect the wildlife population.

(c) Since most of the returns from wildlife are more esthetic than econmoic, a reduction in technical assistance of this magnitude will reduce the application of special wildlife practices by 75 percent from the present level.

3. Range practices: It is estimated that brush and weed control (rangeland) and range seeding will be reduced by such an extent that the following conditions will result:

(a) Annual reduction in sales and services:

(1) Chemical herbicides: 22,500 gallons, $195,000.

(2) Diesel oil: 33,250 gallons, $5,380.

(3) Contractual services: $217,500.

(4) Seed: 7,500 pounds, $3,000.

(5) Equipment, tools, gasoline, oil, etc., normally purchased by landowners incident to the application of these practices will be reduced proportionally as will the amount of hired farm labor: $98.250.

(b) Since a large portion of this work is done by small contractors who specialize in this phase of conservation work, many of them will be forced into bankruptcy or other jobs as a result of the reduction in the application of range conservation practices.

(c) Less than 10 percent of all rangeland in Arkansas is now in good or excellent condition. The Soil Conservation Service is the only agency in Arkansas working actively in assisting landowners to recognize and improve the rangelands. The application of range improvement practices and the art of range management is just getting a good start in the State. The improvement of the 90-plus percent in poor and fair condition will be greatly reduced, plus some loss in the small gains due to the lack of adequate followup.

4. Recreation activities:

(a) Reduce by 50 percent or more the annual conversion of cropland and other land to income-producing recreation enterprises.

(b) As the newest phase of conservation, recreation will be the most adversely affected since landowners and district boards need more help instead of less help in the recognition and development of appropriate recreational potentials.

(c) Some of the cropland that would normally be converted to recreation, or recreation oriented wildlife, will continue to be used for the production of crops in surplus.

(d) A reduction in anticipated recreational developments and installations will prevent the purchase by landowners of approximately $40,000 worth of equipment, materials, supplies, hired labor, contractual services, etc.

5. Woodland practices: It is estimated that tree planting, woodland weeding, intermediate cutting, woodland interplanting, woodland underplanting, and firebreaks will be reduced to such an extent that the following conditions will result:

(a) Annual reduction in sales and services:

(1) Tree seedlings: 5 million seedlings, $22,500.

(2) Contractual services (custom work): $510,000.

(3) Chemical herbicides: 30,000 gallons, $112,500.

(4) Diesel oil: 81,000 gallons, $12,960.

(5) Marking paint: $55,250.

(6) Tree planters, tree injectors, gasoline, hired labor, etc., purchased or used by landowners and contractors incident to the application of these practices will be reduced proportionally: $1,530,000.

(b) Leave State and local agencies and private nurseries with a surplus of tree seedlings (5 million) and facing major reductions in future production.

(c) The reduction in contractual services would force many small contractors who specialize in this phase of conservation work into bankruptcy or other occupations. (The major portion of this work is done by small contractors.)

(d) Chemical companies and equipment manufacturers specializing in products essential to this work will be forced to make production adjustment accordingly.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED ANNUAL REDUCTIONS IN SALES AND SERVICES

(1) Seed: 6,607,500 pounds, $1,253,000.

(2) Fertilizer: 92,000,892 pounds, $2,664,050.

(3) Limestone: 170,000 tons, $1,020,000.

(4) Contractual services (custom work): $1,202,500.

(5) Chemical herbicides: 59,500 gallons, $335,500.

(6) Diesel oil: 114,250 gallons, $18,340.

(7) Fish, for restocking: 17,300 pounds, $8,650.

(8) Fish foods: 600 tons, $57,600.

(9) Tree seedlings: 5 million, $22,500.

(10) Marking paint: $55,250.

(11) Reduced sales to landowners of equipment, supplies, tools, gasoline, motor oil, etc., related to the above reductions. Farm labor hired incident to the application of conservation practices involving these materials and services will be correspondingly reduced: $3,861,450.

Total estimated impact, $10,498,840.

In all probability the greatest significant effect of this reduction in technical application assistance will be reflected in the application of substandard or poor quality conservation practices which will result in permanent or irreparable damage to a priceless natural resource.

HOW A REDUCTION OF $20 MILLION IN FUNDS FOR TECHNICAL APPLICATION ASSISTANCE WILL AFFECT WATER CONSERVATION AND CONTROL PRACTICES

1. Reduce contract work on the land in practices requiring engineering assistance:
(a) Diversions: 80,000 feet.
(b) Drainage field ditches: 600,000 feet.
(c) Land grading and leveling: 7,350 acres.
(d) Drainage mains and laterals: 1,800,000 feet.
(e) Farm ponds: 2,400.
(f) Irrigation field ditches: 262,000 feet.
(g) Irrigation pipelines: 74,000 feet.
(h) Irrigation storage reservoir: 95.
(i) Irrigation system, sprinkler: 23.
(j) Irrigation system, surface: 282.
(k) Irrigation system, tailwater recovery: 22.
(l) Land smoothing: 27,200 acres.
(m) Pumping plant for water control: 429.
(n) Spring development: 74.
(o) Structure for water control: 1,655.
(p) Well: 330.
(q) Spoil bank spreading: 947,000 feet.
(r) Earth moving (all types): 21 million cubic yards.

2. Reduce sales to district cooperators and contractors serving them of:
(a) Corrugated metal pipe: 125,000 feet.
(b) Asbestos-cement pipe by: 70,000 feet.
(c) Aluminum pipe by: 152,000 feet.
(d) Pumping plants: 74.
(e) Well pumps: 330.
(f) Sprinkler heads by: 1,000.
(g) Steel pipe by: 75,000 feet.

(3) Reduce contracting for water conservation and control practices by: $8,270,000.
(a) Eliminate an estimated net profit of $672,000, forcing many small contractors into bankruptcy.
(b) Eliminate 800 equipment operating and servicing jobs paying an average of $3,600 annually or $2,880,000.
(c) Cut purchases of heavy equipment and light equipment purchases by $1 million annually.

ARKANSAS ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

The President's current budget proposes a serious threat to the continued progress of soil, water, woodland, and wildlife conservation in Arkansas according to Sterlin Hurley, Clarksville, Ark., president of the Arkansas Association of Soil and Water Conservation District Supervisors.

This association is made up of the supervisors of the 76 soil and water conservation districts in the State with which 82,000 landowners are now cooperating in conservation work on their farms and ranches.

The President's budget provides for a reduction of $20,130,000 from the 1965 and previous years' appropriations for Soil Conservation Service technical help to landowners through soil and water conservation districts. It is proposed that this reduction be supplanted by charging farmers and landowners for assistance through soil and water conservation districts.

"Such proposed appropriation reductions would decrease by about $10,000 the average Federal funds furnished for technical personnel in each of the soil and water conservation districts in Arkansas. Since there are 76 soil and water conservation districts in Arkansas, it would reduce support to district cooperators in this State in a total amount of more than $744,000," Mr. Hurley said.

"This would be coming at a time when recent workload studies indicate a need for an additional 52 technicians to assist districts in Arkansas," he stressed.

"If the U.S. Congress approves the budget as proposed, it would be a disaster to our soil and water conservation work in Arkansas and throughout the United States. It would have adverse effects on the welfare of every man, woman, and child in America," Mr. Hurley emphasized.

"This proposal would be a blow to conservation generally, and would hurt soil and water conservation immensely," he added.

Mr. Hurley thinks the proposal should not be approved by Congress for the following reasons:

1. It would treat the American landowner unfairly. It would charge the American landowner for technical assistance which the Federal Government provides free in large doses to foreign nations.

2. It would curtail a program which benefits city, as well as farm people, since conservation and development of natural resources is vital for the welfare of every consumer.

3. It would slow up the effort to reduce water pollution resulting from erosion and sedimentation.

4. It would reduce the beauty of the countryside in rural America.

5. It would slow up needed adjustments in land use.

6. It would hit the economically depressed areas hardest. Much of what can be done to alleviate poverty in rural areas is associated with the use of soil and water resources. Soil and water conservation is basic to economic development in rural areas and family farm stability.

7. It would penalize the small farmer who couldn't afford to pay. The family farms are the very backbone of rural America. They operate most of the land and are the first custodians of the water.

8. It would demoralize the Soil Conservation Service. The Soil Conservation Service has become known as the finest scientific agency of its kind in the world for supplying technical assistance for complete resource planning and development, acre by acre, farm by farm, property by property, on individual holdings, watersheds, and whole communities.

9. It would increase costs. A collection system outside of the accepted tax structure in America would have to be devised.

10. Future generations could undergo untold suffering if the soil and water conservation effort in this Nation is decreased. History is full of fallen civilizations that failed because of neglect of the land.

11. To make a political football out of our great natural resources is to threaten the future welfare of the United States.

Mr. Hurley suggests that each citizen ask himself this question: "Am I willing to see our nationwide soil and water conservation program wrecked which was so firmly established in the 1930's?"

MEXICO NEEDS SOME GEORGE HILDNERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, Missouri, which boasts the first school of journalism at Columbia, Mo., has one of the outstanding rural newspapers in the United States at Washington, Mo., published by a man who knows his community and speaks as its conscience, Jim Miller.

Jim has recently written an editorial which I believe encompasses the true meaning of the words, brotherhood, fellowship, and ecumenicity. In my judgment, no one's life better exemplifies the highest standards of our Judeo-Christian ethic than the man about whom the following editorial was written, the Monsignor George J. Hildner, PAVF.

The editorial follows:

MEXICO NEEDS SOME GEORGE HILDNERS

(By James L. Miller)

What Mexico needs more than anything else is a bunch of George Hildners in the villages, towns the size of Washington and larger, and in the rural areas.

The Mexican people are not lazy. They will gladly work 10 hours a day for 8 or 10 cents an hour, 7 days a week without grumbling.

The men in rural Mexico, which is actually the Mexico, get up early in the mornings and take off for the fields, where they will do all kinds of work from cutting down brush, putting up fences, and generally tending the fields.

While the men are at work, the wives and children are home doing fancy needlework, making crude chairs, tables, and other household wares. A few of the children can be spared at times to go to school.

There is no system, no guidance and no cooperative effort at all. While they visit, dance and party together, they work alone, each in his own way.

A little village not too far from Monterrey was pointed out to the Missourian's reporter as typical all over Mexico—that is, typical of villages in the more productive farming areas. The villages in the mountains are something else. That is where you look for a cactus bush to answer nature's call, instead of an outhouse. The lowly outhouse is too advanced and too modern for the mountain areas.

The name of the village in question is San Miguel. This village, like scores of others all over Mexico, is overrun with new kinds of "interdenominational" missionaries, who seem to have their headquarters in Seattle, Wash., and their spawning grounds on the American side of the Rio Grande Valley. From here these missionaries, in all sorts of rigs and conveyances, take off into Mexico to bring salvation to the people.

"Most of these people were brought up as Catholics," one of these missionaries told me, "and our job is to convert them to Christianity."

"Don't you consider Catholics Christians?" we asked.

"Well, yes, in a way," was the reply, "but they are really pagans. Do you know that they worship pictures and statutes."

We tried to explain to this missionary that it takes much more than shouting hallelujah, and quotes from the Bible to make a Christian—that the material well-being must go hand in hand with the spiritual. We tried to explain that a man with an empty stomach, a hungry wife, and half starved children, and a tumbledown doghouse for a home is not apt to put much stock in Bible quotations alone.

"When they are saved, and when they have testified before the assembly, the Lord will provide for their needs," the missionary replied. "Ask and you shall receive," says the Bible. "The Lord never fails—the Lord always provides for the repentent sinners. Amen, amen. The Lord go with you. Will you attend our service tonight, and perhaps testify?"

There was no point carrying on this argument, but we firmly declined to attend one of the services out there in somebody's back yard.

The point we are trying to make is that if men of George Hildner's stamp served these villages, the first thing they would find out would be the natural abilities of the people. If they did fancy needlework and could make furniture after a fashion, he would soon promote a hall in the village, where all of these

people would work together, where they would be paid so much every day for what they did.

He would make connections in a nearby large city as outlets for these various products, and in no time at all a well-paying business could be established with steady incomes for the workers and incomes that would enable them to have better homes, bread and butter on their tables, and their children in the village schools.

There is plenty of opportunity in all of these Mexican villages for such enterprises, and there can be no doubt at all that these enterprises could in a very few years provide mounting incomes for the people and a higher standard of living than any of them have ever dreamed of having.

The same cooperative resourcefulness could be applied on the farms where the men work. There is a great need for the food products they raise in this part of the world, and there is no doubt at all that a thriving economy could soon be established. Such an economy would make for both better citizens and better Christians.

But the "interdenominational missionaries" roaming around in Mexico, repeating quotations from the Bible, which they have never been taught to understand, can't see it that way and will page through the Bible to find a quotation that will justify their stand.

SUPREME COURT DECREE

Mr. DORN. 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. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has no legal authority to reapportion the legislatures of the States of this Union. The Supreme Court decision of June 15, 1964, ordering reapportionment of State legislatures, particularly the State senates, is one of the most autocratic and dangerous decrees in all the history of the civilized world. This decision is reminiscent of the decrees handed down by Roman Emperors. I know of no decree in modern history wrought with more danger to freedom and self-government at the local level.

This order of the Supreme Court is a blow at the foundation stones of this Republic and our free enterprise system. This decision of the Supreme Court makes a mockery of the Constitution and is an insult to the Congress. If this decree of the Court is permitted to stand by the Congress, the Supreme Court can and will someday reapportion membership in the U.S. Senate. The Court can and will reapportion membership on boards of trustees, magistrates, and local officials throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am today joining my colleagues in introducing a bill which would nullify this unconstitutional and unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court. The bill I am introducing would return legislative power to the people, as intended by the Constitution. No legislative body in this country, whether it is the State legislature, city council, or the Congress itself, is free as long as this Damoclean sword of the Supreme Court is suspended over the legislative processes.

This bill would end the apportionment and reapportionment of State legislatures by the Supreme Court. It would keep the Supreme Court from reviewing reapportionment cases and would restrict the district courts from having the jurisdiction to entertain cases that would reapportion State legislatures.

The Supreme Court has usurped legislative powers. My people are fearful that we are drifting into a dictatorship by the Supreme Court. The Congress must act now to preserve the liberties of our people.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT AND THE NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT

Mr. MURPHY of New York. 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. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on March 22 Senator DODD of Connecticut introduced in the other body two bills recommended by the administration—one to amend the Federal Firearms Act and the other to amend the National Firearms Act.

On August 3, 1963, Senator DODD introduced legislation which was not as far reaching or effective as this legislation is in meeting the mail-order gun problem in this country. I introduced similar measures in the House on August 20, 1963. Today I am introducing in the House amendments to the Firearms Acts similar to those introduced by the Senator from Connecticut.

In the last Congress this measure was relentlessly opposed and subsequently killed by the gun lobby, which is one of the most formidable and effective lobbies in legislative history. These amendments have been carefully studied and after 4 years of detailed hearings, provisions are made to insure that this legislation is acceptable to people who come from the Western part of the United States. I know that in the Western States, gun laws are suited to fit the general area involved and are acceptable to the ranchers, farmers, and people who live in scattered areas.

The chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee has commented that we are about to arrive at a sensible compromise on the question. The American Bar Association agreed to set up a committee to study this question because of the constitutional questions involved. The constitutional right to bear arms is involved and this is very sensitive with people who live not only in the West but all over the United States. The American Bar Association also set up a committee to draft a uniform measure for the States which the States themselves could implement, or do whatever they wish to do about gun laws. It is expected that this report will come out of the Judiciary Committees of the Congress because of the constitutional question involved.

A detailed line by line explanation of the legislation appears in the RECORD of March 22 commencing on page 5520.

This legislation introduced today on behalf of the administration is comprehensive and more encompassing than measures introduced 2 years ago.

In the complacent years gone by, when 10 million weapons were placed in unknown hands, the laws of this country were inadequate or unable to control to any significant degree the future tragedies that would be perpetrated by this careless commerce.

The two bills which I have just introduced will in brief do the following:

First. Prohibit mail-order sales of firearms to individuals by limiting firearms shipments in interstate and foreign commerce to shipments between importers, manufacturers, and dealers.

Second. Prohibit sales by federally licensed importers, manufacturers, and dealers, of all types of firearms to persons under 21 years of age, except that sales of sporting rifles and shotguns could continue to be made to persons over 18 years of age.

Third. Curb the flow into the United States of surplus military weapons and other firearms not suitable for sporting purposes.

Fourth. Bring under Federal control interstate shipment and disposition of large-caliber weapons such as bazookas and antitank guns, and destructive devices such as grenades, bombs, missiles, and rockets.

Fifth. Increase license fees, registration fees, and occupational taxes under the Federal and National Firearms Acts.

Sixth. Provide other Federal controls designed to make it feasible for States to control more effectively traffic in firearms within their borders under their police power.

Senator DODD's investigations reveal that a cursory examination of the past which has asked for this legislation for the future has revealed that there is definitely a problem of sufficient scope to justify Federal controls. As for the scope of this problem let us look at the record.

In 1953, 5,000 people were murdered with firearms. Fourteen hundred were murdered with rifles and shotguns. About 2,500 of these murders were committed with mail-order weapons. Senator DODD's investigation reveals that as recently as January 30, 1965, a 15-year-old youngster from nearby Baltimore, shot and killed his father, mother, and sister with a foreign-made, .38 caliber revolver, which he had purchased from the gunrunner, Martin Retting, in Los Angeles, Calif.

As he was arrested, another gun was being delivered to him by Railway Express from the same gunrunner.

This is the same gunrunner who imported and sold the telescopic sight used by Lee Harvey Oswald to track and kill President Kennedy.

On February 4, 1965, a student at the University of California shot and killed his biology instructor with a foreign-made, Walther P-38 pistol, which he purchased from Hunter's Lodge, a mail-order gunrunner firm in Alexandria, Va.

I would cite the following recent reports of "sniper" murders and shootings in the subcommittee files. They have one thing in common. They involve boys in their middle teens and rifles that are available by mail order.

In New York City, a 16-year-old admitted wounding an 11-year-old boy with a mail-order type rifle in a sniper attack.

In New York State, a 16-year-old youngster shot a young bride with a mail-order type rifle.

Again, in New York State, two youngsters ages 14 and 17, are involved in the sniper shooting with a mail-order rifle of two elderly men.

In St. Louis, two youths are held by police in the rifle sniping of homes.

In Los Angeles, one youth is killed and another wounded by a rifleman armed with a mail-order type firearm.

I could go on, reading into the RECORD page after page of these needless atrocities. But I have said enough to show that it is a vast problem, which involves every city and village and which potentially threatens the safety of any and every home in the land.

In my own neighborhood a young boy walking his dog had the dog shot and killed one step ahead of him by an unknown sniper. It is obvious that Federal action is needed to assist State and local authorities in controlling this menace to our society.

The need for this legislation should be obvious to all responsible thinking Americans. Only the closed-minded and obstinate will fail to see the practicality of these changes.

Senator DODD's hearings reveal that during 1963 and 1964, almost 2½ million firearms were imported into the United States from England, Germany, France, Italy, and Spain.

This figure does not include the tens of thousands of ordnance-type firearms, including antitank guns.

Nor does it include the tens of thousands of weapons which have been imported as parts, components, or scrap metal.

When this colossal inventory of surplus foreign weapons is channeled to individual purchasers through the mail-order route in defiance or in indifference to local and State laws, the task of local authorities becomes insuperable.

These investigations conducted by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee revealed that mail-order firearms have been sent to known criminals in cities all across the country.

Guns have been pouring into New York City in circumvention of the well-known Sullivan law there.

In Pittsburgh, juveniles and convicted criminal are receiving mail-order weapons, despite the uniform firearms act of the State of Pennsylvania.

Four thousand of Chicago's citizens, over a 3-year period, received weapons from just two mail-order dealers. One thousand of them had criminal records.

In Los Angeles, many mail-order firearms have been confiscated from convicted felons who used them in the commission of armed robberies.

In September of 1964, the Federal Bureau of Investigation seized four Russian Army Tokarev semiautomatic rifles, which had been shipped into an area of high racial tension in Mississippi by one of our largest firearms importers.

In December of 1964, we had the attempted shelling of the United Nations building by a German World War II mortar which was traced to a firm in New Jersey.

In October 1964, as a result of a feared assassination attempt on President Johnson, a cache of automatic firearms, including foreign weapons, was seized by authorities near Corpus Christie, Tex.

In November of 1963, a Finnish antitank gun was taken from three youths in New Jersey who were discovered shelling nearby farm buildings. FBI information demonstrates that in those areas where firearms regulations are lax, the homicide rate by firearms is substantially higher than in those areas where there are more stringent controls.

In Dallas, Tex., and Phoenix, Ariz., where firearms regulations are practically nonexistent, the percentage of homicides committed by guns in 1963 was 72 and 65.9 percent respectively.

Of particular significance is the fact that in cities where there are strong regulations we have the following figures: Chicago, 46.4 percent; Los Angeles, 43.5 percent; Detroit, 40 percent; and Philadelphia 36 percent. And in New York City, with its much maligned Sullivan law, the rate of murder by gun was 25 percent. Thus, regulation has made a strong impact on this situation even though the uncontrolled interstate traffic makes it easy to evade the law. This legislation will wipe out all mail-order sales to individuals.

It will stop retail sales everywhere to juveniles under 21, except that sales of sporting rifles and shotguns could continue to persons over 18 years of age.

It will dry up the torrent of imported surplus weapons.

It will rigidly control the availability of bazookas, antitank guns, grenades, bombs, and other such deadly playthings now turning up regularly in American cities and towns, and it will drive out the fly-by-night gun dealers and limit the field to responsible stable businessmen.

It will not prohibit sportsmen, marksmen, and bona fide gun clubs and organizations from pursuing their avocation with the same fervent diligence of the past.

It will not restrict the father who wishes to train his son in the proper use of firearms.

I have been a hunter and a soldier on active duty for more than a decade and understand the use of weapons. I have personally trained thousands of Americans in the proper use of firearms, not only personal weapons but crew-served and large caliber weapons. The purpose of this training, of course, was for the defense of our country.

I know that the President shares this concern for the welfare of the legitimate gun industry and of sportsmen everywhere.

The laws which the President has proposed and which I introduce today seek to safeguard the legitimate use of weapons by outlawing the abuse of weapons.

So I ask that all who form a part of the arms industry, manufacturers, dealers, and users, join with us in this effort to surround the legitimate use of firearms with controls that are humane, sane, and civilized, that treat the possession of weapons as a high responsibility, and that regard human life as a sacred thing to be protected at all costs.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the increasing evidence of the major role the firearm plays in our crime picture and in view of the obvious success of strong gun controls, I urge my colleagues in the House to give high priority to moving this legislation on to the President's desk.

GLENN CURTIS AND JOHNNY WOODEN

Mr. BRAY. 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. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, seldom has the impact of a great teacher on a dedicated student been more apparent than last weekend when ex-Martinsville, Ind., basketball star Johnny Wooden's UCLA Bruins met Michigan in a game for the NCAA basketball crown.

Even listening to the game over the radio was most dramatic. The announcer kept saying that the crowd was waiting for the drive for victory that they knew would be made by Johnny Wooden's team. The tension in waiting for this drive even confused the powerful Michigan team. When the drive did come it placed Johnny Wooden among basketball immortals—his team had twice in succession won the national crown.

Those of us who had known and seen his great teacher, the late Glenn Curtis, operate in the heyday of Indiana basketball, understood what was happening. Glenn Curtis was a great teacher and so is Johnny Wooden. Back of every success there is a teacher and no one can fathom how far over the expanse of time and distance the influence of a truly great teacher can be realized.

Glenn Curtis was a great teacher because he built strength and character. He was a strong disciplinarian, a teacher in the greatest sense of the word. As it is with all great teachers, his influence goes on and on years after his death.

AN INVITATION TO AMERICA'S CLERGY TO HELP THE NEGROES OF ALABAMA

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, every fair minded person recognizes there are serious economic conditions faced by many Negroes in the South and in my State of Alabama. All of us want every American to be able to realize the full potential of the American dream. Following is a letter I addressed to Bishop John Wesley Lord of the Methodist Church, advancing one suggestion in which America's clergymen could be helpful. There may be other programs which are better, and I call your attention to this letter in the hope that it may begin constructive thinking and action to help those in the South who need more than marches and demonstrations to give them the opportunity for a better life.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1965.

Rev. JOHN WESLEY LORD,
Methodist Bishop,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BISHOP LORD: For more than 100 years, the people of the South have been torn with a problem that has pervaded our entire society—a problem so great and at the same time so insoluble that it gave birth in 1861 to the most tragic chapter in our Nation's history. Now that tragedy is being repeated and old hatreds reborn in the streets of Selma. Once again, people from other States are marching in the South and to Montgomery, inflamed and angered.

Those gallant, brave men who died upon the flaming fields of Shiloh or Gettysburg did not settle it; the cruel dictates of the victor upon the vanquished did not resolve it; the bitter recriminations of reconstruction did not for a moment ease the pain of it. And neither you who come to the South in what you believe to be in the spirit of a holy crusade, nor the Federal soldier with a bayonet, nor the President's civil rights voting enunciation, will in themselves liberate the Negro from the caste of second class citizenship.

We of the South have lived with this problem every year, every month, every day since slaves became freemen. You cannot make it go away by invoking the power of prayer unless we work in God's way; you cannot erase it with the heel of federalism or by advocating violation of Federal authority, you cannot remedy it by the accuser pointing the finger of scorn at the accused. Members of the clergy, above all others, should know this.

Negroes of the South, as well as those in other sections of our country, have suffered many hardships, many privations, many degradations. Thinking people who have lived close to them in the South for so long would be the last to ignore these facts. Many of the colored race live in what you and I would classify as the most abject poverty; many of them are uneducated; many of them are undernourished—physically, spiritually, socially. Perhaps these are factors that many would argue need the insistent hand of the Federal Government.

You who live in other sections of the Nation have prescribed many pallatives; you have acted upon the instinct of human emotion to settle a problem that cannot be corrected by such visitations as you recently participated in in Selma. Your presence among us, however well intentioned, only compounded the social problem unsettled for 100 years and which is to remain unsettled until practical solutions are found to eliminate the cause.

May I ask, Bishop Lord, when you depart from Selma; when the Negro and his legion of sympathizers have marched from Selma to Montgomery, when the Federal edicts enroll all as full-fledged voters regardless of qualifications, what then? Have you taken the Negro from his one-room shack and placed him into a productive, well-paying job? Will you have provided him the means of caring for his family? Will he have equal opportunity in this vast and wonderful land? Will you have instilled within his mind and heart the responsibility that goes with citizenship? Will you still feel the same about him tomorrow as you did in Selma?

Then where do we go when the marching and singing are over and the prayers are soundless in tomorrow's quiet aftermath? Who, then, will carry his burden of building a new life? Will his emancipation become again a sterile proclamation in the world of fears and frustration? What then, Bishop Lord?

Where will this Negro who has been driven from the cotton farm by modern machines and the shift in agricultural economy find his future? Where will the poverty-stricken family of 10 living on Government dole in a squalid farmhouse, find the happy home that is the promise of America?

Could you help them, Bishop Lord? Could the ministers of America seek practical ways of providing destitute families opportunities in other sections of the Nation? Will the ministers of America rise to this challenge to seek better living conditions for them elsewhere? Is this not Christianity, Bishop Lord, or must we repeat with Edwin Markham:

"How will the future reckon with this man,
How answer the brute question in that hour
When whirlwinds of rebellion shake the world."

All your prayers and memorial services will not lift the Negro overnight into a world of dreams realized. All the pious pronouncements of the well intentioned will not give him the full rank of citizenship. And we of the South are incapable economically of performing what is expected of us and what the Nation has been beguiled into believing can be accomplished with the stroke of a pen or passage of the President's bill now before Congress.

There is not enough money in all our State treasuries, all our private institutions, all our houses of finance to provide the Negro with what he seeks, what he wants and what he has been led to believe that he will have. There is no royal road to success in the right to vote, Bishop Lord. And the right to vote, as precious as it appears to the Nation, is not the burning issue for the Negro people today.

Ministers of our denomination—of all denominations, have the greatest challenge in all the history of America. They can join in a holy crusade greater than any other of our age. Find jobs, find homes, remove thousands of Negroes from the stagnant life that has been theirs since 1863. I do not propose this idea as original. It has been suggested by great leaders of the past and of our own day, but never a program of America's clergy.

In the spirit of John Wesley, we can do in our time as he did in his. It was this spirit of giving concrete help to the poor and the disenfranchised, the social outcast, that leaped the ocean and brought Methodism to its zenith in America.

There are true economic pockets of poverty in the South where the Negro is dependent upon the white man's economy and yet he comprises, in some counties, 80 percent of the population. Could the ministers of America help to remove these thousands from bondage and help provide them with the equal opportunity they have been promised?

Oh, with what missionary zeal could this be accomplished. Let us address ourselves to this great problem of our age with a mass effort. Help these people find themselves. We of the South appeal to you for aid. We do not hate the Negro. It is not in our hearts to persecute him, to hold him down, to limit him. But the task is beyond us and our economy.

Let us not call for troops, but rather call upon a force with far greater power—the brotherhood of man which is the basis of our Judeo-Christian heritage. This is a power greater than all the troops, mightier than any sword. Let us call upon the churches in every community across our broad and bountiful land to use this mighty power to lift the Negro by his bootstraps to a better life.

In 5 years, at most a decade, this monstrous problem can be solved if the churches will answer the call. Small churches can help with relocating a family or two; large churches can find productive work for a score of families. Multiply this by the work of churches of all denominations in every one of our 50 States of our Union. Ministers can capture this vision, reach into the South with the long arm of understanding of the real problem of economics.

This would be a completely voluntary movement of people working through the love of God. It would mean that we would remove from the welfare rolls of the South thousands of impoverished families. We would retrain them, make them welcome in communities throughout the land and find productive work for them as useful and contributing citizens. This challenge should be especially appealing to those ministers in States that have less than 10 percent Negro population. We know these ministers are anxious to do their part in the full emancipation of their fellow Americans as evidenced by their presence in Selma.

I have been part of the southern community all my life. I have known the Negro for what he is; and for the most part he is a good citizen, a deeply religious person. His right to vote should be fundamental. No one wants to deny him that right, if he is qualified. No one should insist upon that right, for black or white, if the man or woman is not qualified or responsible for his actions as a good citizen.

I propose this measure in somber and dedicated reflection: Organize a campaign to help erase poverty, ignorance and the evils of vanishing opportunity. If the church fails, then we admit that religion in America has failed. We have spent millions of dollars on our own churches and our programs. Our houses of worship are beginning to have every modern convenience: air conditioning, luxurious pews, elevators. Floodlights and full page newspaper advertisements proclaim to the world the affluence of our edifices. Many of the homes of our ministers are posh with the modern comforts in a world gone mad for comforts. By comparison, how paltry have been our contributions to him and his family who live in a shack on the edge of a pasture that once grew cotton.

How much more important to our Nation and the world would be a crusade of salvaging these wasted lives than a vain display of whipped up emotions on our streets, of cities of the South, calling forth the scorn, ridicule and derision of the world upon the heads and hearts of thousands of fine white people who are guilty of no wrong except that which fate wrought.

Marches may be more stimulating, for sure, and the rewards appear on the surface more appealing, but perhaps many Christians should be reminded that Christ said: "Therefore, when thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee as hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets that they may have the glory of men."

Such marches evoke hysteria, turbulence and antagonisms, and the results must be

reckoned with by those participating in them and especially outsiders who feel that they are called upon to cleanse the houses of neighbors.

Let us clean our own houses as well as our own hearts; let us admit that by shows of emotions on the streets this problem will never be solved. And so, knowing this, let us move to other methods that can solve it, and thereby, "Let your light so shine that it will glorify your Father which is in heaven."

I hope you will be willing to take the lead in putting such a program into action. I am ready and willing to be helpful in whatever way I can. In order to create interest, I am making the proposal a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the challenge that all religious Americans join in whatever effort you and other church leaders put forth in this campaign. We, of the South, are anxiously waiting to hear from you.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

JIM MARTIN,
Member of Congress.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES FRANCIS REILLY, ESQ.

Mr. DEVINE. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House spent a great deal of time on the omnibus crime bill and a great many comments were made concerning the situation here in the District of Columbia, particularly as it related to the crime rate.

On the opposite side of the ledger, I think flowers for the living should be awarded and tribute paid to one of the outstanding attorneys in the Nation's Capital.

One of the first persons I met when I came to Congress in January 1959 was the Honorable James Francis Reilly. Since 1959 Mr. Reilly and I have become close personal friends, which friendship far transcends our different political affiliations.

Aside from Mr. Reilly's standing in the legal community, I have marveled at the substantial amount of time and energy which he has so freely and unselfishly given over the years to projects for the advancement of national as well as local interests.

In 1960, Mr. Reilly was appointed by all of the chief judges of all the courts in the District of Columbia, and the President of the Board of Commissioners, as one of the seven original, uncompensated trustees of the Legal Aid Agency established by Congress in that year. It should be noted here that the then chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, the Honorable E. Barrett Prettyman, has stated that Mr. Reilly was "largely responsible for one of the major steps forward in the administration of justice in the Nation's Capital and, indeed, in the country as a whole" in his efforts with the Congress in urging the establishment of this Agency. Further, the Judicial Conference of the United States has recently recognized this Agency as the model which the Federal courts throughout the country should follow in establishing systems for implementation of the Criminal Justice Act of 1964 for assignment of counsel to represent persons charged with crime and who are financially unable to retain counsel. Mr. Reilly was Chairman of the Legal Aid Agency at the time of his resignation, for personal reasons, on December 10, 1964.

In March 1961 the chairman of the Senate and House District of Columbia Committees appointed Mr. Reilly as the noncompensated Member-Chairman of the District of Columbia Armory Board. He served in that capacity until October 10, 1961, after the District of Columbia Stadium had been completed sufficiently for the first football game of the Washington Redskins on October 1, and the dedicatory ceremonies on October 7 with a game between George Washington University and Virginia Military Institute, attended by approximately 20,000 people.

I attended the swearing-in ceremonies of Mr. Reilly in March 1961 and watched with deep interest his work on the Armory Board and can attest to the industry, time, independence, and dedication which Mr. Reilly gave to this community effort, without compensation, for the outstanding job which the Board did while under his chairmanship. I can also recognize the financial sacrifice which Mr. Reilly suffered because of his necessary absences from his office because of his pressing obligations to his large, growing family, as well as his clients.

In September 1961, President Kennedy nominated and the Senate confirmed Mr. Reilly as a member of the seven-man Post Office Department Advisory Board. Mr. Reilly served as Acting Chairman of this Board for most of the time he served until his resignation on December 31, 1964. The work of this Board during Mr. Reilly's tenure received nationwide and congressional approbation, particularly the Board's published reports on research, mechanization, and development; and equal employment opportunity.

In October 1962, Mr. Reilly was appointed by the U.S. district court as a member of that court's admissions and grievances committee, and as an examiner in civil and criminal procedure, extraordinary remedies, and real property, in which capacity he still serves.

During all of this period, Mr. Reilly has maintained an active practice of the law, and has actively participated in many other community, school, and church activities. Mr. Reilly has been an exemplary citizen in his community and of his country.

Prior to my friendship with Mr. Reilly, he served as an Assistant Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia; as an examiner for and subsequently as executive assistant to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board; and by nomination of President Roosevelt and confirmation of the Senate, as a member of the Public Utilities Commission.

My affection and respect for Mr. Reilly has increased with the years, but frankly, Mr. Speaker, my remarks today were precipitated by a sentence in a letter which former Chief Judge Prettyman wrote to Mr. Reilly on the occasion of his resignation last December 10 from the Legal Aid Agency, when among other things, Judge Prettyman wrote:

> Of course, service such as you have given is never appreciated by the public, and much less is any public expression made of it.

I hope that my remarks today will give public expression and appreciation for not only Mr. Reilly's work on the Legal Aid Agency but also for his other very substantial contributions to his community, his Nation, and to the public interest. I include, therefore, Judge Prettyman's letter, as well as letters from U.S. Court of Appeals Chief Judge David L. Bazelon, from U.S. District Court Chief Judge Matthew F. McGuire, and from associates of Mr. Reilly on the Legal Aid Agency; and a letter to Mr. Reilly from Postmaster General John N. Gronouski on the occasion of Mr. Reilly's resignation last December 31 from the Post Office Department Advisory Board as part of my remarks at this point:

U. S. COURT OF APPEALS,
Washington, D.C., December 21, 1964.

JAMES FRANCIS REILLY, Esq.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: It would be impossible for me to phrase my feeling of regret that you are retiring from the Legal Aid Agency. Of course service such as you have given is never appreciated by the public, and much less is any public expression made of it. However, you have the satisfaction of knowing that you have been largely responsible for one of the major steps forward in the administration of justice in the Nation's Capital and, indeed, in the country as a whole. I must also add that we had a lot of fun in the process.

I wish for you continuing good health and very great prosperity. I hope you do not make too much money, as that might spoil you.

Wishing you and yours a merry Christmas,

Sincerely,

Barrett.

E. BARRETT PRETTYMAN,
Chief Judge.

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS,
Washington, D.C., December 23, 1964.

JAMES FRANCIS REILLY, Esq.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REILLY: It was with great regret that I read your letter offering your resignation as Chairman of the Board of Directors for the Legal Aid Agency. Your service to the Board and to the defense of indigent persons accused of crime has been a model to your contemporaries and in the finest traditions of our profession.

In its 4 years of service to this community, the record of your organization in the continuing and, at times, frustrating job of guaranteeing equality before the law is one of which you and the Board may be justifiably proud. The Legal Aid Agency has set an example that is already being looked to by offices in other parts of the country. Since its establishment, its lawyers have handled over 685 cases in the U.S. district court and have offered invaluable service and assistance to the other members of the bar appointed to represent indigents in criminal cases. Agency attorneys have served with integrity and competence in the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the juvenile court, the Commission on Mental Health, and in over 909 preliminary hearings in felony and homicide cases in this jurisdiction. Despite the pressures and antagonisms which are so often the lot of those who are called upon to do an unpopular job, they have maintained the highest devotion to their clients' interests

and the professional ethics which govern their work. You and your Board have guided them in this task with patience, courage, and wisdom.

I was indeed pleased to learn of the expansion of your services under a grant from the national defender project of the Legal Aid and Defender Association. I hope that Congress will choose to continue the services and positions financed under that program. The Legal Aid Agency has in many ways become a focal point for creative thinking and improvement of the administration of criminal justice in the District of Columbia. Its strengthening can only enhance the role it has played in educating and assisting the bar in this area.

I know that your decision to leave your position does not in any way evidence any departure from your longstanding devotion and interest in the solution of the problems of the administration of criminal justice here. We have only carved a small niche in the enormous problems that beset the criminal law field from investigation through the correctional process. I look forward to many more years of your creative thought and mature judgment on these issues. At the present I and the community offer our deep thanks.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. BAZELON,
Chief Judge.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C., December 15, 1964.

JAMES FRANCIS REILLY, Esq.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: It is with regret that I note you have concluded that by virtue of the pressure of your own personal and professional affairs you must tender your resignation as a member of the statutory Board of Trustees of the Legal Aid Agency.

Yours has been a splendid contribution, and it is with a feeling of honorable and justifiable pride that you can look back upon it.

Wishing you and yours all the joy and happiness of this holy season, and the hope that all good things will be yours in abundance in the new year.

Yours very sincerely,

MATTHEW F. MCGUIRE,
Chief Judge.

KILPATRICK, BALLARD & BEASLEY,
Washington, D.C., December 17, 1964.

JAMES FRANCIS REILLY, Esq.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I was very sad to receive the copy of your letter of the 10th resigning from the Board of the Legal Aid Agency. It is clear that you have as a member, and particularly as Chairman of the Agency, made another outstanding contribution to the community, but in addition to that, we shall all miss intensely the pleasure of working with you from a personal standpoint. I will hope to have further opportunities to do so.

With warm regards and all good wishes for the holiday season, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK A. BALLARD.

COVINGTON & BURLING,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1964.

JAMES FRANCIS REILLY, Esq.,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR JIMMY: As you know, I read your letter of resignation from the Legal Aid Agency's Board with sinking heart, however fully I understand and respect your reasons for the action.

I have no such extensive experience as have you in various community ventures—but I have some. Never—but never—have I known anyone who takes hold of a community job as ably, as diligently, and as conscientiously as you do. In the case of the Agency, it was you who, even before its birth, principally contributed to its life. Thus far it has been successful beyond expectation, with every prospect for even greater success in the long future. The credit is due mainly to you, to your leadership and ingenuity.

It is never true that a given person cannot be replaced. But in this instance it is as nearly true as it can be.

My affection to you,

HOWARD C. WESTWOOD.

LEGAL AID AGENCY FOR
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C., December 22, 1964.

JAMES FRANCIS REILLY, Esq.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: As we face a new year without you on our Board, I want you to know that I am very grateful to you for your many kindnesses to me personally and for the enormous good you have done the Agency and the cause which it is devoted to. I hope you will have a long and happy career and that the new year will bring you and your family added blessings.

Affectionately,

CHARLES B. MURRAY.

LEGAL AID AGENCY
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C., December 21, 1964.

JAMES FRANCIS REILLY, Esq.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REILLY: Mr. Murray recently handed to me your letter to the Board expressing your decision to resign. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for all you have done for our organization and to express my deep sense of loss in seeing you leave.

I think in the years that you served on the Board and as its Chairman, the Agency has grown into an organization of which you may be justifiably proud. I think there is not a member of the staff who has not served with devotion to the standards of professional competence and integrity that you and the Board have asked of us.

We are aware and deeply appreciative of the part you have played in our growth, both as an organization and as men.

Respectfully,

GARY BELLOW,
Deputy Director.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1965.

Mr. JAMES FRANCIS REILLY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I'm sorry you have resigned as a member of the Post Office Department Advisory Board. I am well aware of the leadership you have displayed as exemplified by the fact that the Board members elected you as Acting Chairman to preside over the Board's meetings in the absence of the Chairman and the Vice Chairman.

The entire Department is indebted to you for the outstanding services you have rendered. We will sorely miss your wise advice and counsel, as well as your great sense of humor.

I am sure I speak for all the members of the Board in tendering to you our deep appreciation and affection.

Cordially,

JOHN GRONOUSKI,
Postmaster General.

VOTING RIGHTS BIILL

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, since introduction of the President's voting rights bill, we have seen in the news media considerable discussion about the merits of the bill. The unconstitutional and discriminatory nature of the bill has been vividly pointed out by several distinguished commentators and writers as well as described in the Congress. In this regard I want to call attention to the column by Arthur Krock appearing in the New York Times of March 23, 1965:

IN THE NATION: GOOD REASONS FOR THE HURRY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 22.—The price demanded for suspending the current mass marching, trespassing, and prostrate picketing against voting discrimination is swift congressional approval of the President's 1965 equal rights legislation. Mr. Johnson urged the joint session of Congress to make this payment. Attorney General Katzenbach did the same before the House Judiciary Committee. So it was wholly consistent with this purpose when the bipartisan leadership notified the Senate today that, unless the bill is approved by April 15, the Senate must forgo its usual Easter recess.

But the notice served the purpose in another way. For the more time that is allowed to point out the flagrant constitutional and procedural flaws in the draft submitted by the administration, the more plainly these flaws will be exposed.

ENACTMENT FORECAST

The leaders predict that Congress will pass the legislation, anyhow, without major excision or modification. In that event, the Supreme Court majority which has expanded the scope of the 14th amendment far beyond prior judicial interpretations may not boggle at giving the stretch to the 15th that will be required to validate the President's bill. But even the truncated Senate debate designed by the bipartisan leadership will at least project these highlights of the bill:

FEATURES TO BE DEBATED

1. By the arbitrary choice of the 1964 presidential election as the occasion when a State turnout of less than 50 percent of the eligible voters will put it in the category of States in which the Attorney General can suspend all voting eligibility tests and subject its elections to supervision by Federal registrars, the bill is ex post facto legislation.

2. It also conflicts with the constitutional guarantee to all States (by article I, 2-2) of the right to fix their voting qualifications, limited only by the ban in the 15th amendment on abridgment in any discriminatory form of the equal right of any citizen to vote who has met the State requirements for eligibility.

3. The grant of power to the Attorney General to decide that a fixed pattern of the discrimination barred by the 15th amendment is responsible for the low percentage enables him to: exclude Alaska, with 46.7 percent, from the thrust of the legislation; include South Carolina and Virginia, despite the proved absence of discriminatory employment of their tests in the November 1964 election; and hit the selected targets of a bill misrepresented as national legislation—Ala-

bama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina and Virginia.

4. The device thus abridges the guarantee of article I, 2-2, to all the States. In the six States listed above it opens the ballot to total illiterates. It permits North Carolina, with a 51.8-percent turnout last November, to maintain a literacy test outlawed in certain neighboring States. And, although a considerable percentage of Americans who have registered to vote constantly, fail for a variety of reasons, to exercise their privilege at the subsequent poll, the President's bill applies only to the percentage of a State's eligible votes cast in the election, regardless of whether the registration exceeded 50 percent.

5. Although the legislation celebrates voting as a sovereign right, it provides that this right can be terminated for any citizen who has failed to vote for 3 consecutive years.

6. If a State where tests have been prohibited for 10 years petitions the Federal judiciary for the restoration of its guarantee in article I, 2-2, on the ground that it has been free of discrimination in that period, it is confronted by the discriminatory provision of the bill that limits jurisdiction of such petitions to a three-judge panel of the Federal district courts in Washington.

A VITAL FLAW

One of the measure's vital flaws would be removed by providing that the Attorney General shall apply it county by county instead of a statewide basis. But this would leave undisturbed deep constitutional and moral infractions that require the exposure of a debate which a bipartisan political force is employing powerful pressures to forestall.

To abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite of voting in Federal elections, the President and Congress concluded this could only be done legally by a constitutional amendment. The voting rights bill supplies much more ground for a similar conclusion. This view is held among lawyers who are familiar with Court utterances on the subject matter that at least put in question Attorney General Katzenbach's confident assurance to the House Committee that the bill is constitutional, and meets the requirements that enforcement legislation be appropriate and reasonable.

REPEAL OF TELEPHONE EXCISE TAX NEEDED

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to repeal the tax on telephone service.

To repeal this tax will reduce telephone bills by 10 percent. Florida telephone users would immediately realize savings of well over $20 million each year.

This Federal excise tax is paid by telephone users and not the telephone companies. The Federal Government imposed the tax during World War II in an effort to curb unnecessary use of the telephone, and the tax has outlived its original purpose.

The telephone has become a necessity of modern life. Businesses depend on it, and the personal life of America has been deeply affected by this utility. To continue to impose a Federal tax on telephone service works a hardship on the average citizen who is already overburdened with Federal, State, and local taxes.

In 1964, Florida telephone users paid out an average of $20.42 each for telephone taxes. Telephone companies pay the tax to the Government after they collect it from the subscribers. It is another instance of business acting as a collection agent for the Government, and I am hopeful that repeal of this tax will not only reduce each telephone subscriber's bill by the amount of the tax but that the reduction in operating overhead for the telephone companies will result in benefits to telephone subscribers.

The legislation which I am introducing will apply to local service tax as well as the tax on long distance calls. I urge passage of this measure by the Congress as promptly as possible.

EXTENSION OF TERM OF A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CHELF. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, late yesterday afternoon, March 22, 1965, I introduced House Joint Resolution 394 which would increase the term of a Member of the House of Representatives from 2 to 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, every time I go home to visit my people either during an election year or in an "off year," invariably a discussion of politics ensues. The most frequent and constant topic of conversation has to do with the shortness of a term of a Member of the House of Representatives. For instance, my friends always ask: "Are you running again?" and if it is an election year and I reply: "Yes" they say, "Merciful heavens, FRANK, we just got through voting for you." When it is an off year and I am only visiting, the conversation is the same: "Why don't you fellows do something about this business of running every 2 years?" Truly, Mr. Speaker, the people are way ahead of us in our thinking on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, since this has been going on for the past 20 years, I have at long last decided to take the advice of my people and try to "do something about it." As a result, I have worked long and diligently trying to prepare a resolution that would not only be acceptable to two-thirds of the House of Representatives but would merit the overwhelming support of the other body as well.

Mr. Speaker, there is much that can be said for legislation of this kind:

First. It would greatly reduce the personal campaign expenses of an individual Member. As you know, this amounts to a great deal every other year, especially, when there are many of us who have closed our law offices and are giving not only top priority to the office but all of our time, energy, and what talents the good Lord saw fit to endow us with.

Second. It would save the treasuries in the 50 States millions of dollars in unnecessary election costs.

Third. It would make it possible for a Member to devote himself completely and entirely to his duties instead of having to campaign all of the time.

Fourth. It would go far toward reducing pressures of the many pressure groups.

Fifth. I am told that a fairly recent poll conducted throughout the United States showed that the vast majority of our voters favor a 4-year term.

Mr. Speaker, before I introduced this legislation, I wrote a letter to 432 Members of the House asking them to please give me their advice as to whether I should undertake the task. As a result, I was glad to learn that out of 236 replies, 170 were unequivocally for the amendment, 20 were against it, and 46 listed themselves in the doubtful column. Many of the 170 had written in longhand such notes as: "I am fervently for it," "overwhelmingly," "vehemently," and "emphatically" for it. One Member even used the expression that he was not only religiously and painstakingly for the legislation but that his wife was, too.

Mr. Speaker, if you and my colleagues will please pardon a personal reference, let me give to you what my daughter, Bonnie, said to me on one of my trips home from Washington. Upon my arrival at my home in Lebanon, I was greeted by the family and my then little daughter, Bonnie, said: "How long are you going to be home on this trip?" When I replied that we were in recess and therefore I could spend a few days, she lowered her head and sadly replied: "But daddy, when you are home, you are never home." She was right—I was leaving immediately for a speaking engagement.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that my House Joint Resolution 394, is not a new idea. Bills of this nature have been introduced for years. However, in making a conscientious and diligent study of all of the bills I was able to secure, I found that they did not adequately cover the situation. As a result, I have tried desperately to use as much of the language and expressions which would carry out the original intent and purpose of our intellectual Founding Fathers when they conceived, drafted, and perfected our great Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I know all of the shopworn arguments against this legislation, the chief objection being: The House Member should "stand muster" each 2 years; if he does so, he will be forced to remain close to the people.

Mr. Speaker, the manner in which my constitutional amendment has been drafted would stagger the total membership of the House of Representatives so that one-half of the number would have

to run every 2 years along with the one-third of the other body. Never in history have the people been known to defeat anything near one-half of the total membership of the House of Representatives. Therefore, my bill would not only keep the people with a strong grip on their Government, but there is no problem whatsoever with the Members keeping in close touch with the people. When the term of 2 years was set in the Constitutional Conventions, it was done for the purpose of allowing each House Member to go back home, most generally by horseback or carriage, to visit his approximately 30,000 constituents. Today, my colleagues, the situation is quite different with radio, newspapers, magazines, telephone, telegraph, TV, and now even with the satellite Telestar, we can bounce messages live when and as they are uttered in Washington, London, Moscow, or Paris. And we have an average of 435,000 constituents per district.

Certainly, I am having no trouble hearing from my good people because my mail is running, at the moment, 300 to 500 letters daily.

Today, we also have faster modes of transportation, such as the jet airplane.

Over the years, many Members have spoken out for a 4-year term. I could quote them, but I do not want to burden my colleagues. However, I would like to quote a few lines from a speech made in the U.S. Senate January 20, 1959, by my able friend, the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD. Among other things he said:

> I find that 170 years ago, there was no majority of opinion in favor of a 2-year term, and I feel that the supporting arguments for a 4-year term have advanced in this modern and more complex age.

He also said:

> A 4-year term would give a Representative an opportunity to perform a greater service to his constituents, devoting more time to legislative duties.

In addition thereto, Senator MANSFIELD said:

> Two years is by no means long enough for a Representative to learn his job, which is one of the most complicated, demanding, and responsible in the world.

Senator MANSFIELD completed this particular speech by saying:

> Campaign and election costs have grown steadily and there is no reason to think they will decrease. Good men may be discouraged from running for the House of Representatives because they feel they cannot afford it. If a Member did not have to run every 2 years, the costs would certainly be reduced.

Mr. Speaker, it is most interesting to learn that of the 46 present Members of the House who are undecided on this legislation at the moment, at least one-third of them stipulated that they would not only retain an open mind but were inclined to go along with some plan that would increase the present term from 2 to 4 years.

Inasmuch as this bill has to be submitted to the 50 State legislatures to be ratified—within 7 years—it will not therefore apply to me because frankly I do not plan to seek reelection for that length of time.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that my bill will be forthwith referred to the Judiciary Committee of the House for hearings as soon as possible.

DISTRIBUTION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS TO EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS PER ADVANCED DEGREES CONFERRED

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, measuring the research and development capabilities of educational institutions involves many factors, some general and others specific in nature. One of the general factors is the number of advanced degrees conferred. In this we must assume research and development activity is concentrated in the postgraduate schools. Further it is assumed the number of postgraduate degrees conferred provide an indication of the relative size of postgraduate facilities.

With this criteria of research and development capabilities established it is then possible to make an assessment of the geographical distribution of Federal research and development funds on the basis of dollars allocated to educational institutions per advanced degree conferred. The national average is $14,300 per advanced degree.

Only nine States receive allocations on this basis which exceed the national average. Heading the list is Nevada with $195,600 per advanced degree. At the bottom of the list is Wyoming with $2,100.

Listed in 47th place is my own State of Indiana with $3,400 per student. In the list of States which includes Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, only Illinois with $16,900 per advanced degree exceeds the national average. The allocation to the other States include Minnesota, $11,100; Iowa, $10,900; Wisconsin, $8,000; Ohio, $7,000; Michigan, $6,300, and as previously mentioned, Indiana, $3,400.

Here is a solid, compact seven-State area which contains almost 25 percent of our Nation's population, which produces more than 25 percent of the advanced degrees conferred in the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering. Its educational institutions have proven research and development capabilities and yet the geographical distribution of Government research and development funds indicates there is less than adequate utilization of these capabilities.

If this area of research and development competence continues to be overshadowed in the future on the basis of Federal research and development fund allocation then I fear it will become increasingly difficult to maintain this competence. And it should be pointed out this same apprehension can be expressed for most other sections of the Nation.

IN MEMORIAM

Mr. BROOKS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an item which appeared in the Gilmer Mirror, Gilmer, Tex., October 8, 1964, with reference to the death of Mr. O. J. Beckworth:

SERVICES HELD FOR O. J. BECKWORTH, 80

Otis Jefferson Beckworth, 80, father of Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH, died at 7:28 a.m., Friday following a lengthy illness at Gladewater Municipal Hospital.

Mr. Beckworth was a retired schoolteacher and had lived in east Texas many years, making his home in Gladewater for the past 12 years and he formerly resided in Gilmer.

Funeral services were held at First Baptist Church in Gladewater at 2 p.m. Monday with Rev. J. C. Henderson and Rev. Irby B. Bates officiating at rites. Interment was in Gilmer City Cemetery.

Mr. Beckworth was a member of the Baptist church many years, and was a native of Georgia. He come to Texas with his father and several brothers and sisters about 1890.

The family settled in Smith County, where Mr. Beckworth was reared and from whence he attended Sam Houston State Teachers College at Huntsville.

Mr. Beckworth returned to east Texas after completing his schooling and taught in numerous schools in Upshur County, which he made his home from that time until his death. He received a master of arts degree from Stephen F. Austin State College during the years and also served 6 years as county superintendent of schools in Upshur. He retired from public life while instructing at Winiona schools.

Mr. Beckworth was married to the former Miss Josie Slaughter of Van Zandt County in 1912. She died in 1938. Four children were born to the Beckworths, including Congressman BECKWORTH and Mrs. Pat Smith, who are twins.

Mr. Beckworth married Mrs. Pearl Phipps in 1943 and they continued to reside in Upshur County until her death in August this year.

A member of Glade Creek Baptist Church, Mr. Beckworth also belonged to the Odd Fellows Lodge at Gilmer.

Surviving are his daughter, Mrs. Pat (Linnie) Smith, Gladewater; his son, a brother, E. M. Beckworth, Stephenville; a sister, Mrs. Julia Ranspot, Mineral Wells; and five grandchildren.

Pallbearers were Mr. Beckworth's nephews. They are Paul Beckworth and Gary Beckworth, of Dallas; Jake Slaughter, of Canton; L. F. Crawford, of Fruitvale; Cecil Bowdoin, and Russell Bowdoin, of Lindale; J. B. Beckworth, of Minden, La.; and Jake Beckworth, of Hope, Ark.

Also I desire to include a poem found in his Bible which was read during the funeral services:

FOR TODAY

(By Edgar Guest)

Lord, let me live today
From start to close.
In just the kindly way
Which friendship knows.
Let me be thoughtful, too,
And generous here;
Keeping in all I do
My record clear.

Lord, let me live today
Full to my best.
No hurtful thing I'd say
Even in jest.
Keep me from scorn and hate
And petty spite.
Lord, let my soul be great
From dawn to night.

Lord, let me live today
From malice free.
Let me in work or play
Unselfish be.
Let no one find me proud
Or harsh or cold,
Too silent, or too loud,
Afraid, or over bold.

Lord, let me live today
A friend to all
Who chance along my way
Though great or small;
And when at last the sun,
Now rising high, shall set,
Let there to all I've done
Be no regret.

Mr. Beckworth lived a full and fruitful life. He knew both the joy of living and the many sorrows that can come to a family. Two of his children, Otis Claxton and Nellie Mae Beckworth, died while he was a relatively young man, and his first wife was ill many years before she passed away in 1938. He knew success and also how to overcome handicapping obstacles and successive disappointments.

At the age of 20 he began to study in the seventh grade and walked several miles each day—to and from the school he attended. After marrying Josie Slaughter, a well-known and beloved Texas teacher, he was taught by her and after two of his children were born, he continued his education, spending 2 years at Sam Houston Normal College. This enabled him to obtain a permanent State teachers certificate. He obtained a second permanent State teachers certificate by taking examinations on numerous subjects. When 52 years of age, he received his first degree at Stephen F. Austin State Teachers College; and when 59 years old, he received his master's degree at the same institution. He also attended the University of Texas. Mr. Beckworth was successful as a farmer, teacher, school administrator, and as county school superintendent. He and Mrs. Pearl Sloan Phipps Beckworth, his second wife, a prominent and well-loved Texas teacher who died but a few weeks before Mr. Beckworth, always participated actively in the political campaigns of his son, LINDLEY BECKWORTH. Widely known throughout Texas as an effective and diligent campaigner, he spoke convincingly in many towns and communities in behalf of his son, LINDLEY. He was always a faithful and active supporter of the Democratic Party and its nominees.

With the passing of Mr. Beckworth, it can be said that a person who counted for good and who was a truly constructive personality had died. In his many years as a teacher and administrator, he championed the cause of the needy child. Mr. Beckworth was well known as a friend to the downtrodden and forgotten. He and his good wife, Miss Pearl, would carry food and fresh vegetables to impoverished people. He was always active in behalf of the worthy causes of his Nation, his State, and the communities in which he lived. Never was he afraid of an unpopular cause if he believed it right and just, nor would he dodge or duck an uncomfortable decision. Otis Jefferson Beckworth was—above all—loyal and faithful to his family, his religion, his friends, and his country.

USE OF CHEMICAL WARFARE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. RYAN. 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. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is shocking to learn that the United States is using chemical warfare in South Vietnam. According to newspaper reports today, the United States has given, and is giving, the South Vietnamese disabling "types of tear gas" for combat use. This is the first time the United States has been involved in the combat use of gas since World War I.

It has long been recognized that chemical and biological warfare is inhumane and should not be used in combat. In August 1943, at the height of World War II, President Roosevelt speaking about the use of gas in combat stated:

> Use of such weapons has been outlawed by the general opinion of civilized mankind. This country has not used them, and I hope that we never will be compelled to use them. I state categorically that we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies.

On January 13, 1960, President Eisenhower, in speaking of chemical and biological weapons, stated:

> So far as my instinct is concerned, it is to not start such a thing as that first.

Now the United States has started first. The use of gas, like napalm bombing, is an inhumane measure in a desperate war.

According to the newspaper accounts, gas was first used in December. The people of this Nation and their representatives were never told of this new departure. Who knows what to expect next.

I have several times spoken before this House and urged that an honorable settlement be negotiated in Vietnam. Several of my colleagues have suggested the same course of action. As long as it is believed this complex issue can be resolved by military might, there will be an increasing temptation to escalate the war.

The time has come to seek a diplomatic settlement in Vietnam.

USING VOMIT GAS IN VIETNAM IS ACTUALLY A HUMANE FORM OF WARFARE

Mr. STRATTON. 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. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the comments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] a moment ago suggesting the use of a gas which makes people nauseated represents an inhumane and barbarous type of warfare.

If the gentleman had taken the trouble to read the announcement of the Department of Defense he would have seen that in combat situations in Vietnam, where the Vietcong enemy has infiltrated with friendly South Vietnam civilians, rather than drop bombs that would kill all these people, friends and foes alike, we are now utilizing a discovery which simply makes them nauseated and for the time being prevents the Vietcong enemy from attacking our friends, thereby saving their lives. I cannot think of a more humane development that we could possibly use. Instead of criticizing the Pentagon I think we ought to congratulate those chemists who have come up with this new and humane method of fighting this difficult and baffling guerrilla war which has so often frustrated our capabilities in more conventional types of weapons. Let us hope our scientists continue to perfect similar developments which will prevent the Communists from destroying the freedom of South Vietnam with a minimum of loss of life.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to commend the gentleman for the statement he is making. Everyone knows our country is doing all that it possibly can to suppress the spread of Communist infiltration. We are up against a conspiracy. The President has briefed the Members of Congress. He is the Commander in Chief. Our commanders in the field are reasonable people who are trying to do a reasonable job under difficult circumstances, and I think it ill behooves us to map military strategy here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman. We ought to make clear that what is being used in Vietnam is not a poison gas of the type considered by the Geneva Convention, but a humane gas, a new and encouraging development. Let us not be frightened with labels. Let us recognize the facts.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there are not any two ways about it, we must protect our troops from infiltration. This Congress has gone on record unequivocally as supporting the President of the United States in his effort to bring peace in Vietnam. We are doing everything we possibly can to get the point home to these people that we will not be driven out of Vietnam. This use of a new gas is one of the

human ways we are now trying to bring sense into the heads of these people. If this does not work we might try something else. But we are determined to stay there, and this Congress and the Nation are backing the President in his course. We must win. We cannot be defeated, and we will not retreat. It is a question of whose side you are on. I happen to be on the side of the President of the United States and the American people. It is as simple as that.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York for the position he has taken in this matter. I would like to support the position of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], and the gentleman from South Carolina who chairs the all-important Armed Services Committee here in the House of Representatives and express once again my whole-hearted support for the President in Vietnam and his leadership there against the aggressiveness of communism.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. I want to join my able colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RIVERS] and the majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], in supporting the President of the United States in the military policy laid down in South Vietnam. To me it would be incredible if we do not use all of the means at our command to support our Armed Forces in South Vietnam who are the victims of the vicious aggression of the Communists. So far as the use of this gas is concerned, it is not a gas in the ordinary sense at all. It is the humane way or instrument of making war. Should we pull out of there, may I say to the gentleman, that would then be the road to war, and to untold hardship over all of southeast Asia, if not indeed over the entire world. It is the course of peace that we are pursuing in South Vietnam today.

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

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

Mr. MACGREGOR. Would the gentleman from New York agree with me that the use of this particular instrumentality is within the discretion of field commanders?

Mr. STRATTON. I do not know what the rules and regulations are that the Pentagon has adopted on this new weapon, and I would not want to comment on that particular point. I feel sure that a decision has been made at the highest level. But to suggest, as was done a moment ago on this floor, that the use of a gas which merely makes people vomit and temporarily incapacitates them, rather than killing them, is some sort of barbaric and inhumane procedure—when in point of fact this weapon was developed and is now being used to save lives rather than take lives and is therefore a new kind of humane weapon—is just fantastic and I could not let this opportunity pass without taking the time to comment on it here on the floor of this House.

SPECIAL ORDER REQUEST

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday and Thursday of next week, March 30 and April 1, following the legislative business of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 60 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter. Mr. Speaker, I will not use the time allotted to me for today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RETURN PRAYER TO THE NATION'S SCHOOLS

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I have fulfilled a promise that I pledged to the voters of the Seventh District of Pennsylvania during the recent campaign. This promise of action brought great response from the various groups and formal gatherings, that I had the pleasure of addressing during the campaign.

The voters of the Seventh District would like prayers returned to the public schools of the Nation. I have introduced a measure to restore prayer to the schools, as I feel their request must be met.

Today, many questions concerning the social fabric of our Nation are being asked of the Nation's leaders. The students are daily asking questions concerning morality and social progress. Yet, a factor in the development of the American character has been removed from the classrooms. Prayer remains an important function in every state occasion, both on the local and national levels. As Members of Congress, we welcome a prayer each day. However, prayers are not found in the places of learning, where the future Members of this great body will be found. Prayer is the highest form of respect and honor and I feel that respect is missing from the current social fabric of our Nation.

The State should remain neutral in the matters of religion; however, real neutrality would best be served, if the State would permit those children who so desire to begin their school day with a prayer to do so. My bill mentions prayer, not religion or a specific prayer. I am calling for a free exercise of principles through prayer. Principles and ideas must be expressed and prayer is certainly an effective method of placing personal conflicts aside and having the individual ponder his role in life.

The highest Court of the land must always intercede to prevent infringements upon freedom of religion, however the Court should guard against decisions which would identify the Federal Government with antireligion. The intent of the Founding Fathers was that this Nation will have freedom of religion—not freedom from religion.

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION SPEAKS OUT ON MERGER

Mr. CLEVELAND. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, as one who has for many years been interested in military affairs, having served both as a National Guard officer and as a Reserve officer, I am very much interested in Secretary McNamara's proposed merger of the Reserves and the Guard.

I am concerned now that in the long run, our National Security may be impaired, rather than enhanced, by his proposal. The Reserve Officers Association has recently written a letter to the Governor of Massachusetts, in which they alert him to some of the details of Secretary McNamara's plan which, in their opinion, will adversely affect the Guard in Massachusetts.

As the time for hearings on this question approaches, I feel that this letter may be helpful to my colleagues in understanding the long-range results of the proposed merger, and I therefore, under unanimous consent, have it reprinted in the RECORD.

There are, in addition to the points made by the ROA, other effects of Secretary McNamara's proposal that, it now appears, affect our Nation's long-range ability to respond in a mililtary way to the rising threat of armed conflict.

In the absence of more specific arguments to the contrary, I believe that our Nation needs a strong Reserve, as well as a strong National Guard. Their resources and their roles are so significant and so different, that we should continue them in substantially their present form.

The letter follows:

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1965.

Hon. JOHN A. VOLPE,
Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: The Secretary of the Army held a press conference March 15 and

announced that 37 Governors of the States plus the District of Columbia had approved the troop list changes inherent in the proposal to destroy the Army Reserve, increase the strength of the National Guard, and place the remnants of the Army Reserve into a pool of personnel who will be subject to recall but will be unable to train other than by taking correspondence courses.

I realize that the only official communications that you have had on the subject is through your adjutant general who has been subjected to tremendous pressure from both the Department of the Army and the National Guard Bureau to accept the plan and the concept. The National Guard Association has exerted similar pressure upon him and has urged him to put the plan to you in its best light. Some of the adjutant generals have resisted the pressure and some of them have not.

The pressure stemming from the National Guard leadership is premised solely upon an overall increase in National Guard numbers and exclusive control of the Army Reserve by the National Guard.

But this is not the whole story and as Governor of your State, with responsibility for its welfare and that of its citizens, I ask you to listen to the other side which this letter endeavors to tell you.

While it is true that the National Guard overall strength is being increased from 400,000 to 550,000 men, this accession of numbers is being purchased at a tragic price.

The National Guard, today, with an authorized allowance of 400,000 officers and men is organized into 23 divisions. Fifteen of these divisions will be abolished. In other words, 66 percent of the National Guard organization as it exists today will be eliminated. About 150,000 National Guardsmen will be summarily dismissed from their positions. Out of these 15 divisions, 6 small brigades will be formed. Forty general officers, now in the National Guard, will lose their drilling status. The impact of this will be felt heavily by every National Guard organization located west of the Mississippi.

Furthermore, after the reorganization is completed and the National Guard becomes the only Reserve Force left to the Army, it will inevitably lose its State orientation and control. The Secretary of Defense believes, with the intensity of a crusader, in a completely centralized organization and simply will not tolerate State interference. When questioned by the Senate Preparedness Committee on this subjct on March 1, he stated and I quote his exact words, "because I have directed it and because the Federal Government pays 90 percent of its costs and consequently holds a heavy bludgeon over them." The handwriting is on the wall. If this reorganization goes through, your control over your National Guard forces will be nominal.

There is another aspect to this reorganization that should be brought to your attention. The reservists in your State far outnumber the National Guardsmen. They are citizens, too. They bitterly resent being torn out of the Army Reserve and having their Reserve component destroyed and turned into a pool. They are looking to you for all of the protection that you can give them. They expect it of you.

In the light of the damage this plan will do to the National Guardsmen and Reserves in your State; the turbulence and poor morale it will cause; the net reduction of income to your citizens who have been doing their duty and do not deserve this blow; and the necessity for suporting the status of the National Guard as a State militia, we urge you to vigorously oppose this concept.

As one of the distinguished Senators in the Senate Preparedness Committee stated, "This is no time to reduce our military strength simply to save money." It is now generally acknowledged that the primary purpose of the plan was conceived to do just that.

E. H. REEDER,
Rear Admiral, USNR,
National President.

FIVE PERSPECTIVES ON EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 1965, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics, Georgetown University, testified before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the subject of East-West trade.

Dr. Dobriansky is a distinguished economist. He is also internationally recognized as a legitimate authority on conditions within the Communist empire.

It is my understanding that there may be considerable delay before the committee in the other body completes its hearings on the subject of trade with Communist governments.

It is also my understanding that the House committees expect to give this vital issue only superfluous attention.

Therefore, I deem it necessary and timely to make Dr. Dobriansky's views available for review at this time.

Before doing so, I include at this point a statement by the Vice President of the United States, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who, as a Senator from Minnesota, observed the following in a 1961 address:

The Soviet Union's economic offensive is a carefully thought out plan to disrupt normal commercial cooperation between the industrial nations of the West and the underdeveloped countries which need capital, to snare other nations into becoming economically dependent on the Soviet Union, and to promote friction within the Western alliance. What we are seeing is a form of economic banditry by the Soviet Union, another weapon in its imperialistic scheme.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the statement entitled "Five Perspectives on East-West Trade," by Dr. Dobriansky:

Mr. Chairman and distinguished Members, I am grateful for this opportunity to present five interrelated perspectives on the extremely vital subject of East-West trade. With some identifying qualification, the quoted Humphrey statement on the cover describes pungently the nature of the totalitarian Red economic aggression launched against us and the free world. Considering the effectiveness of Moscow's deceptive peaceful coexistence and the potemkinized independence of so-called satellites in central Europe, the statement bears even greater applicability today than 4 years ago.

Within the limited space of this presentation, the perspectives offered here embrace certain supportable preconceptions and points of understanding that necessarily must impinge on any rational evaluation of the issue. Indeed, whatever the preconceptions, analytically they are more determinative for the resolution of this important issue than the essentially secondary considerations of credits, strategicity of goods, outstanding obligations, various legal impediments, patents, copyrights, the most-favored-nation treatment and, last but not least, the blunt desire for profits. Narrow discussions of these secondary points cannot satisfactorily answer the more fundamental questions of the strategic significance of trade in the imperio-colonialist Red design for world conquest, the role of the so-called satellites in the implementation of this design, Western economic contributions to the strength of the totalitarian Red Empire, and seeming short-run benefits accruing to the tragic long-run disbenefit of the free world in this incessant cold war struggle. In short, East-West trade is not a subject for the simple vacuum of normal commercial negotiation and transaction, but rather it is an issue fraught with extensive politico-economic ramifications that the following interlocking perspectives aim to delineate.

I. U.S. ECONOMIC CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOVIET RUSSIA'S INNER EMPIRE

One of the most striking ironies of the modern period is the heavy inadvertent economic assistance given by the United States to the formation, growth, and development of Soviet Russia's inner empire; namely, the Soviet Union itself. The supreme irony is that unconditioned good intentions, mixed with unfortunate elements of protracted ignorance, have contributed to the buildup of the power center of the so-called world Communist movement and the basic enemy of our Nation. There seems to be almost a cyclical pattern in our economic assistance to Moscow's imperio-colonialist ambitions.

Succinctly, the pattern has been as follows: (1) 1919–22, while one non-Russian nation after another—be it Byelorussia, Georgia, Ukraine, or Turkestan—strove to preserve its newly won independence in the full spirit of Wilson's national self-determination principle, the American Relief Administration poured over $40 million into Soviet Russia, indirectly helping it to destroy the new non-Russian states; (2) 1926–31, while Moscow embarked upon a genocidal Russification program against its captive non-Russian nations, U.S. exports of basic industrial and electrical equipment, plus valuable know-how, more than doubled to contribute immeasurably to Moscow's first 5-year plan; (3) 1932–40, while Soviet Russian assaults on the forces of non-Russian "bourgeois nationalism" reached new peaks in the manmade famine of 1932–33, the Vinnitsia genocide of 1936–37, the heavy deportations and purges of the period, certain American business groups pressed for the recognition of the U.S.S.R., a bilateral commercial agreement was consummated in 1935, exports moved steadily upward to about $87 million by 1940, and though the percentage of our total exports was never more than 4.3 percent, its incremental value to Moscow's empire economy was incalculable; and (4) 1942–47, while during the war and after non-Russian nationalism erupted throughout the empire, roughly $11 billion of U.S. goods were poured into the U.S.S.R. and used both to defeat the Nazis and to crush the forces of non-Russian independents.

This ugly record of the past may be explained away on grounds of ignorance and shortsightedness; today, there is little excuse for adding another chapter to this record and callously ignoring the effects of expanded unconditional trade with the U.S.S.R. on the

captive nations in the U.S.S.R. The incredible irony of democratic America abetting the strength and power of Soviet Russia's imperio-colonialist reins over approximately 120 million non-Russians in this inner empire would only be compounded. It is bad enough that politically we have been grossly deficient in extending the promise of freedom and independence to these crucially situated captive non-Russian nations; let us not economically contribute to the alienation of these natural allies.

II. CAPTIVE NATIONS VERSUS TOTALITARIAN RED STATES

My second perspective on this thoroughly politicoeconomic subject is the cold war dimension in the Red Empire, between the captive nations and the totalitarian Red states. It is a grave and misleading fallacy to identify the captive nations—the unfree peoples themselves—with the respective totalitarian Red states in the empire, as some do today when they speak of "fragmentation," "nonmonlithism," and some mythical "growing independence of Communist nations" in Moscow's outer empire. Indeed, this fallacy is used to justify expanded U.S. trade with the totalitarian governments in Central Europe. Yet it is evident that there has been an unfortunate unfamiliarity with Soviet Russian techniques of "independence" and "nationalist" gestures vis-a-vis the non-Russian republics in the inner empire, which substantially have also been applied to the "satellites."

The armed and public eruptions for the greater part of the 1950's—in Georgia as well as in Hungary, in Turkestan as in Poland, in Ukraine as in East Germany—were scarcely beneficial to plan fulfillments, the integration of the East European sector of the Red empire along the still cardinal line of self-sufficiency, the launching of a world economic offensive, particularly among the underdeveloped countries, and the general pursuit of the cold war in every conceivable sphere. When Western acquiescence to the empire became manifestly evident, latitudes for superficial changes and gestures were easily afforded, and the resistance of the captive nations has had to assume more covert forms, as in economic slowdowns, "localism" in the U.S.S.R., underground political activity, and utilization of allowable means for national expression which the governments themselves seek to exploit.

It is most difficult to comprehend the logic of those who contend that by simply trading with the Red totalitarian governments we would further the independence of several captive nations, enhance the opportunities of freedom, and advance the interest of world peace. Simple commercial trade would guarantee the very opposite. In sheer power terms, the survival of every so-called Communist government, including Belgrade and Peiping, ultimately rests on the power of Russia's inner empire. Despite typical intra-empire rifts and quarrels, it is fantastic to believe that any dependent regime in Central Europe would seek suicide. It is always interesting to observe, as in the present North Vietnam crisis, how the party's ranks spontaneously close when the whole network appears to be threatened. Moreover, with organic Comecon relationships, one member benefiting by Western trade benefits the whole. Unconditional trade would work for the totalitarian state and the empire and against the captive nation and its struggle for freedom.

III. DEVELOPMENT OF THE RED TRADE WEAPON

The third perspective can be introduced by recalling the fact that in 1952, when Stalin's Moscow announced Russia's world economic offensive, our businessmen laughed; 8 years later many of them were rightly concerned about the oil offensive in Western Europe and the empire's penetrations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. They saw more than just normal, competitive, business-as-usual trade. The development of the Red trade weapon has demonstrated well the dictum expressed by Khrushchev in 1955, "we value trade least for economic reasons and most for political reasons."

Red strategists have even provided the stages of this long-run development: (1) the buildup of U.S.S.R. industry in the twenties and thirties and its reconstruction in the postwar period, to which the West contributed heavily; (2) in the fifties, East European integration and the plunge into the world economic offensive, again with Western assistance; (3) the sixties and seventies, the complete liberation of the underdeveloped countries from politico economic ties with the imperialists; and (4) by 1980, with the West so isolated and in turmoil, victory will fall like a ripe apple into the laps of the "worldwide Socialist camp." Fantastic? We have already witnessed the first two stages and are now witnessing the third in process.

Whether this third stage will be successfully completed by the empire's rulers will depend, among other things, on the type of long-run trade policy we and our allies adopt to wage the cold war. Mikoyan, not to mention others, has given the clue as to how the industrial West is to aid in this Red global program: "It will be necessary to make wide use of foreign trade as a factor for economizing in current production expenditures and in capital investment, with the aim of accelerating the development of corresponding branches" (1961). In other words, whether by direct trade with Moscow or indirectly via Bucharest, Warsaw, or Prague, the West is to enable the empire to leap over years of research and development cost so that it in turn would show the underdeveloped countries how to lead into "Socialist industrialization."

To argue as some do for more liberalized trade, or to adjust our license issuances to the fact that West European business profits from close to $5 billion worth of transactions with Eastern Europe is analogous to justifying the spread of opium peddling because some indulge in it. Also, to lubricate the drive for easier East-West trade and simultaneously argue for the passage of the $3.3 billion foreign aid program because Red pledges of economic aid presumably quadrupled in 1964 is not exactly a self-consistent posture in the light of the empire's economic warfare objectives.

IV. THE WEAPON OF TRADE FOR FREEDOM

When inventory is taken of the manifold use to which the Red empire employs its strategic trade weapon, it becomes clear that in reality no desired good for empire import is nonstrategic. The cold war economies of the empire thrive on fertilizers, food, transport facilities, plastics, and clothing, as they would on technological data, heavy machinery, and advanced military weapons. Yet, these and other items suggest degrees of strategicity that can accommodate a realistic and flexible trade policy predicated on political concession values. We should have no hesitation or fear to utilize trade as a weapon for freedom just as the Red totalitarians manipulate it as a weapon for conquest.

This policy, proportioning trade bids to political concession bids, represents a via media between complete embargo and slipshod liberalization. It would be practicable and adaptable for all changing circumstances; it would allow for credits and cash payments, consumer goods and producer ones; it would certainly infuse a consistency in our trade relations with all sectors of the Red empire, in the Far East as well as in Eastern Europe; and in addition to negative and positive economic advantages, as pertain to the empire's plans, the underlying captive nations, the efficacy of our own foreign aid, and intrafree world trade, it would produce both the tremendous propaganda advantage of constantly spotlighting the real causes of our foremost problems and a vital leverage to rectify the problem of increasing West European trade with the Red empire. The list of concession bids would be of graded order, entailing the dismantling of the Berlin Wall, vastly expanded cultural exchange, the satisfaction of World War II agreements, the neutralization of Laos, the reunification of Germany, exodus from Cuba, withdrawal of Soviet Russian troops from Hungary and other captive areas, and many other tangible points of value performance.

V. THE NEED FOR WESTERN TRADE POLICY UNITY

A formulation of trade policy along these lines implicitly underscores the need for unity primarily with our West European allies. The lack of such unity is in large measure attributable to our own failure in providing the necessary leadership in the cold war, over and beyond the military umbrella and foreign aid. With a new, concentrated initiative on our part in this economic area, even playing up to De Gaulle's conception of a united free Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, a NATO Council on Free World Trade should be established to forge this economic weapon for freedom and infuse a new life of working partnership in the Atlantic community.

The results of this course of positive action would naturally have to be extended to our allies in the Far East. With the economic power assembled, in the ratio of 3 to 1 to the entire Red empire, the so-called Communist economic offensive would become a sterile exercise as the free world market, particularly in the underdeveloped areas, flourishes bountifully as the market for the free.

Mr. Speaker, this subject should be of vital interest to all of us. I do hope all the Members of the House and all citizens who avidly follow the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will reflect on all the points as set forth by Dr. Dobriansky.

WHY QUARREL WITH SUCCESS?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's press has been filled with a proposal to attack the independence of the Federal Reserve System and subject it to political control. The ranking minority member of the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman WILLIAM WIDNALL, has written a most informative article exposing the fallacies in the proposed bill, H.R. 11. In section after section, the respected New Jersey Representative points out the dangers in such an experiment. Knowing Mr. WIDNALL's critique will be of interest to Members of Congress and others concerned with banking and monetary pol-

icy, I, under unanimous consent, include the article which appeared in the March issue of Banking at this point in the RECORD:

WHY QUARREL WITH SUCCESS?

(By Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL)

Bankers individually need to wake up. They need to abandon the reticence into which they have retired, withdrawing from legislative fights. Their justification for their inactivity is outdated. It frequently is expressed in terms of, "Well, of course, our customers represent all points of views, so we can't very well engaged in legislative controversy."

In my considered judgment, bankers do not serve the best interests of their customers representing all points of view unless they actively engage in the present legislative controversy adversely affecting banking in this 89th session of the Congress. For what is at stake now is not just banking, but the soundness of our money. This affects everybody: Banks, their customers, and the general public.

FOREMOST PROPOSAL

Foremost among legislative proposals adversely affecting our dollar and banking is the wide-ranging bill, H.R. 11, introduced by my good friend and colleague, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, on January 4, 1965. I have high personal regard for the chairman. He is personable, able, and conscientious. But, I simply do not share his monetary views.

H.R. 11 is a collection of miscellaneous provisions tied together by one central theme—subordinate the Federal Reserve System to the politics of the party in power and remove such independence as it has. H.R. 11 has been referred to as an omnibus banking bill. In my opinion it would be more accurate to call it a blunderbuss banking bill, because it surely would shoot down confidence in our currency and bank credit at home and abroad, confidence in the very integrity of our monetary system. Every bank, every community, every citizen has a stake in this.

The first nine sections of the Patman bill now before the Housing Banking and Currency Committee would require retirement of all Federal Reserve bank stock and, in lieu thereof, require the purchase of a certificate of membership for which a nominal fee of $10 would be paid. There is no question that the system so revised would be workable. But for more than 50 years the Fed, under the existing member bank stock purchases requirement, has evolved into the world's best and most respected central banking system. Then why quarrel with success? Why downgrade the Fed to a $10 membership club? There is no need for this provision of the bill.

Section 10 is the heart of H.R. 11. It would amend section 12A of the Federal Reserve Act which relates to open market operations of the Fed, broadening its scope to encompass not only open market operations but "all other actions and policies of the Federal Reserve banks and the Board in the field of monetary affairs." All Fed monetary actions and policies then would become subject to absolute Presidential control; for the subsection, as it would be amended, would provide that all these activities "shall be conducted in accordance with the programs and policies of the President pursuant to the Employment Act of 1946 and other provisions of law."

Section 16 of the bill would amend the Employment Act of 1946 so as to require the President, in transmitting his Economic Report to the Congress in January of each year, to include in his program his "recommendations on fiscal and debt management policy and guidelines concerning monetary policy, domestic and foreign, including the growth of the money supply as defined by him." But as already noted, section 10 of the bill is so worded as to convert these "recommendations" to absolute "controlling directives."

EFFECT ON THE FED

Independence of the Fed within the Government would be completely gone. Members of the Fed Board would become mere puppets to carry out monetary actions and policies determined in the White House. Banking and credit policy affecting the dollar's purchasing power and soundness would be open to the whims and expedients of politicians. Serious deterioration of confidence in the integrity of our monetary system would be an inevitable result of such action.

The bill goes on to require that the Federal Reserve Board "shall submit a quarterly report to the Congress, stating, in comprehensive detail, its past and prospective actions and policies under this section and otherwise with respect to monetary affairs, and indicating specifically how such actions and policies facilitate the economic program of the President."

Imagine conducting monetary policy within the context of such unheard of requirements. The President, it should be noted moreover, would be required to set monetary policy objectives for a year in advance. The Fed not only would have to report in detail to Congress within not less than every third month on what it had done in implementing those or other objectives, but also would have to lay bare in comprehensive detail what it was going to do in the future.

No central bank could operate wisely under such requirements. Politicians, professors, and press would have a field day expounding on every move the Fed had made or was about to make in carrying out monetary policy. Any Congressman could take off 5 minutes from a busy day to make a speech telling the Fed what it ought to be doing. Speculators would love it—they wouldn't even have to guess any more. Headline writers would have a circus. The dollar would be groggy. The financial markets would be bewildered. It is hard for me to conceive of a more disrupting approach to the conduct of monetary policy.

END OF THE BOARD

Section 11 of the bill would fire all seven members of the existing Board of Governors the moment the bill became law. And they would stay fired. Subsection (b) of section 11 reads: "The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System established under authority of the Federal Reserve Act as in effect prior to the effective date of the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section is abolished. Each member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in office immediately prior to the taking effect of such amendment shall be paid 1 year's salary at his then current rate." All of the present board members would be fired en bloc through abolishing the existing board and each would be given 1 year's salary as termination pay. This would become effective immediately upon the signing of the bill into law.

The new Federal Reserve Board would be a five-man body, with the members serving for 5-year terms, once initial rotation of members was established. The members would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The President would designate the chairman of the Board. Although the preface to the enacting clause states that the bill, as one of its provisions, provides for "making the term of the chairman of the Board coterminous with that of the President of the United States," such is not necessarily the case under the actual provisions of the bill. Section 11(a) provides, "The President shall designate one member as chairman, to serve as such until the expiration of his term of office as a member or until the President shall designate another member to serve as chairman, whichever is earlier."

PRESIDENTIAL POWER

Under that provision the chairman could serve a year or more beyond the term of the President or he could serve as chairman for less than a day. Even after rotation of board members was fully established, a President could name at least five different members as chairman during the course of a 4-year Presidential term. Service of a board member as chairman strictly would be at the pleasure of the President.

The new members of the new Federal Reserve Board, in due course, would assume the newly restricted duties of the existing members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System who, as noted, would be fired upon enactment of the bill. The new Board members would assume the duties of the Federal Open Market Committee, as the bill in just seven words would abolish that Committee.

AUDIT BY THE GAO

The bill provides that the General Accounting Office audit the Federal Reserve banks. Presently the 12 banks are audited by an extremely capable audit supervisory staff under the direction of and solely responsible to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The new section recognizes that the GAO may not be presently, and probably is not, equipped to do the job. It authorizes the Comptroller General "to employ such personnel and to obtain such temporary and intermittent services as may be necessary to carry out the audit." If the GAO audited the Federal Reserve banks, the Board still would have to continue for an indefinite period of time its own system audits to discharge with assurance the Board's responsibilities in supervising the individual Federal Reserve banks and their branches.

Aside from unnecessary duplication of audits, the change would make it possible for the GAO to meddle in monetary policy. That such a probability is more than academic is attested by the dispute at the present time between the Treasury and GAO over Treasury tax and loan accounts in commercial banks. The Treasury supports continuation of the existing system, under which commercial banks do not pay interest on tax and loan accounts but in return provide special services to the Government without cost. The Treasury views the present system as "a model for the attainment of public ends through the automatic operation of private incentives." But the GAO disagrees—and Chairman PATMAN has introduced H.R. 42 which would carry out the position of the GAO. I'll stick with the Treasury experts in this dispute.

FINANCIAL CONTROL

The bill would require the Fed to pay all of its income into the Treasury and come to the Congress for appropriations for its expenses. Last year expenses of the Fed were $197 million and $1.06 billion of net earnings were paid into the Treasury. That is a most impressive record. What is involved in this proposed change, is extension of political control over the Fed. Use political control of the Fed's expenses as a lever to influence monetary policy and confidence of foreign monetary authorities in the integrity of the dollar would suffer. It would

seriously diminish their willingness to continue to hold dollars, rather than gold, in their own monetary reserves. Why invite a foreign gold run on the dollar?

I think every banker should have an opinion on this proposal. You should obtain a copy of the bill and not just read, but study it intensively. Put your bank counsel to work on it. Make it your business to have your own opinion on the proposal and then do something about it. Make your views known at home and in Washington. Don't rely on someone else to do this for you. It is your duty.

As I have stated, Chairman PATMAN is an energetic advocate of his position. He has mounted what he refers to as a grass-roots crusade to change the Fed. This started with his August 3 "ABC's of Money" speech on the floor of the House, followed by the mailing of reprints to a reported "more than 300,000" persons around the country. Members of the Congress report that the chairman's speech received considerable publicity in their local papers. Members also report they are receiving letters from their constituents to support Chairman PATMAN'S Federal Reserve bill when it is introduced. It is time that bankers themselves, as constituents, communicate with their Congressman. No less important, bankers should make their views known to their customers, local press, and radio.

NO PARTISAN MATTER

The impending legislative fight over this bill is not a politically partisan matter. Bankers, big and small, are members of each of our political parties. If it were a partisan fight, the chairman would win hands down, as his party has a 2-to-1 majority both on the committee and in the Congress. It is going to require votes to stop this bill; votes from both majority and minority Members of the House. If you believe, as I do, that this bill is a most unsound and unwise legislative proposal that would adversely affect your industry and the economy of the whole country, then you as bankers should get busy—now. Write your Congressman; talk with your Congressman; get your customers to write him; convince him that this bill endangers our monetary system and would make it the football of politics. It should be defeated.

EDUCATION—FIRST WORK OF OUR TIMES AND SOCIETY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has called education "the first work of our times and the first work of our society."

Nearly 100 years ago, on March 2, 1867, another President Johnson gave similar recognition to the importance of education in our national life by signing into law "An act to establish a Department of Education," which had been passed by the 40th Congress of the United States. Nine days later, the President appointed Henry Barnard, who, with other leading educators, had long advocated a Federal education agency, the first Commissioner of Education.

The broad scope intended from the outset for the Department of Education was made clear by the wording of the act which declared that the new Department should serve the purposes "of collecting such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories, and of diffusing such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems, and methods of teaching, as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country."

Despite its designation as a Department, however, the newly created education agency was not accorded Cabinet status. The act establishing a "Department" of Education was never repealed, but a year after its creation, in 1868, the Department was referred to in an appropriation act of Congress as the "Office of Education." For 72 years the Office of Education was attached to the Department of the Interior. In 1939 it was transferred to the Federal Security Agency, whose organization was designed to include various bureaus and offices which administered programs involved in relationships with individuals as distinguished from departments with more apparent functional missions. Ultimately, in 1953, it became a part of the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Today it is imperative that we assign education a new—and higher—place in the Federal structure. In 1867—or perhaps as recently as 1953—it may have been appropriate for the education agency of the Federal Government to be a subcabinet unit. In 1965 it is an absurd anachronism.

I have spoken before on the urgent need to create a Department of Education. Today I would like to add a few remarks on this vitally important subject.

The phenomenal growth of education in America during a single decade—the decade immediately after the Office of Education was placed under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—and its projected further growth during the decade ahead are illustrated by the following statistics:

Enrollments in our elementary and secondary schools, public and private, increased from 32.3 million in 1953 to 46.9 million in 1963. By 1973, they are expected to reach 54 million.

The number of boys and girls graduating each year from our high schools climbed from 1.3 million in 1953–54 to 2.3 million in 1963–64. This number is expected to reach 3.1 million in 1973–74.

The number of classroom teachers in elementary and secondary schools rose from 1.2 million in 1953 to 1.8 million in 1963. We will need almost 2.2 million teachers by 1973.

College and university enrollments increased by more than 50 percent in the 1950's. In the present decade, they will nearly double, reaching 7 million enrolled students by 1970.

This unprecedented expansion in educational activity has been paralleled by an unprecedented degree of support for education from the Federal Government. We are fast abandoning the old—and false—idea that Federal support for education means Federal control of education. With the States and local communities already devoting 37 percent of their expenditures to education, it has become apparent that extensive Federal help is now required for the very survival of our schools. A major step toward recognition of the Federal Government's responsibility to education was taken with the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, designed primarily to strengthen education in the sciences, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. More recently, the 88th Congress enacted by far the most comprehensive program of Federal support for education in our Nation's history. Of course these programs have resulted in greatly increased Federal expenditures for education.

In the appropriation act of 1868, to which I have previously referred, a total of $20,000 was provided the Office of Education. In 1939, when the Office was attached to the Federal Security Agency, it operated within a budget of about $27.4 million. By 1953, when the Office of Education became a subordinate part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, its appropriations totaled about $290 million, a figure that did not increase over the next 5 years.

In fiscal year 1964, however, Office of Education appropriations reached about $700 million, and in fiscal year 1965 they more than doubled to $1.5 billion. In fiscal year 1966, if the proposed $1.5 billion education program is enacted, the total will come to $3.4 billion—nearly five times the amount of only 2 years ago. Even during the present fiscal year, the Office of Education has a larger budget than several departments with Cabinet rank.

These figures are a fair reflection of the tremendous growth of the scope and significance of the Office of Education in recent years. They represent the transformation of a comparatively unimportant statistical office into the agency primarily responsible for the Federal Government's role in what President Johnson has aptly described as "the first work of our times and the first work of our society."

Despite this primary responsibility, the Office of Education still expends less than one-third of the total Federal education budget, which amounts to roughly $5 billion in the present fiscal year. This budget is shared by no less than 42 separate departments, agencies, and bureaus of the Federal Government. Nearly every department conducts its own education programs. So do such diverse agencies as the National Science Foundation, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Veterans' Administration, and the Smithsonian Institution. Within the De-

partment of Health, Education, and Welfare itself, $700 million is expended for education by agencies other than the Office of Education.

It is clearly past time to bring to an end the overlapping and duplication in the Federal educational role, to give taxpayers fair value for educational funds expended, to create a clear, rational, workable mechanism for our Federal education programs.

It is clearly past time to recognize in fact what we have already recognized in legislative acts—that the strength of education within our society requires an essential Federal responsibility. Education, within the executive branch, must be accorded a position equal to this responsibility. This requires the creation of a Department of Education, with a Secretary of Cabinet rank, to carry out the educational responsibility of the Federal Government and to give proper weight and focus to education along with other major instruments of our national policy.

On January 4, I introduced a bill to establish a Department of Education in the Federal Government. The needs which this bill are designed to meet are both imperative and apparent, and again I urge all Members of this body to join in its support.

The 40th Congress of the United States has the historic distinction of being the first to recognize the responsibility of the Federal Government to "promote the cause of education throughout the country." The 89th Congress can make an equal contribution to the cause of education and the welfare of the Nation by giving education its rightful place in the Federal structure. It is most appropriate that a measure adopted in the administration of President Andrew Johnson should be carried to its logical and necessary conclusion in the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The words of Representative Ignatius Donnelly, of Minnesota, spoken in support of the establishment of a Federal education agency nearly 100 years ago are applicable today:

> Pass this bill and you give education a mouthpiece and a rallying point. It will throw a flood of light upon the dark places of the land. It will form a public sentiment which will arouse to increased activity the friends of education everywhere, and ignorance will fly before it.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XX

Mr. BOGGS. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the excellent series of articles appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on the many problems facing New York City continues.

The following article concerns the urgent task of combating air pollution and tells us what is being done about this problem.

The article appeared in the Tribune on February 10, 1965, and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: THE FORMIDABLE TASK OF CLEANING UP OUR CITY'S AIR

(By Joseph R. Hixson)

In 10 days the killer claimed 165 lives in New York City. They were almost all old people and babies under a year of age. The killings weren't discovered until 1962. Then the statisticians marked them down as "excess deaths" during one of the city's recurring smog episodes in November 1953.

An excess dead person might just as well have been murdered because he or she wouldn't normally have died that day. It is too bad that it takes 9 years for the experts to detect and report excess asthma, pneumonia and heart failure deaths caused by air pollution. If doctors could tabulate them on the days when eyes are smarting and noses are protesting, citizens of New York City might become angry and demand action.

Of course, nobody likes the incinerator fly ash that blackens lungs and shirts and window sills, nor the acrid odors from New Jersey industries, nor the visible and invisible toxins from auto, truck and bus exhausts, nor the sulfur dioxide from cheap No. 6 fuel oil. If contaminated water came out of the faucet, everyone would insist on a cleanup of the water supply. But everyone is content to contribute simply one dime a year to the fight against filthy air. After all, isn't the New York City program the second largest in the country, after Los Angeles? (Angelenos pay 50 cents a year.)

Commissioner Arthur Benline, who heads the city's department of air pollution control, accepts his defeats cheerfully. He asks for more money for air monitoring devices and for more inspectors, but then he is reasonably happy when his budget isn't cut, as it almost was this year. After the budget people scheduled a reduction in Mr. Benline's budget, there was such a hue and cry that he received $19,000 more than last year, a total of $932,000.

The money allocated to air pollution control in New York City is spent as follows: $428,000 for the inspectors; $179,000 for the engineers who approve new heating and disposal installations; $142,000 for research and determinations of atmosphere pollutants in the laboratory, and $183,000 for rent, secretaries, commissioners, board members, pencils and paper.

Now the new Federal air pollution control program, started last Fall, may just put an additional $200,000 into Mr. Benline's kitty. But that is just investigative money and "sound the alarm when things become impossible" money. It isn't going to purify any air.

Making the city air safer to breathe would cost millions and millions of dollars. On any given day, 36 of Mr. Benline's 44 inspectors are chasing around New York City's 320 square miles of soot fall peering into boilers and furnaces and incinerators, advising, cajoling and handing out summonses that can cost up to $500 for habitual violators.

Air pollution control inspectors make their calls both in response to public complaints of soot pouring from chimneys and from what they themselves observe.

When the inspector calls, he first goes down into the basement of the building to inspect the burner and boiler. He checks to see whether the alarm system is working. A bell should ring if more than the permissible amount of soot is going to the chimney from the burner.

If an incinerator is in question, the inspector goes to the roof to check for fly ash heaped around the flue. He questions the superintendent on his trash-burning practices.

When the inspector finds something wrong (as occurred 5,467 times out of 34,324 visits last year, he issues a written warning telling the building owners to have it fixed. Then, if there is another complaint or violation at the same address, he issues a summons that must be presented in court (1,147 summonses were issued in 1964).

But what the public sees and complains about constitutes less than 10 percent of the air pollution problem.

Take the matter of sulfur in fuel oil. Down at St. Vincent's Hospital, in a special airtight plastic telephone booth, Dr. Stephen M. Ayres recently exposed an asthmatic woman to air containing just 50 parts of sulfur dioxide per million parts of air. After ten breaths she turned blue and Dr. Ayres was forced to stop his research while he resuscitated his subject. Dr. Ayres, director of the cardiopulmonary laboratory at St. Vincent's says, "Our studies on the resistance of the tubes that carry air in and out of the lungs show that air pollution definitely kills victims of asthma and emphysema." (Emphysema is a chronic, suffocating disease resulting from failure of the tiny air sacs in the lung to empty completely when a person exhales.)

No doctor in New York City will make an estimate of the number of deaths and illnesses caused by air pollution in any given year. But a research group from Cornell Medical School is monitoring air pollution on New York's lower East Side and checking the health of residents of city housing projects there.

KNOWN CANCER-CAUSERS

The medical researchers already have some indications that respiratory diseases increase during periods of bad pollution, but their data are not yet ready for scientific publication.

Mindful of such baleful effects of sulfur dioxide in the air, the city council recently passed a fuel oil code limiting sulfur content to 3 percent now and 2.2 percent by 1969. Owners of private homes burn a good grade of fuel oil containing little sulfur. But one- or two-family furnaces account for only a tiny fraction of the estimated 3.5 billion gallons of oil burned in the city every year. Most of that oil is No. 6, thick and sludgy and sulfurous. Most of it has more than 3 percent sulfur. Some has more than 4.

Commenting on the new regulations limiting sulfur content, a spokesman from the Consolidated Edison Co. said they would increase his company's fuel bills by 10 percent. The Con Ed fuel bills now run $109 million per year, and the $12 million increase is bound to come out of the pockets of Con Ed's New York customers.

If sulfur dioxide and other sulfur compounds are New York's No. 1 air pollutant, the chemicals from automobile and truck exhausts rank second, according to Dr. Morris Jacobs, an expert on air pollution at the Columbia University School of Public Health.

New highways, tunnels, and bridges continue to funnel more and more automotive traffic into the metropolitan area. The chemicals from exhaust pipes—called aldehydes—created the air pollution crisis in Los Angeles and are creating one here. Some of the aldehydes in those exhaust fumes are known cancer-causers. When there is lead in the gasoline, that noxious element is also added to the air we breathe.

The State of New York requires "blowby" devices on all new cars sold. The devices recirculate exhaust fumes from the crankcase back into the cylinders, giving them a second chance to burn completely into harmless vapors. Such devices theoretically cut exhaust pollution by 40 percent. But Dr. Jacobs, a realist about machinery, said in a recent interview that the devices quickly foul up with carbon and lose most of their efficiency. Nobody has estimated the cost of cleaning the devices every 5,000 miles, nor does the law require it. An uncleaned blowby device can actually increase auto air pollution, Dr. Jacobs says.

A spokesman for the New York State Air Pollution Control Board admits that the lack of enforcement of blowby device maintenance casts doubt on the achievements of the new law. He said, however, that there is to be a meeting in Albany later this week to discuss amending the law. The State has been told that the devices should be cleaned every 6,000 miles and replaced completely every 12,000 miles. The attachment only costs $1.50, to which labor should only add another dollar or so.

Automobiles that come to New York City from New Jersey need not have the exhaust-purifying devices. And the fumes from New Jersey industries are not purified either. The westerly winds waft factory contaminants to New Yorkers 75 percent of the time.

The best thing about the Jersey fumes is that they keep moving. The same westerlies that bring them to New York, carry them on out to sea. But they are always present, waiting to be trapped by what weathermen call a thermal inversion. That is when a mass of cool air suddenly sweeps into town and is trapped under the warm air it displaces. The cool air is denser than the warm and thus cannot rise. If the wind then suddenly drops, New Yorkers live for a day or several days in a fetid soup of ever-accumulating organic chemicals. The last prolonged inversion occurred in October 1963, but we have several short ones every year, usually in the fall.

A long inversion is the air pollution crisis the public health authorities really worry about. With a proper network of air monitoring stations and a law with teeth in it, air pollution control could, in an emergency, ban autos from the city, tell certain factories to shut down, and stop citizens from burning any leaves or refuse. But the warning system doesn't yet exist. Nor does the legal authority.

There is an interstate sanitation commission, formed as the only tangible result of New York City's long hassle with New Jersey over the fumes imported across the Hudson River. The commission is planning to spend $1.5 million to study sources of air pollution in the metropolitan area and to set up the needed alarm system.

The trouble is that, despite its imposing name, the commission hasn't $1.5 million to spend or anything close to that sum. For comparative purposes, the total appropriation Congress allocated to the U.S. Public Health Service to make air pollution control grants this year is just $4,180,000, and Congress stipulated that no single State should receive more than $522,000.

The State of New Jersey has just been given $250,876 under the Federal grant program that is aimed mainly at stimulating communities which have problems with air pollution and have done nothing at all about them.

Before New York City could submit its excruciatingly detailed application for $200,000, the city fathers had to appropriate $100,000 as its share. Fortunately the Federal grant can be made for a calendar year starting in any month, so the city only had to set aside $33,000 for this fiscal year, which ends in June. Will the city get the money? A spokesman for the Public Health Service said he didn't know who would be the beneficiary of the next set of grants. More than half the appropriation has already been given out, and New York hasn't seen a dollar yet.

Is the failure of New York City and New Jersey neighboring communities to get together on their pollution problems jeopardizing the grant? The Public Health spokesman said he doubted it. But he added that the officials in Washington prefer to have an integrated plan for any given air problem area. In 20 years of trying, the city and New Jersey have never even agreed on the problem, much less on a plan.

Commissioner Benline's department must cope not only with the intransigence of an independent State, New Jersey, but with independent agencies and giant utilities. The transit authority, whose overage buses make a large contribution to the unpleasant fumes breathed here, says it can't afford to recondition the engines of all its overage vehicles. The city housing authority, likewise, isn't always cooperative about its faulty incinerators.

And despite all the money Con Ed boasts it has spent, Mr. Benline isn't completely satisfied that the company has done all it can. Con Ed people point to the city's insatiable demands for power, especially in the summertime. They say they would like to build taller stacks to carry off the coal residues their electrostatic traps don't catch. But the Federal Aviation Agency won't allow smokestacks above a given height in the vicinity of busy airports.

And so, in a welter of jurisdictional squabbles, studies piled upon studies, and howls of financial anguish when any enforcement is attempted, the New Yorker changes shirts and dresses twice daily, wheezes with chronic bronchitis that isn't entirely caused by cigarettes, and waits for somebody to bail him out of the awful air he must breathe to live.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXI

Mr. BOGGS. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, bureaucracy, redtape, and indifference have plagued urban renewal projects in New York City for many years.

The following article from the New York Herald Tribune of February 11, 1965, tells the story of one of these projects—the most ambitious in the country:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: RENEWAL—WITH HEART

(By Marshall Peck and Barry Gottehrer)

"This is the most exciting thing that has ever taken place," says a 35-year-old housewife living in the West Side urban-renewal area. "We only hope we can survive it."

A New Yorker's struggle for survival in the face of poorly planned and haphazardly administered urban renewal is not a new story. It is one that has been told and retold during the city's 15-year program.

Yet the 20-block West Side project is not just any urban-renewal project. It is the most ambitious ever attempted in the United States and its aim—and the city's claim—has been that this time, regardless of past failures where lower-income families were repeatedly bulldozed off their land and pushed into another depressed area, the people of the neighborhood would come first.

In the words of the city administration, human renewal—rather than human removal—had come to New York.

Unfortunately, like many of the city's programs, the words are a far cry from reality.

Somewhere between February 1, 1963, when the city started taking title to property in the area—from 87th to 97th Streets and from Central Park West to Amsterdam Avenue—and today, area residents are convinced that the city has lost touch with its people.

To them, the city's $200 million human renewal program has been sidetracked by increasing bureaucracy, redtape, and indifference.

"We have reached a point at this stage where we don't know what kind of controls are being used by the city," says Father Henry J. Browne, pastor of St. Gregory's Roman Catholic Church on 90th Street and president of Strycker's Bay Neighborhood Council. "We have found poor coordination, McKinley-era bookkeeping, poor liaison. It takes staffing and determination to save every human being up here—that's what is needed. And that's what we haven't been getting."

FROM SUBLIME TO RIDICULOUS

According to area residents, what they have been getting has ranged from the sublime to the ridiculous. They claim that, as of yesterday afternoon, the city had lost track of hundreds of area residents, people who were moved out and were due to be moved back, because of inefficient bookkeeping.

They also claim that dispossess notices have been remailed to the same party a number of times and that copies of dispossess lists have contained the names of people deceased or already out of the area.

This alleged foulup in relocation has already been the subject of a $230,000 study called the Greenleigh Survey, paid for by taxpayers' money. The report—which is supposed to be critical of several city departments in their handling of the relocation of West Side residents and the provision of adequate health services—was due last fall. Since then, a preliminary report and at least one later version have made the rounds of top city officials but the report remains unpublished.

Commissioner of Relocation Herman Badillo says that the report will be made public soon and that some of its recommendations have already been put to use in the area.

Strycker's Bay residents however, insist that they have seen no change in the city's handling of the project.

What disturbs many people—both inside and outside this one area—is not that the city's intentions are wrong. They aren't. Human renewal—as has been practiced by Mayor Richard Lee of New Haven—can and will work.

What disturbs New Yorkers is that, despite its good intentions, the city administration has failed to convince the residents of this area, the one area New York officials continue to point to as the showcase of its human renewal program, that it can convert its words into deeds.

"It is not enough to eliminate physical slums," says Milton Mollen, city housing coordinator. "This does not eliminate the underlying problems—poverty, discrimination, social deprivation. In the renewal program, we must recognize and help to deal with these problems in every possible way. If we do not, we will simply shunt these un-

fortunates from one slum to another. Whatever we build will only be a monument to their hardship. In short, we believe that urban renewal should and must be human renewal."

HONEYMOON DIDN'T LAST

These are certainly words to renew by. And, like most city programs at their inception, the city housing people tried to follow them in full with the West Side project—helping to set up and cooperating with a Citizens Advisory Board and the Stryck-er's Bay Neighborhood Council, which represents 50 local groups and institutions.

The honeymoon did not last long.

Today, despite city administration statements and speeches that the West Side urban renewal area remains a prime example of the city's "human renewal," the area residents have learned differently.

According to Father Browne, the city has been sorely and woefully derelict in not keeping close track of some 4,500 tenants (single persons or family units) who are affected by the renewal program.

"It's just crazy,," he said, "for if the city doesn't know where people are, how are they going to get them back?" Right now, he pointed out, the city is trying to distribute priority notifications to West Side tenants that the deadline for applications into the first four units is March 1, but these notices are in letters which are being returned—addressee unknown—in the mail.

The history of the letters is a complicated one—and the city admits there have been snags.

Last June, the department of relocation sent out letters to 4,500 tenants—those still in as yet unaffected portions of the renewal area, and those who had moved or been relocated—apprising them that they should indicate interest if they wished to seek accommodations in the first four middle-income housing units going up.

Of this mailing, 500 letters were returned by the post office marked "addressee unknown." About 40 to 50 percent of those to whom the letters went didn't bother to answer.

Commissioner Herman Badillo, of the department of relocation, was obviously dissatisfied with the mailing. It seemed to indicate that half of the tenants couldn't care less.

"I had satisfied the legal obligations," he says, "but I certainly felt we should go further." On the possibility that recipients had not chosen to open official city mail, he agreed to furnish address labels and postage to Strycker's Bay, and let them use their letterhead envelopes for a return address.

SECOND MAILING SENT OUT

Thus a second mailing went out in October. On this one, Mr. Badillo admits that an out-of-State address list was used—although this was not realized until the letters began to return unopened to Strycker's Bay. The council stopped counting the returns after they had gotten 1,000 back.

By this time, of course, Father Browne and the council were in an uproar. If indeed, the city had lost touch with at least 1,000 tenants, things were not looking up for a rebuilding of the old community.

This led to a recheck by relocation, and it agreed to follow up on 300 sample "unknowns" provided by the council. In December, the council once again mailed out 300 letters to addresses the department of relocation had verified. By the end of January, it had received 139 of these letters back—mostly stamped "address unknown" by the post office.

Commissioner Badille, who believes in close cooperation with the West Side residents, is now trying to find out why letters with verified addresses still came back unopened.

Undercurrents of dismay about city efficiency started coming to the surface on the West Side a year ago. Last February, the citizens' advisory board sent city authorities a confidential report of the state of affairs after 1 year's progress. It was anything but flattering for the city.

The report did not mince words. In its introduction, it said:

"Despite all the good intentions, the promised program for relocation and maintenance have never gotten off the ground, and the West Side urban renewal area, like so many development programs before it, has become a blighted no man's land. Buildings have been closed for months, waiting for demolition to begin. They stand empty, inviting squatters, vandals, and vermin of all types. Horrified tenants have left the area in droves, somehow managing to find living quarters elsewhere, rather than to continue to stay amid the barren wastes of the upper nineties. The relocation department has done little to find them places for these people, or to enable them to remain within the area. Most have left on their own, with or without their bonuses, many to places and residences unknown."

The report said in conclusion: "It is unfortunate and we regret very much that our report turned out to be negative. We have to be impartial and we cannot turn evil into virtue."

Mr. Badillo says that the findings of the still unreleased Greenleigh survey have been indeed applied to the needs of the West Side community. Specifically, he said that the Greenleigh survey led to a formation of several demonstration projects, aimed at helping the residents—old and young—in a number of social service areas.

Residents, however, claim these projects are only window dressing and fall short of solving the increasing ills of the area.

"For all the brickbats that flew, I desire to have the best possible contact with the community groups," says Mr. Badillo. "I feel the best channels are the neighborhood channels."

Mr. Badillo claims that the percentage of unknowns in the West Side ultimately will turn out to be less than 10 percent. Yet, even if only 10 percent of the former residents move back into the West Side project area, Mr. Badillo will consider it a victory because "that will prove that it's possible."

The West Side area (first studied in 1956 and scheduled for completion by 1968–70) is being constructed in three stages for the purpose of permitting the best orderly transition possible.

City planners have praised the overall concept as one that employs the full spectrum of urban development—renewal, rehabilitation, conservation.

But if the people who have been dislocated to make way for progress do not return, New York's human renewal program will fall far short of its aims.

"That's the whole aim of urban renewal," said a realistic city aid. "Otherwise, who are you cleaning up an area for? Don't forget, we're dealing with things we've never done before, but the basic principle is to rehabilitate for people who live in an area—not drive them out and have someone else move in. Otherwise, we might as well leave it to private enterprise."

One critic of the West Side renewal program is Joseph Lyford, who has been conducting extensive research on the project for a book commissioned by the Fund for the Republic. He says: "The West Side hasn't worked out a hell of a lot differently than did slum clearance under Robert Moses—except it hasn't worked as efficiently."

HUMAN EXPLOITATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest appraisals of the defunct bracero program and the attempts to revive it was written by John Herling and printed in the Washington News this evening, March 23, 1965. Mr. Herling views the discredited bracero program in the broader perspective of the agricultural backwardness in America. This backwardness has been responsible for the tremendous resistance to better working conditions, higher wages, and the recognition of the dignity of the worker that has been exerted by the farm industry over the years.

These farmers and growers and the big corporations which run the huge agricultural enterprises, who insist on the right to pay substandard wages and to work men under inhuman conditions, are draft dodgers from the war on poverty.

With unanimous consent I am inserting the article by John Herling at this point in the RECORD:

HUMAN EXPLOITATION

(By John Herling)

The big corporations which run huge agricultural enterprises in California are trying desperately to win exemption from the war against poverty. Their managers refuse to get used to the idea that human exploitation, traditional in their industry, is no longer a permissible activity. They lag behind other American employers and enterprises who have learned—sometimes reluctantly—that higher wages, better working conditions, and the recognition of the dignity of the worker create advantages for the entire community.

For many years, through various means, legal and illegal, the corporate growers depended on a vast pool of low-paid Mexican workers who were brought in to work the crops, then sent back across the border. Last year, Congress cut off the importation system. Corporations were given sufficient warning to adjust their hiring policies. Congress, and both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, agreed that with the high level of unemployment in our country, there was no sense in importing foreign workers when U.S. workers were unemployed and available.

To implement the clear congressional intent, Secretary of Labor Wirtz has issued regulations which sustain the ban on the importation of foreign workers unless it can be shown that domestic workers are not available if offered a decent minimum wage and proper working conditions. The regulation went into effect January 1, 1965. Ever since, the growers continue to apply the squeeze to, among others, Democrat Pat Brown of California, to their two Republican Senators, and to a variety of friends and lobbyists in Washington to get Secretary Wirtz to let down the bars and bring in the Mexican braceros once again.

In the first 2 months of this year, crops have been gathered by available domestic workers despite the piteous call for help from the braceros.

In a letter to Governor Brown, Mr. Wirtz pointed out that whereas "over 10,000 foreign workers were used in California agriculture in January and February last year, 1964, none was used this year. This has meant thousands of additional jobs for U.S. workers. And despite a good deal of talk about alleged losses in various California crops, there, in actual fact, have been no significant losses resulting from labor shortages."

Then, "the special recruitment programs, in which State and Federal offices have cooperated fully, have worked reasonably well. They have been handicapped by the deliberate attempts of some growers to keep these efforts from succeeding, and by some workers falling short of doing what was reasonably expected of them.

"We are still a long way," he said, "from finally solving the problems which arise from the basic fact that wage levels for agricultural work are way below those for work of comparable difficulty in other industries. Talking about our people not wanting to do stoop labor gets pretty thin when we know that the real point is that they are being expected to do it at wages which average less than half what they are for other work that is in general easier. And the talk about foreign workers doing this work because they are made of sterner stuff is nonsense too."

Before turning over jobs to foreign workers, Labor Department officials believe more vigorous recruitment should be carried out in California with its 400,000 unemployed. Reports indicate that growers have thrown blocks in the way of domestic workers to make the farm jobs less desirable. Second, if not enough qualified unemployed can be found in California, interstate recruitment can be carried out. Third, a large supply of American Indians, now on reservations, who are often overlooked, could be brought into the farm labor market. Fourth, as summer months come along, and unemployment increases, many of these unemployed for the summer could be recruited.

WASHINGTON, LINCOLN, AND EDISON

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N.J., who retired in 1959 as senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison Industries, West Orange, N.J., delivered an inspirational talk on February 18, 1965, before the Kiwanis Club of East Orange on "Washington, Lincoln, and Edison." This address, which was printed in the East Orange Record and other Moreau publications in its entirety, will be of interest to our colleagues, many of whom are personally acquainted with Mr. Stringfellow.

His own distinguished career reflects how thoroughly Mr. Stringfellow has emulated Edison's industry, integrity, and initiative which he cited in his address. Mr. Stringfellow went to work for the great inventor as head of the Washington, D.C., office of the Edison Storage Battery Co. in 1918. The consistently high selling records and profitable administration of that office prompted Mr. Edison to give Mr. Stringfellow the general sales managership of this company in 1923, and the following year he was made vice president and general manager. Mr. Stringfellow's brilliant record showed that the great inventor also had a talent for selecting the best men as his associates.

Like Thomas A. Edison, Mr. Stringfellow, always a busy man, nevertheless found his boundless energies could encompass worthy external activities. Mr. Stringfellow was one of the founders and first president of the New Jersey Division of the American Cancer Society and recipient of that society's award for distinguished service in cancer control. For his zealous contributions to this and other medical programs, he received the 1958 Annual Citizens Award of the Academy of Medicine of New Jersey and was made honorary member of the Academy.

His achievements, which are too numerous to cite, have earned him an honorary degree of doctor of fine arts from Ithaca College, Ithaca, N.Y.; honorary degree of doctor of laws from Upsala College, East Orange, N.J.; honorary degree of doctor of humanities from Indiana Technical College, Fort Wayne, Ind.

Mr. Stringfellow was imperial potentate of the Shrine of North America, 1958–59, and is connected with many business, charitable, and patriotic organizations.

I am pleased to insert at this point in the RECORD Mr. Stringfellow's inspiring address:

WASHINGTON, LINCOLN, AND EDISON

(Address by George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N.J., former business associate of Thomas Alva Edison, past imperial potentate, before the Kiwanis Club of East Orange, N.J., Feb. 18, 1965)

Each of the 12 months in our calendar is important. However, I think that February is one of the most important in that Washington, Lincoln, and Edison were born this month.

It was in February that Washington said, "Labor to keep alive in your breast—that little spark of celestial fire—called conscience."

It was in February that Lincoln said, "Let us have faith that right makes might and in that faith, let us dare to do our duty as we understand it."

I shall mention briefly the philosophy of Washington and Lincoln and will deal more extensively with Edison, with whom it was my privilege to have been a daily business associate during the last decade of his long and productive life.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

George Washington was born February 22, 1732—233 years ago. Washington looked after the welfare of our country as a father his child. He fought for and helped make our country grow strong. He guided it when it was young and gave leadership in developing the greatest form of government, in the words of Gladstone, "ever stricken off in a given time—by the brain and purpose of man."

He and his associates gave us a system of government which provides investors, producers, and consumers with freedom of choice and freedom of opportunity.

Nowhere in the world do men enjoy as much freedom and as high a living standard as we, thanks to his courage and wisdom. Washington truly earned the imperishable title of "Father of His Country."

Our forefathers bequeathed to us a system in which the productive facilities of the Nation are owned by the people instead of the Government. Our benefactors gave us a system of government that recognizes the dignity of the individual and encourages high moral and ethical standards. They gave us a system of government—born of the principle that all men have the right to pursue happiness and to enjoy the blessings of liberty.

Our forefathers gave us a system of government which provides everyone an opportunity to make the most of what he has and rewards him according to his ability. They did not subscribe to the philosophy that government owes everyone a living.

Our forefathers glorified the individual, not the state, as the Communists do. They worked like Trojans to build a strong America and they roared like lions—to establish and maintain freedom. They had granite in their character and iron in their backbones. They kept government the servant of the people and so must we, if we are to remain freemen, and thus be worthy of our great heritage.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Abraham Lincoln was born on February 12, 1809—156 years ago. He was one of the world's truly great men.

He will always live in the minds and hearts of people everywhere. In his memorable Gettysburg Address and in other speeches and writings, Lincoln expressed his belief in the American people and in our system of government. He never lost touch with the people and millions knew him for what he was, "Honest Abe."

Lincoln held the Nation together and thus preserved the system of government which made it possible for Edison and others to contribute not only to the progress of our country but to the betterment of the world.

THOMAS A. EDISON

Thomas A. Edison was born on February 11, 1847—118 years ago.

It is generally recognized that Edison was the world's greatest inventor. How, you may ask, did Edison, a poor boy, raise the money to build and equip his research laboratory, and staff it with capable assistants?

Edison raised the money by the sweat of his brow and the exercise of his fertile brain. Edison received no subsidy from his government, as is all too often the case today.

Edison was known as the "genius of Menlo Park." He was asked on one occasion to define "genius." Said Edison, "Genius is 95 percent perspiration and 5 percent inspiration."

One of Edison's first major inventions was the universal stock ticker, which he sold for $40,000. He used much of the proceeds to build, equip, and staff his laboratory.

Edison believed in and practiced the four basic principles of management: Plan, organize, delegate, and supervise.

Edison's favorite invention, the phonograph, was patented February 19, 1877. It was the most original of his 1,100-odd inventions. Having conceived the idea of recording and reproducing sound, Edison sketched his idea on a scrap of yellow paper and handed it to John Kruesi, one of his associates, with instructions: "Kruesi, make this."

A few days later Kruesi handed the inventor a queer-looking contraption. Edison wrapped a sheet of tinfoil around the cylinder of the device and, as he turned the crank that revolved the cylinder, he spoke into a

brass horn (attached to a recorder riding on the tinfoil) these historic words, "Mary had a little lamb." Edison reversed the operation of the contraption and heard these words repeated, and thus was born the recording and reproduction of sound we know today.

Edison's most widely known and used invention is the incandescent lamp which illuminates the world. As you perhaps know, radio and television are predicated upon the principle of the incandescent lamp.

If Edison had lived under a Communist state, it would have been necessary for him to have gone to the "Bureau of New Ideas, of the Division of Engineering, of the Office of Social Improvement."

To obtain essential commodities with which to experiment in his efforts to produce the electric light and his 1,100 other inventions, it would have been necessary for Edison to have revealed his educational qualifications to a Communist bureaucrat. Having no educational qualifications, Edison would have been denied the use of materials for his experiments and thus we would have been deprived of the electric light and the other great inventions which Edison's genius gave to the world.

If Washington and his associates had not given us our system of government, if Lincoln had not held that government together in its most trying period, it is safe to assume, I think, that Edison would not have made his great contribution to civilization.

Ours is a great system of government. It is our duty and our responsibility to keep it intact as it was passed on to us by our wise benefactors. If we heed the advice of Washington and Lincoln in matters of government, and if we emulate Edison's industry, integrity, and initiative, the future of America will be beyond man's comprehension.

"America", said Ralph Waldo Emerson, "is another name for opportunity. Her whole history appears like a last effort of divine providence in behalf of the human race."

May I quote from the last known message which Mr. Edison communicated to his fellow countrymen: "Be courageous * * * history repeats itself again and again. Be as brave as your forefathers before you. Have faith: go forward." Perhaps there is no time in the history of this Republic when faith and courage were more needed than today. We, the beneficiaries of this great man, would do well to implement his message.

MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO REPEAL THE FEDERAL TAX ON JEWELRY

Mr. BOGGS. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include the following extraneous material:

RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

Resolution memorializing Congress to repeal the Federal tax on jewelry

Whereas the Congress of the United States did in the year 1954 impose a tax on jewelry sold at retail equivalent to 10 percent of the selling price; and

Whereas the aforesaid tax was imposed during the Korean emergency to discourage the manufacture of jewelry, and the reason for the imposition of said tax no longer exists; and

Whereas the imposition of said tax has placed a great burden on the domestic jewelry industry already beset by low-wage foreign competitions and increasing tariff barriers against jewelry exports; and

Whereas the manufacturing of jewelry and related products is one of the leading industries of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, providing employment for many of its citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States be and they hereby are respectfully requested to repeal the Federal tax on the sale of jewelry at retail; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is requested to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution in the hope that each will use his best efforts to enact legislation to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

AUGUST P. LA FRANCE,
Secretary of State.

USE OF CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General of the United States has approved an opinion of the General Counsel of the Civil Service Commission that contracts with private contractors to furnish people to work alongside military personnel and civil service employees are a form of personnel procurement not authorized by law and violates the provisions of the Civil Service Act, the Veterans' Preference Act, the Classification Act, and other personnel statutes. This is House Report No. 188 and is a timely supplement to a report issued by the subcommittee March 2, "Use of Contractor Personnel in Department of Defense."

The Department of Defense is paying over a billion dollars annually more for personnel furnished by contractors than would be necessary if the work were assigned to civil service employees on the direct payroll of the Federal Government. The members of the subcommittee are not advocating that the Government go into the business of manufacturing items such as paint, shoes, or electronic gear; but we do say in this report that it is not good business for the Government to contract with private interests merely to furnish people to perform work that currently is and historically has been successfully handled by Government personnel.

Manpower and procurement officials from the Department of Defense testified in public hearings in June 1964 before the Manpower Subcommittee that the Department did not have adequate information at headquarters concerning contractor personnel as to numbers, costs, and so forth, working in support areas for the military services. These officials indicated that procedures were being developed to insure that more complete information would be made available to the Washington level. The subcommittee members have been informally advised that since our hearings a top-level study is underway to correct these problems.

The members of the subcommittee feel that action should be taken to correct the several problem areas as outlined in these reports. This includes a recommendation that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget reorient the Bureau's policies relating to the procurement of manpower. However, we feel that changes made to existing labor practices should be orderly and in no way disruptive to either our defense posture or to our economy.

MORE U.S. HELP TO COMMUNISTS ON WAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I want to call to the attention of the Members of this body an excellent article by Lindsey Williams, publisher of the Loudonville, Ohio, Times. He calls attention to the fact that the United States has been allowing—indeed, encouraging—increased trade with our enemy, the Communists. Since 1961 we have seen the Kennedy and Johnson administrations encourage more East-West trade based on the foolish theory that it will produce better relations. Shades of the Japanese scrap deals of the thirties.

We are in an impossible position in telling the world that we should increase trade with the Soviet Union at the same time we urge them not to trade with the pipsqueak Castro. The greatest knave of them all is held out as a responsible person to do business with but we want to embargo all vessels which carry on trade with Cuba. How stupid can we get? Well, Mr. Williams points this out in the following excellent article which I read into the RECORD at this point.

[From the Loudonville (Ohio) Times, Mar. 18, 1965]

MORE U.S. HELP TO COMMUNISTS ON WAY

(By Lin Williams)

"Ain't nobody in here but us chickens" is the punchline to a venerable old joke about a chicken thief caught redhanded and challenged by an irate farmer.

The Continental Grain Co., of New York City, is knee deep in bagged fowl and assures a startled public that there is nobody around but true blue American businessmen.

Inspiration for this little parable is a recent announcement that Continental obtained an export license permitting the sale of $11 million worth of soybeans to Russia. The action sent soybean futures prices racing to seasonal highs, and the quiet little deal between Continental, the Communists and the U.S. Commerce Department finally was revealed.

Millions of Americans are under the impression that there is a ban on the sale of foodstuffs and strategic materials to Russia and her satellites except surplus wheat. It is generally believed that wheat was exempted by a bill pushed by the late President Kennedy as a means of improving our gold reserves while reducing our troublesome farm surplus.

All well and good if the administration had told the country the truth about the bill. As Congressman FRANK BOW and others frantically tried to tell the public then, the so-called wheat bill opened the door for the sale of any product to Russia. Not once in the bill is the word "wheat" mentioned. The word "product" is used throughout the law.

Now we see that other items besides wheat (much of which is transshipped to Cuba) is going to our cold war enemies. Even the cynics were surprised at the current sale inasmuch as soybeans are not even surplus.

Soybeans are versatile, being used for margarine, bread, drugs, fertilizers, insect sprays, and plastic. Just what the Russians intend to do with their 4 million bushels is unknown.

Grain merchants predict more deals in the offing. If so, there is no reason to believe that the Commerce Department won't give an export license. Since the soybean price is well above the subsidy price, the Government cannot stipulate shipping arrangements, as it tried to do for wheat.

You will remember that in October 1963, Federal officials required that the wheat for Russia be sent in U.S. vessels. American longshoremen refused for a while to load the ships.

In the end, however, an increase in loading fees brought the longshoremen around, and pressure from our allies and Russia led us to relax our requirements to the extent that only half its shipments had to go in higher priced U.S. ships.

It was a flimsy dodge—once our pesky scruples were laid aside—for Canadian ships to load "Russian" wheat at U.S. ports, and before getting out of sight of land receive "changed orders" sending the ship directly to Cuba. American ships cannot visit Cuba because of an official "blockade" ignored by nearly every other country.

Continental was the principal in those first wheat deals to the tune of nearly $80 million. Russia bought the wheat at less than American bakeries pay for the commodity—the American taxpayers making up the difference through subsidies.

The sale of "surplus" farm products is raising ruckus in other parts of the world, also, these days.

Gamal Nasser, President of the United Arab Republic, last month told the United States to "go drink the ocean," an Oriental insult equivalent to "go to hell." The Egyptians underscored their spite by burning down the U.S. Information Library, not once but twice.

Reason for the outburst was a mild remonstrance from our Government that Nasser shouldn't transship our wheat and other foodstuffs to Congolese rebels.

At stake is $17 million worth of commodities. Nasser can afford to be belligerent only because this is the last shipment of $420 million of wheat sold to him over the last 2½ years.

Uncle Sam smiles tolerantly and says he is going ahead with the last shipment anyway.

This spineless response to a flat-out spit in the face riled Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, Republican, of Illinois, and Congressman Bow, ranking minority member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee. They engineered an amendment to a bill providing $1.6 billion to the Commodity Credit Corporation, which handles sales of "surplus" farm products, prohibiting further deals with Nasser.

President Johnson persuaded the Senate to put aid to Egypt back into the bill, thus requiring the House to reconsider. I certainly hope we don't kow-tow to Nasser or any other international hoodlums, but Johnson gets what Johnson wants.

There seems to be some quaint notion that Congress has no business in foreign policy, and we should let the President do as he wishes in this area.

The Founding Fathers must be spinning in their graves. As the Federalist Papers make clear, and as American history has demonstrated, the responsibility for foreign affairs rests with the representatives of the people—not with a single chief executive.

It is a great mystery to me what we hope to accomplish by toadying to Nasser. I read a large number of newspapers and magazines on current events. Nowhere have I discovered any reason advanced for deference to the United Arab Republic dictator. If any reader has some obscure reference shedding light on this situation I would greatly appreciate having it.

It is a sad fact that the $3.3 billion foreign aid we are handing out is important to our economy. When you consider that 75 percent of all foreign aid goes for the purchase of farm and industrial products in the United States, you can see why. On top of this we feel obligated to rid ourselves of mounting farm surpluses by selling them at discount prices to our avowed enemies.

Surely, it must be possible to channel help to our friends and deny it to those who openly work against us without wrecking the U.S. economy.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important recommendations of President Johnson in his far-seeing message to Congress on America's cities was for the establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I am pleased today to introduce the legislation, H.R. 6654, recommended by President Johnson to create this vitally needed new Department.

Our cities can be means of fostering and furthering the good life for Americans of which the President spoke. Or they can be enemies of the good life, and the breeding grounds of degradation and misery.

By establishing the Department of Housing and Urban Development, we shall take a significant step toward improving the quality of urban life.

The problems of our cities are among our foremost national problems. The organization of the Federal Government should reflect this obvious fact. We should promptly give urban affairs their due representation and consideration at the Cabinet level.

The new Department would help coordinate and focus all the Federal programs to aid our cities. It would improve administration and encourage solution of urban problems through the cooperation of private persons and groups and all levels of government.

A section-by-section summary of H.R. 6654 follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

SHORT TITLE

Section 1 provides that the act would be cited as the "Department of Housing and Urban Development Act."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

Section 2 sets forth the purpose of the bill and that the Congress finds that establishment of an executive department is desirable to carry out the purpose.

Congress would declare that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require, as a matter of national purpose, sound development of the Nation's urban communities and metropolitan areas in which the vast majority of its people live and work.

To carry out the purposes, Congress would find that establishment of an executive department is desirable to: (1) Achieve the best administration of the principal programs of the Federal Government which provide assistance for housing and for the development of the Nation's communities; (2) assist the President in achieving maximum coordination of Federal activities which have a major effect upon urban, suburban, or metropolitan development; (3) encourage the solution of problems of housing and urban development through State, county, town, village, or other local and private action (including promotion of interstate, regional, and metropolitan cooperation); and (4) provide for full consideration, at the national level, of the needs and interests of the Nation's communities and their people.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT—RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY

Section 3(a) establishes the Department of Housing and Urban Development and provides that it would be headed by a Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, who would be appointed by the President with Senate confirmation.

The Department would be administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary. The Secretary would receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by the law for the heads of executive departments. (At present, under sec. 303(a) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, the secretaries of departments receive $35,000 per annum.)

Section 3(b) directs the Secretary, among his other responsibilities, to advise the President with respect to Federal programs and activities relating to housing and urban development; to develop and recommend to the President policies for fostering the orderly growth and development of the Nation's urban areas; exercise leadership at the discretion of the President in coordinating Federal activities affecting housing and urban development; provide technical assistance and information (including a clearinghouse service) to aid State, county, town, village, or other local governments in developing solutions to urban and metropolitan development problems; encourage comprehensive planning by State and local governments with a view to coordinating Federal, State, and local urban development activities; and to conduct continuing studies of housing and urban development problems.

Section 3(c) provides that nothing in the bill shall be construed to deny or limit the benefits of any program, function, or activity to any community on the basis of its population or corporate status, except as may be expressly provided by law.

UNDER SECRETARY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Section 4(a) provides that there shall be in the Department an Under Secretary, four Assistant Secretaries, and a General Counsel, all of whom would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. These officers would perform the functions, powers, and duties prescribed by the Secretary. They would receive the same compensation as the Under Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries, and General Counsels of other departments. (At present, under section 303(c) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, Under Secretaries receive $28,500 per annum, and under section 303(d) of that act, Assistant Secretaries and General Counsels receive $27,000 per annum.)

Section 4(b) provides that there shall be in the Department an Assistant Secretary for Administration who would be appointed by the Secretary with the approval of the President. The Assistant Secretary would receive the same compensation as is provided by law for Assistant Secretaries for administration of executive departments ($26,000 per annum). He would perform the functions, powers, and duties prescribed by the Secretary.

TRANSFERS TO DEPARTMENT

Section 5(a) transfers to the Secretary all the functions, powers and duties of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Public Housing Administration, and the functions, powers, and duties of the heads and other officers and offices of those agencies.

Section 5(b) transfers the Federal National Mortgage Association, together with its functions, powers, and duties, to the Department. The Secretary of the Department would be vested with the functions, powers, and duties of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator with regard to FNMA. The Secretary would therefore become the Chairman of the Board of Directors of FNMA. FNMA would be an entity within the Department, and the rights and interests of the owners of outstanding common stock issued under the FNMA Charter Act would not be affected by the transfer.

Section 5(b) would also repeal language in section 308 of the FNMA Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1723), which was superseded by a subsequent provision in the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. Section 308 provided that the President of FNMA received compensation at the rate established for the heads of the constituents of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 listed the salary for the President of FNMA separately. Under the provisions of section 5(b) of the bill the separate listing in the Salary Act would be repealed, and the President of FNMA would be one of the six positions provided in section 7(c) of the bill with compensation at the annual rate applicable to level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule provided by the Executive Salary Act of 1964 ($26,000).

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Section 6(a) would amend section 19(d)(1) of title 3 of the United States Code to place both the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in the line of succession to the Office of the President of the United States. They would be eligible to act as President only if the Vice President, Speaker of the House, President pro tempore of the Senate, and the heads of other executive departments having precedence over them by law are unable to serve as President.

Sections 6(b) and 6(c) are technical provisions which would extend to the new Department the provisions of title IV of the Revised Statutes, except to the extent inconsistent with the bill. Those provisions deal with such matters as departmental vacancies, regulations, duties of clerks, details and employment of personnel, oaths, subpenas and witness fees.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 7(a) provides that all the personnel, liabilities, and resources, including funds, property, and records available in connection with the functions transferred by section 5 to the Department, are transferred with the respective functions.

Section 7(b) provides that no transfers of functions may be made within the Department with respect to the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association unless the Secretary finds such transfers would not adversely affect the rights and interests of the owners of FNMA common stock.

Section 7(c) would authorize the Secretary to appoint and fix the compensation of Department personnel and prescribe their duties. The law applicable to the Federal civil service would apply to employees of the Department. The Secretary further would be authorized to fix the compensation for not more than six positions at the annual rate applicable to positions in level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule provided by the 1964 Executive Salary Act ($26,000).

Section 7(d) permits the Secretary to delegate any of his functions to such officers and employees of the Department as he may designate and to authorize successive redelegations of functions he has delegated. The Secretary is also authorized to prescribe necessary rules and regulations. This subsection repeals a portion of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), so that the Secretary could delegate or redelegate authority to (1) approve the workable program of a locality for dealing with its overall problems of slum and blight, (2) certify that Federal assistance to urban renewal work enumerated under section 101(c) may be made available to a community, and (3) determine that the relocation requirements of section 105(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 have been met.

Section 7(e) authorizes the Secretary to obtain the services of experts and consultants at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals.

Section 7(f) authorizes the Secretary to establish a working capital fund, similar to those in other departments, for operating various common administrative services in the Department such as supply, messenger, mail, telephone, space, library, and reproduction services. The revolving fund would be financed through appropriations, and charges against the agencies and offices in the Department for which services are performed.

Section 7(g) directs the Secretary to have a Department seal made and provides for judicial notice of the seal.

ANNUAL REPORT

Section 8 requires the Secretary to make an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress on the activities of the Department during the preceding calendar year.

SAVINGS PROVISIONS

Section 9(a) would provide that no cause or action by or against any agency or officer whose functions are transferred by the bill would abate by reason of the new act, and that such causes of action could be asserted by or against the United States or any appropriate official of the new Department.

Section 9(b) provides that any pending litigation or other proceeding by or against any agency or officer whose functions are transferred by the bill would not abate by reason of the new act, and also provides for appropriate substitution of successor parties.

Section 9(c) provides that, except as expressly provided in the bill, all powers and authorities otherwise existing would not be affected by the bill. All rules, regulations, and orders issued under applicable law prior to the effective date of the bill would continue in effect unless modified or rescinded by the Secretary or other legally authorized officer or office of the Department. References in other Federal laws to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or to any officers, office, or agency therein, except the FNMA and its officers, would be deemed to mean the Secretary. This subsection also provides that the positions and agencies (HHFA, FHA, and PHA, and their heads and officers) transferred under section 5(a) of the bill would lapse.

SEPARABILITY

Section 10 provides a standard separability clause.

EFFECTIVE DATE AND INTERIM APPOINTMENTS

Section 11(a) provides that the act would take effect 60 days from the date of its approval, or on such earlier date as the President may specify. However, in the interim, and any time after approval of the act, the President could nominate and the Senate could confirm the Department's officers. The Assistant Secretary for Administration could also be appointed during the interim period by the Secretary with the approval of the President. Such officers would not enter on duty until the act takes effect generally.

Section 11(b) makes provision for designation by the President of interim officers, as may be necessary, for a 60-day period immediately after the effective date of the act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HAMILTON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

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. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND), for 30 minutes, on March 24, 1965; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. PATMAN on Tuesday, March 30, for 60 minutes; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN on Thursday, April 1, for 60 minutes; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, on Wednesday next, March 31, for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 15 minutes, today; and to

revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Bow, his remarks today on the District of Columbia appropriation bill and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. KING of New York.

Mr. UTT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. PEPPER.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 624. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 24, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES AS REQUIRED BY THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED, BY PUBLIC LAW 86–472 AND BY PUBLIC LAW 86–628

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86–472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86–628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds.

The required reports are submitted herewith:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 792, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Foreign Agricultural Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
W. R. Poage:												
Ecuador	Sucre	July 10	July 11	1	444.00	24.00	444.00	24.00			444.00	24.00
Bolivia	Boliviano	July 11	July 13	2	286,875	24.00	593,750	48.00			593,750	48.00
Peru	Sole	July 12	do	1	436.00	20.00	1,125.00	41.98			1,125.00	41.98
Brazil	Cruzeiro	July 14	July 17	3	26,680	23.00	45,240	39.00			45,240	39.00
Harlan Hagen:												
Ecuador	Sucre	July 10	July 11	1	444.00	24.00	444.00	24.00			444.00	24.00
Bolivia	Boliviano	July 11	July 13	2	286,875	24.00	593,750	48.00			593,750	48.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	July 14	July 17	3	26,680	23.00	45,240	39.00			45,240	39.00
D. R. Matthews:												
Ecuador	Sucre	July 10	July 11	1	444.00	24.00	444.00	24.00			444.00	24.00
Bolivia	Boliviano	July 11	July 13	2	286,875	24.00	593,750	48.00			593,750	48.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	July 14	July 17	3	26,680	23.00	45,240	39.00			45,240	39.00
Robert C. Bruce:												
Ecuador	Sucre	July 10	July 11	1	444.00	24.00	444.00	24.00			444.00	24.00
Bolivia	Boliviano	July 11	July 13	2	286,875	24.00	593,750	48.00			593,750	48.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	July 14	July 17	3	26,680	23.00	45,240	39.00			45,240	39.00
M. Allen Paul:												
Ecuador	Sucre	July 10	July 11	1	444.00	24.00	444.00	24.00			444.00	24.00
Bolivia	Boliviano	July 11	July 13	2	286,875	24.00	593,750	48.00			593,750	48.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	July 14	July 17	3	26,680	23.00	45,240	39.00			45,240	39.00
Total								596.98				596.98

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$596.98

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture.

JANUARY 15, 1965.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Agriculture Subcommittee	Dollar		939.00		840.10		8,689.45		206.95		10,675.50
Defense Subcommittee	do		88.15		83.75		702.60		241.33		1,115.83
Foreign Operations Subcommittee	do		1,188.15		1,275.50		12,654.40		575.85		15,693.90
Independent Offices Subcommittee	do		483.04		217,29		195.92		46.75		943.00
Interior Subcommittee	do		467.50		454.08		1,901.55		164.12		2,987.25
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Subcommittee	do		814.93		636.42		5,963.59		136.37		7,551.31
Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee	do		1,166.20		915.15		6,144.35		310.55		8,536.25
Surveys and investigations staff	do		3,425.86		3,560.39		12,902.42		197.60		20,086.27
Committee total			8,572.83		7,982.68		49,154.28		1,879.52		67,589.31

GEORGE MAHON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

MARCH 3, 1965.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Jamie L. Whitten:											
Mexico	Dollar		23.75		24.50		1.50		4.25		54.00
United States and transportation	do		17.50		20.75		578.90		5.25		622.40
Subtotal			41.25		45.25		580.40		9.50		676.40
Hon. Joseph P. Addabbo:											
Japan	Dollar		61.50		66.50		9.75		11.75		149.50
Hong Kong	do		54.05		60.95		11.75		14.75		141.50
United States and transportation	do				1.50		1800.40		3.50		1805.40
Subtotal			115.55		128.95		1821.90		30.00		2096.40
Hon. Robert H. Michel:											
Japan	Dollar		61.50		65.40		9.25		12.50		148.65
Hong Kong	do		54.05		62.75		12.50		13.20		142.50
Peru	do		60.00		37.50		3.50		9.50		110.50
Argentina	do		56.25		39.75		3.25		10.50		109.75
Brazil	do		57.00		49.00		5.50		9.75		121.25
United States and transportation (includes 1 trip to Far East and 1 trip to Latin America).	do				2.50		2877.30		11.50		2891.30
Subtotal			288.80		256.90		2911.30		66.95		3523.95
Ross P. Pope:											
Japan	Dollar		61.50		63.50		8.50		10.25		143.75
Hong Kong	do		54.05		59.75		11.00		12.75		137.55
Mexico	do		48.00		44.00		6.50		8.50		107.00
Colombia	do		38.60		32.00		6.00		6.50		83.10
Peru	do		60.00		34.50		5.50		14.50		114.50
Argentina	do		53.00		37.00		6.25		7.50		103.75
Brazil	do		57.00		40.00		9.50		10.50		117.00
Trinidad	do		37.50		37.00		4.50		9.50		88.50
United States and transportation (includes 1 trip to Far East, 1 trip to Latin America, and stops at Lexington, Ky.; Amarillo, Tex.; Tempe, Ariz.; Riverside, Calif., en route).	do		83.75		61.25		3,318.10		20.50		3,483.60
Subtotal			493.40		409.00		3,375.85		100.50		4,378.75
Subcommittee total			939.00		840.10		8,689.45		206.95		10,675.50

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Daniel J. Flood:											
Venezuela	Dollar		61.90		12.46				7.20		81.56
United States and at sea	do		26.25		71.29		702.60		234.13		1,034.27
Total			88.15		83.75		702.60		241.33		1,115.83

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Otto E. Passman (includes 1 trip around the world and 1 trip to the Far East):											
Switzerland	Dollar		28.00		30.80		4.00		15.40		78.20
Lebanon	do		24.00		27.10		2.00		16.80		69.90
India	do		22.00		23.75				9.00		54.75
Thailand	do		24.00		51.25		13.00		15.00		103.25
Hong Kong, new territories Hay Ling Chau and Macao.	do		279.00		238.10		64.55		162.80		744.45
Taiwan	do		14.50		8.75						23.25
Okinawa	do		2.00		1.50						3.50
Japan	do		24.00		24.50		5.20		13.50		67.20
United States and transportation	do		42.00		44.00		4,217.50		20.00		4,323.50
Subtotal			459.50		449.75		4,306.25		252.50		5,468.00

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John J. Rhodes:											
Switzerland	Dollar		28.00		51.00		2.00		11.25		92.25
Lebanon	do		24.00		39.50		2.50		15.80		81.80
India	do		22.00		34.25				14.50		70.75
Vietnam	do				41.90		6.00		13.75		61.65
Hong Kong and Macao	do		105.00		123.00		10.80		35.50		274.30
United States and transportation	do				8.50		2,465.00		9.75		2,483.25
Subtotal			179.00		298.15		2,486.30		100.55		3,064.00
Kenneth Sprankle:											
Okinawa	Dollar		2.00		1.50						3.50
Taiwan	do		14.50		7.75						22.25
Hong Kong	do		144.00		112.00		11.00		38.00		305.00
United States and transportation	do				8.50		1,801.50		5.75		1,815.75
Subtotal			160.50		129.75		1,812.50		43.75		2,146.50
Francis G. Merrill (includes 1 trip around the world and 1 trip to the Far East):											
Switzerland	Dollar		24.00		29.00		2.50		12.75		68.25
Lebanon	do		22.00		26.25		1.50		13.50		63.25
India	do		22.00		26.50				14.50		63.00
Thailand	do		22.00		29.70		2.00		22.00		75.70
Hong Kong and Macao	do		249.00		228.00		35.25		87.50		599.75
Taiwan	do		14.50		8.35						22.85
Okinawa	do		2.00		1.50						3.50
Japan	do		20.00		24.25		3.50		9.30		57.05
United States and transportation	do		13.65		24.30		4,004.60		19.50		4,062.05
Subtotal			389.15		397.85		4,049.35		179.05		5,015.40
Subcommittee total			1,188.15		1,275.50		12,654.40		575.85		15,693.90

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Independent Offices, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Albert Thomas:											
Puerto Rico	Dollar		15.95		6.65		2.25		3.35		28.20
Brazil	do		145.52		69.52		79.65		8.76		303.45
Chile	do		32.30		15.73		4.75		2.97		55.75
Peru	do		15.75		8.00		2.35		3.75		29.85
Panama	do		15.50		7.25		2.50		2.25		27.50
United States (transportation furnished by Federal Aviation Agency).	do		16.50		7.00		6.25		2.00		31.75
Subtotal			241.52		114.15		97.75		23.08		476.50
Keith F. Mainland:											
Puerto Rico	Dollar		15.95		5.75		2.25		2.25		26.20
Brazil	do		145.52		65.87		79.65		5.50		296.54
Chile	do		32.30		10.73		3.80		2.75		49.58
Peru	do		15.75		6.80		2.60		2.50		27.65
Panama	do		15.50		7.12		3.37		2.25		28.24
United States (transportation furnished by Federal Aviation Agency).	do		16.50		6.87		6.50		8.42		38.29
Subtotal			241.52		103.14		98.17		23.67		466.50
Total			483.04		217.29		195.92		46.75		943.00

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Michael J. Kirwan: United States and trust territories.	Dollar		226.30		236.93		929.50		82.75		1,475.48
Eugene B. Wilhelm: United States and trust territories.	do		241.20		217.15		972.05		81.37		1,511.77
Total			467.50		454.08		1,901.55		164.12		2,987.25

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary and Related Agencies, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John J. Rooney:											
Brazil	Dollar		42.00		39.25				10.75		92.00
Uruguay	do		31.00		29.50				9.00		69.50
Argentina	do		16.00		21.60				5.25		42.85
Barbados	do				8.50				2.50		11.00
United States and transportation	do						1,531.94				1,531.94
Subtotal			89.00		98.85		1,531.94		27.50		1,747.29
Hon. John M. Slack, Jr:											
Venezuela	Dollar		56.10		36.00				7.50		99.60
Brazil	do		39.75		35.00				6.17		80.92
Argentina	do		54.00		28.60				5.00		87.60
Chile	do		32.14		25.00				2.00		59.14
Peru	do		31.32		23.00				4.20		58.52
United States and transportation	do						966.57				966.57
Subtotal			213.31		147.60		966.57		24.87		1,352.35
Hon. Elford A. Cederberg:											
Venezuela	Dollar		56.10		37.95				5.00		99.05
Brazil	do		39.75		33.07				8.15		80.97
Argentina	do		54.00		30.20				3.00		87.20
Chile	do		32.14		23.83				3.00		58.97
Peru	do		31.32		21.30				10.80		63.42
United States and transportation	do						966.57				966.57
Subtotal			213.31		146.35		966.57		29.95		1,356.18
Hon. Glenard P. Lipscomb:											
Venezuela	Dollar		56.10		37.95				3.50		97.55
Brazil	do		39.75		33.07				7.10		79.92
Argentina	do		54.00		28.70				6.00		88.70
Chile	do		32.14		26.00				5.00		63.14
Peru	do		31.32		22.00				5.20		58.52
United States and transportation	do						966.57				966.57
Subtotal			213.31		147.72		966.57		26.80		1,354.40
Jay B. Howe:											
Brazil	Dollar		40.50		37.50				11.00		89.00
Uruguay	do		29.50		28.65				8.50		66.65
Argentina	do		16.00		22.00				5.50		43.50
Barbados	do				7.75				2.25		10.00
United States and transportation	do						1,531.94				1,531.94
Subtotal			86.00		95.90		1,531.94		27.25		1,741.09
Subcommittee total			814.93		636.42		5,963.59		136.37		7,551.31

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Tom Steed:											
France	Dollar		117.00		94.00				24.50		235.50
Austria	do		24.30		29.00				2.10		55.40
Germany	do		32.00		28.15				2.95		63.10
England	do		83.00		55.50				11.65		150.15
Lebanon	do		80.00		60.00				30.00		170.00
Jordan	do				17.00				3.00		20.00
United Arab Republic	do		20.00		11.50				6.00		37.50
Turkey	do		28.00		24.00				16.00		68.00
Italy	do		50.00		40.00				29.90		119.90
United States and transportation	do						2,303.30				2,303.30
Subtotal			434.30		359.15		2,303.30		126.10		3,222.85
Hon. Silvio O. Conte:											
France	Dollar		36.00		29.50				8.00		73.50
Lebanon	do		82.00		64.20				10.60		156.80
Jordan	do		15.10		12.50				5.00		32.60
Israel	do		40.00		26.00				12.00		78.00
Italy	do		50.00		33.00				15.00		98.00
Portugal	do		39.00		24.60				7.00		70.60
United States and transportation	do						1,481.05				1,481.05
Subtotal			262.10		189.80		1,481.05		57.60		1,990.55
A. A. Gunnels:											
France	Dollar		134.00		92.95				18.30		245.25
Austria	do		24.30		29.00				4.00		57.30
Germany	do		32.00		28.15				6.20		66.35
England	do		83.00		55.50				2.65		141.15
Switzerland	do		12.00		9.50				3.50		25.00
Lebanon	do		82.00		62.00				32.00		176.00
Jordan	do				12.00				3.00		15.00
United Arab Republic	do		20.00		11.00				5.20		36.20
Turkey	do		32.50		26.20				16.00		74.70
Italy	do		50.00		39.90				36.00		125.90
United States and transportation	do						2,360.00				2,360.00
Subtotal			469.80		366.20		2,360.00		126.85		3,322.85
Subcommittee total			1,166.20		915.15		6,144.35		310.55		8,536.25

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Surveys and Investigations Staff, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
William C. Austin:											
Japan	Dollar		35.50		74.50				8.50		118.50
Korea	do		16.00		14.00				2.50		32.50
Hawaii	do		80.00		78.00				10.00		168.00
Round-trip transportation	do						691.25				691.25
Subtotal			131.50		166.50		691.25		21.00		1,010.25
Charles Bolz:											
Japan	Dollar		104.00		125.00				6.50		235.50
Hawaii	do		56.00		43.50				4.50		104.00
Round-trip transportation	do						1,021.00				1,021.00
Subtotal			160.00		168.50		1,021.00		11.00		1,360.50
Francis L. Cashin:											
Panama Canal Zone	Dollar		209.12		209.13		23.40				441.65
Transportation	do						92.34				92.34
Subtotal			209.12		209.13		115.74				533.99
P. J. Collinet:											
Germany	Dollar		112.00		128.00		12.92				252.92
Netherlands	do		9.00		7.00				1.15		17.15
England	do		48.00		20.00				1.05		69.05
Round-trip transportation	do						518.20				518.20
Subtotal			169.00		155.00		531.12		2.20		857.32
Leo E. Conroy:											
Germany	Dollar		64.00		64.75				2.50		131.25
France	do		64.00		74.20				7.55		145.75
Belgium	do		8.00		9.00				1.50		18.50
England	do		24.00		20.75				1.00		45.75
Round-trip transportation	do						510.60				510.60
Subtotal			160.00		168.70		510.60		12.55		851.85
Joseph F. Cunningham:											
Panama Canal Zone	Dollar		209.12		209.13		19.05				437.30
Transportation	do						71.65				71.65
Subtotal			209.12		209.13		90.70				508.95
Herbert C. Duffy:											
Japan	Dollar		104.00		125.75		1.25		5.75		236.75
Hawaii	do		56.00		44.00				3.00		103.00
Round-trip transportation	do						1,021.00				1,021.00
Subtotal			160.00		169.75		1,022.25		8.75		1,360.75
Robert M. Franklin:											
Panama Canal Zone	Dollar		213.12		213.13		45.73		6.10		478.08
Transportation	do						81.55				81.55
Subtotal			213.12		213.13		127.28		6.10		559.63
R. C. Halstead:											
Japan	Dollar		35.00		77.25						112.29
Korea	do		15.00		17.50						32.50
Hawaii	do		75.00		85.25						160.25
Germany	do		131.85		89.50		10.80		1.55		233.70
Netherlands	do		11.00		6.20				1.20		18.40
England	do		32.00		14.75						46.75
Round-trip transportation	do						1,230.52				1,230.52
Subtotal			299.85		290.45		1,241.32		2.75		1,834.37
Walter B. Hunter:											
Panama Canal Zone	Dollar		204.00		204.00		22.56				430.56
Transportation	do						86.89				86.89
Subtotal			204.00		204.00		109.45				517.45
E. Huyett Magee:											
Japan	Dollar		104.00		127.00		1.25		4.50		236.75
Hawaii	do		56.00		45.00				3.00		104.00
Round-trip transportation	do						1,021.00				1,021.00
Subtotal			160.00		172.00		1,022.25		7.50		1,361.75
John R. Moore:											
Japan	Dollar		152.00		135.00		6.00				293.00
Hawaii	do		12.00		11.00		1.00				24.00
Germany	do		64.00		67.25						131.25
France	do		64.00		78.00				1.00		143.00
Belgium	do		8.00		9.00				.50		17.50
England	do		24.00		22.75				1.00		47.75
Round-trip transportation	do						1,531.60				1,531.60
Subtotal			324.00		323.00		1,538.60		2.50		2,188.10
Peter J. Murphy, Jr.:											
Germany	Dollar		131.85		91.05		4.60				227.50
Netherlands	do		11.00		6.35				1.15		18.50
England	do		53.30		24.95				1.10		79.35
Round-trip transportation	do						518.20				518.20
Subtotal			196.15		122.35		522.80		2.25		843.55

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Surveys and Investigations Staff, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James V. Sullivan:											
Japan	Dollar		35.00		65.00				18.50		118.50
Korea	do		15.00		14.00				3.50		32.50
Hawaii	do		75.00		80.00				13.00		168.00
Round-trip transportation	do						711.32				711.32
Subtotal			125.00		159.00		711.32		35.00		1,030.32
R. Scott Tyree:											
Japan	Dollar		104.00		106.75		1.25		10.50		222.50
Hawaii	do		56.00		44.00				4.00		104.00
Round-trip transportation	do						1,021.00				1,021.00
Subtotal			160.00		150.75		1,022.25		14.50		1,347.50
Severin F. Ulmer:											
Japan	Dollar		35.00		71.50				10.50		117.00
Korea	do		14.00		17.00				2.00		33.00
Hawaii	do		85.00		72.50				12.00		169.50
Round-trip transportation	do						691.25				691.25
Subtotal			134.00		161.00		691.25		24.50		1,010.75
Robert L. Van Wagoner:											
Japan	Dollar		35.00		75.00				8.50		118.50
Korea	do		15.00		16.00				1.50		32.50
Hawaii	do		75.00		83.00				10.00		168.00
Round-trip transportation	do						711.32				711.32
Subtotal			125.00		174.00		711.32		20.00		1,030.32
Harry Wood:											
Japan	Dollar		35.00		69.50				14.00		118.50
Korea	do		16.00		14.50				2.00		32.50
Hawaii	do		75.00		83.00				8.50		166.50
Round-trip transportation	do						711.32				711.32
Subtotal			126.00		167.00		711.32		24.50		1,028.82
Harvey C. Wright:											
Germany	Dollar		64.00		67.25						131.25
France	do		64.00		78.00				1.00		143.00
Belgium	do		8.00		9.00				.50		17.50
England	do		24.00		22.75				1.00		47.75
Round-trip transportation	do						510.60				510.60
Subtotal			160.00		177.00		510.60		2.50		850.10
Grand total			3,425.86		3,560.39		12,902.42		197.60		20,086.27

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 84, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Frank J. Becker:												
France	Franc	Mar. 26	Mar. 28	2	294	60.00	294	60.00			294	60.00
Spain	Peseta	Mar. 28	Mar. 31	3½	4,820	80.50	4,820	80.50			4,820	80.50
Germany (appropriated funds)	U.S. dollar [1]	Mar. 31	Apr. 1	1		23.00		[1] 4.00				[1] 4.00
England	Pound	Apr. 1	Apr. 6	5½	53-1-0	148.50	53-1-0	148.50			53-1-0	148.50
Holland (transportation to Europe and return):	Guilder								3,402.33	944.30	3,402.33	944.30
Counterpart funds								289.00		944.30		1,233.30
Appropriated funds (Air Force)								4.00				4.00
James A. Byrne:												
Spain	Peseta	Nov. 24	Dec. 2	8	22,400	400.00	13,441	231.74			13,441	231.74
Germany:												
Counterpart funds	Deutsche mark	Dec. 2	Dec. 7	6	1,200	300.00	560	140.00			560	140.00
Appropriated funds	U.S. dollar							[1] 31.00				[1] 31.00
Italy	Lira	Dec. 8	Dec. 12	4	125,000	200.00	10,875	17.40			10,875	17.40
Morocco	Dirham	Dec. 15	Dec. 15	1	250	50.00	115.36	23.00			115.36	23.00
United States (transportation to Europe and return):	U.S. dollar									1,129.12		1,129.12
Counterpart funds								412.14				412.14
Appropriated funds (Army).								31.00		1,129.12		1,160.12

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 84, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Jeffery Cohelan:												
England	Pound	Jan. 3	Jan. 10	8	72-8-0	216.00	44-14-10	125.28	6-16-9	19.14	51-11-7	144.42
United States (transportation to England and return).	Dollar									471.30		471.30
Counterpart funds								125.28		19.14		144.42
Appropriated funds (Air Force).										471.30		471.30
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 14	Nov. 18	4	1,800	200.00	874.25	97.15			874.25	97.15
Israel	Pound	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	2	260	87.00	260	87.00			260	87.00
Iran	Rial	Nov. 20	Nov. 22	2	6,375	85.00	4,575	61.00			4,575	61.00
Pakistan	Rupee	Nov. 22	Nov. 26	4	543.81	112.99	346.81	72.06			346.81	72.06
India	do	Nov. 26	Nov. 29	3	714.75	150.00	474.75	99.48			474.75	99.48
Thailand	Baht	Nov. 29	Dec. 2	4	3,097.50	150.00	3,097.50	150.00			3,097.50	150.00
Philippines	Peso	Dec. 2	Dec. 6	4	975	250.00	750	192.30			750	192.30
Hong Kong	Dollar	Dec. 6	Dec. 9	3	1,149.50	200.00	1,051.63	182.97			1,051.63	182.97
Japan	Yen	Dec. 10	Dec. 12	2	54,000	150.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
United States (transportation to Japan and return).	Dollar									2,353.75		2,353.75
Counterpart funds						1,384.99		1,091.96				1,091.96
Appropriated funds (Navy).										2,353.75		2,353.75
Hon. O. C. Fisher:												
Antarctica [2]												
New Zealand [2]												
Philip W. Kelleher:												
France	Franc	Apr 30	May 4	5	735	150.00	735	150.00			735	150.00
United States (transportation to Europe and return).	Dollar									160.00		160.00
Counterpart funds						150.00		150.00				150.00
Appropriated funds (Air Force).										160.00		160.00
Philip W. Kelleher:												
Greece	Drachma	Oct. 17	Oct. 20	3	4,500	150.00	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00
Turkey	Piaster	Oct. 20	Oct. 22	2	900	100.00	900	100.00			900	100.00
Lebanon	Pound	Oct. 22	Oct. 24	3	457.5	150.00	380.3	124.36			380.3	124.36
Jordan	Dinar	Oct. 24	Oct. 25	1	17.85	50.00	14.28	40.00	3.57	10.00	17.85	50.00
Israel	Pound	Oct. 25	Oct. 26	1	150	50.00	150	50.00			150	50.00
Germany (transportation to Europe and return).	Mark								5,302.80	1,334.37	5,302.80	1,334.37
Clarence D. Long:												
Japan	Yen	Dec. 5	Dec. 9	4	7,200	200.00	7,200	200.00			7,200	200.00
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	Dec. 10	Dec. 11	1	2,000	50.00	2,000	50.00			2,000	50.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 11	Dec. 13	2	576	100.00	576	100.00			576	100.00
Philippines	Peso	Dec. 13	Dec. 14	1	445	50.00	445	50.00			445	50.00
Kong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 14	Dec. 15	1	288	50.00	288	50.00			288	50.00
Germany (transportation to Japan and return).	Mark								7,079.68	1,781.50	7,079.68	1,781.50
Hon. Walter Norblad: Puerto Rico (appropriated funds, Navy).	U.S. dollar	Jan. 9	Jan. 17							60.75		60.75
Hon. Alvin E. O'Konski:												
Japan	Yen	Dec. 11	Dec. 15	5	90,000	250.00	28,800	80.00			28,800	80.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar	Dec. 16	Dec. 20	5	1,440	250.00	766.08	133.00			766.08	133.00
Taipei	New Taiwan dollar	Dec. 21	Dec. 23	2	4,000	100.00	840	21.00			840	21.00
Japan	Yen	Dec. 24	Dec. 25	2	36,000	100.00	7,200	20.00			7,200	20.00
Holland (transportation to Japan and return).	Guilder								3,881.66	1,075.55	3,881.66	1,075.55
Hon. Philip J. Philbin:												
France (transportation to Europe).	Franc								4,078.66	416.20	4,078.66	416.20
England	Pound	Sep. 4	Sep. 10	7	67-7-3	189.00	67-7-3	189.00			67-17-3	189.00
Germany	Mark	Sep. 10	Sep. 13	3	288	72.00	288	72.00			288	72.00
United States (transportation from Europe to United States).	Dollar									111.27		111.27
Counterpart funds								261.00		416.20		677.20
Appropriated funds (Air Force).										111.27		111.27
Alexander Pirnie:												
Italy	Lira	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	62,500	100.00	62,500	100.00			62,500	100.00
England	Pound	Dec. 9	Dec. 12	3	53-14-0	150.00	43-2-2	121.68			43-2-2	121.68
France	Franc	Dec. 12	Dec. 15	3	720	150.00	522	107.53			522	107.53
Germany	Mark	Dec. 15	Dec. 18	3	600	150.00	170	42.93			170	42.93
Germany (transportation to Europe and return).	do								4,022.5	1,015.70	4,022.5	1,015.70
L. Mendel Rivers:												
Spain	Peseta	Mar. 25	Mar. 28	3½	4,640	77.50	4,550.10	76.00	19,75.81	33.00	6,526	109.00
Germany	Mark	Mar. 28	Mar. 21	3	276.00	69.00	192	48.00	84	21.00	276	69.00
France	Franc	Mar. 31	Apr. 1	1	127.00	30.00	126.50	29.50	69.22	16.00	195.72	45.50
Italy	Lira	Apr. 1	Apr. 3	2	34,884	56.00	34,884	56.00	17,442	28.00	52,325	84.00
Switzerland	Franc	Apr. 3	Apr. 5	3	363.15	84.00	293.93	68.00	127.50	30.50	421.43	98.50
United States (transportation to Europe and return).	Dollar									222.53		222.53
Counterpart funds								277.50		128.50		406.00
Appropriated funds (Air Force).										222.53		222.53

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 84, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
L. Mendel Rivers:												
France (transportation to Europe).	Franc								4,078.66	416.20	4,078.66	416.20
England	Pound	Sept. 4	Sept. 10	7	67-17-3	189.00	67-17-3	189.00			67-17-3	189.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	Sept. 10	Sept. 13	3	288	72.00	288	72.00			288	72.00
United States (transportation from Europe to the United States).	Dollar									111.27		111.27
Counterpart funds								261.00		416.20		677.20
Appropriated funds (Air Force).										111.27		111.27
Spain [2]	Peseta	Oct. 22	Oct. 27	6	17,958	300.00						
Germany	Deutsche mark	Oct. 28	Nov. 1	5	1,000	250.00	1,000	250.00	200	50.00	1,200	300.00
United States (transportation from Europe to the United States).	Dollar									111.27		111.27
Counterpart funds								250.00		50.00		300.00
Appropriated funds (Air Force).										111.27		111.27
Frank M. Slatinshek:												
England	Pound	Oct. 15	Oct. 17	2½	44-15-8	125.00	28-18-4	80.51			28-18-4	80.51
Denmark	Kroner	Oct. 17	Oct. 18	1½	518.25	75.00	380.46	55.06			380.46	55.06
Germany	Deutsche mark	Oct. 18	Oct. 21	3	595.50	150.00	325.54	82.00			325.54	82.00
Greece	Drachma	Oct. 21	Oct. 23	2	3,000	100.00	3,000	100.00			3,000	100.00
Italy	Lira	Oct. 23	Oct. 25	3	93,750	150.00	73,750	118.00			73,750	118.00
Spain	Peseta	Oct. 25	Oct. 28	2	8,979	150.00	4,489.5	75.00			4,489.5	75.00
Germany (transportation to Europe and return).	Deutsche mark								4,624.80	1,163.76	4,624.81	1,163.76
Total						7,351.49		5,203.95		13,086.48		18,290.43

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$13,524.17
Appropriated funds, Government department:	
Department of Army	1,160.12
Department of Navy	2,414.50
Department of Air Force	1,191.64
Total	18,290.43

MARCH 1, 1965.

MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

[1] Funds expended at military installations where local currencies were not acceptable.
[2] No expense to the government.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 55, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Thomas E. Morgan:												
France	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 18	8	245	50	1,920	400	185	37.75	1,957.75	437.75
England	Pound	Nov. 18	Nov. 23	5	17.16.6	50	89.8	250			89.8	250.00
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 24	Nov. 26	3	1,500	50	4,500	150			4,500	150.00
Turkey	Lire	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	3	450	50	1,050	150			1,050	150.00
Total												987.75
Hon. Wayne L. Hays: Bermuda	Pound	Feb. 9	Feb. 16	8	12	33.50	96.19	268.76			961.9	268.76
Hon. Lindley Beckworth:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 21	Nov. 25	5	17.16.6	50.00	90.0.0	250.00	46.3.0	129.20	136.3.0	379.20
U.S.S.R	do	Nov. 25	Nov. 28	3	17.16.6	50.00	54.0.0	150.00			54.0.0	150.00
Do	Austrian schilling.								901.25	35.00	901.25	35.00
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	Nov. 28	Dec. 1	3	717.5	50.00	2,152.5	150.00	1,519	105.85	3,671.5	255.85
Austria	Austrian schilling.	Dec. 1	Dec. 3	3	1,300	50.00	3,875	150.55	13,119.2	508.22	16,994.2	658.77
Total								700.55		778.27		1,478.82
Hon. Harris B. McDowell:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 21	Nov. 25	5	17.16.6	50.00	90.0.0	250.00	46.3.0	129.20	136.3.0	379.20
U.S.S.R	do	Nov. 25	Nov. 28	3	17.16.6	50.00	54.0.0	150.00			54.0.0	150.00
Do	Austrian schilling.								901.25	35.00	901.25	35.00
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	Nov. 28	Dec. 1	3	717.5	50.00	2,152.5	150.00	1,519	105.85	3,671.5	255.85
Austria	Austrian schilling.	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	1	1,300	50.00	1,300	50.00	426.2	16.50	1,726.2	66.50
Hungary	Forint	Dec. 2	Dec. 3	1	2,400	50.00	2,400	50.00	1,453	30.25	3,853	80.25
Greece	Drachma	Dec. 3	Dec. 7	4	1,500	50.00	6,000	200.00	1,772	59.06	7,772	259.06
Italy	Lira	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	31,050	50.00	62,100	100.00	48.835	78.12	110,935	178.12
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	2	2,993	50.00	8,979	150.00	4,879.3	81.32	13,858	231.32
Portugal	Escudo	Dec. 11	Dec. 13	2	1,435	50.00	1,435	50.00	1,878	65.41	3,313	115.41
Total								1,150.00		600.71		1,750.71

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 55, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. William T. Murphy:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 21	Nov. 25	5	17.16.6	50.00	90.0.0	250.00	46.3.0	129.20	136.3.0	379.20
U.SS.R	do	Nov. 25	Nov. 28	3	17.16.6	50.00	54.0.0	150.00			54.0.0	150.00
Do	Austrian schilling.								901.25	35.00	901.25	35.00
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	Nov. 28	Dec. 1	3	717.5	50.00	2,152.5	150.00	1,519	105.85	3,671.5	255.85
Austria	Schilling	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	1	1,300	50.00	1,300	50.00	426.2	16.50	1,726.2	66.50
Hungary	Florint	Dec. 2	Dec. 3	1	2,400	50.00	2,400	50.00	1,453	30.25	3,853	80.25
Greece	Drachma	Dec. 3	Dec. 7	4	1,500	50.00	6,000	200.00	1,772	59.06	7,772	259.06
Italy	Lira	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	31,050	50.00	62,100	100.00	48,835	78.12	110,935	178.12
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	2	2,993	50.00	8,979	150.00	4,879.3	81.32	13,858	231.32
Portugal	Escudo	Dec. 11	Dec. 13	2	1,435	50.00	1,435	50.00	1,878	65.41	3,313	115.41
Total								1,150.00		600.71		1,750.71
Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher:												
Switzerland	Franc	Apr. 23	Apr. 25	2	120.71	28.00	241.42	56.00			241.42	56.00
Italy	Lira	Apr. 25	Apr. 29	4	17,433	28.00	69,733	112.00			69,733	112.00
France	Franc	Apr. 29	Apr. 30	1	147	30.00	147	30.00	5,119.52	1,044.80	5,266.52	1,074.80
Spain	Peseta	Apr. 30	May 1	2	1,377	23.00	3,754	46.00			2,754	46.00
Philippines	Peso	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	2	195	50.07	390	100.14			390	100.14
Vietnam	do	Dec. 4	Dec. 5	1	195	50.07	195	50.07			195	50.07
Thailand	Baht	Dec. 5	Dec. 6	1	1,032.5	50.00	1,032.5	50.00	516.25	25.00	1,548.75	75.00
Vietnam	do	Dec. 7	Dec. 13	7	1,032.5	50.00	1,032.5	50.00			1,032.5	50.00
Do	Piaster				3,639	50.00	10,916	150.00			10,916	150.00
Do	Yen				18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Do	Hong Kong dollar.				287.38	49.89	287.38	49.89			287.38	49.89
Korea	Hwan	Dec. 13	Dec. 15	3	12,725	49.90	24,180	94.82			24,180	94.82
Do	Hong Kong dollar.				287.38	49.89	287.38	49.89			287.38	49.89
Hong Kong	do	Dec. 16	Dec. 17	1	287.38	49.90	207.37	36.01	85.08	14.77	292.45	50.78
Japan	Yen	Dec. 17	Dec. 19	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Germany									8,277.60	2,069.40	8,277.60	2,069.40
Total								1,074.82		3,153.97		4,228.79
Hon. John S. Monagan:												
Netherlands	Guilder	June 15	June 15	1	90.00	24.00	90.00	24.00			90.00	24.00
Switzerland	Franc	June 15	June 18	3	120.72	28.00	362.17	84.00			362.17	84.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	June 18	June 19	2	95.00	24.00	10	48.00	3320.63	835.80	3510.63	883.80
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 21	Nov. 25	5	17.16.6	50.00	90.0.0	250.00	46.3.0	129.20	136.3.0	379.20
U.S.S.R	do	Nov. 25	Nov. 28	3	17.16.6	50.00	54.0.0	150.00			54.0.0	150.00
Do	Austrian schilling.								901.25	35.00	901.25	35.00
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	Nov. 28	Dec. 1	3	717.5	50.00	2,152.5	150.00	1,519	105.85	3,671.5	255.85
Austria	Schilling	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	1	1,300	50.00	1,300	50.00	426.2	16.50	1,726.2	66.50
Hungary	Forint	Dec. 2	Dec. 3	1	2,400	50.00	2,400	50.00	1,453	30.25	3,853	80.25
Greece	Drachma	Dec. 3	Dec. 7	4	1,500	50.00	6,000	200.00	1,772	59.06	7,772	259.06
Italy	Lira	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	31,050	50.00	62,100	100.00	48,835	78.12	110,935	178.12
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	2	2,993	50.00	8,979	150,00	4,879.3	81.32	13,858	231.32
Portugal	Escudo	Dec. 11	Dec. 13	2	1,435	50.00	1,435	50.00	1,878	65.41	3,313	115.41
Total								1,306.00		1,436.51		2,742.51
Hon. Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 21	Nov. 25	5	17.16.7	50.00	90.0.0	250.00			90.0.0	250.00
U.S.S.R	do	Nov. 25	Nov. 28	3	17.16.6	50.00	54.0.0	150.00			54.0.0	150.00
Do	Austrian schilling.								901.25	35.00	901.25	35.00
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	Nov. 28	Dec. 1	3	717.5	50.00	2,152.5	150.00	1,519	105.85	3,671.5	255.85
Austria	Schilling	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	1	1,300	50.00	1,300	50.00	426.2	16.50	1,726.2	66.50
Hungary	Forint	Dec. 2	Dec. 3	1	2,400	50.00	2,400	50.00	1,453	30.25	3,853	80.25
Greece	Drachma	Dec. 3	Dec. 7	4	1,500	50.00	6,000	200.00	1,772	59.06	7,772	259.06
Total								750.00		246.66		996.66
Hon. Robert R. Barry:												
England	Pound	Nov. 14	Nov. 16	3	17.17.3	50.00	53.17.8	150.01			53.17.8	150.01
France	Franc	Nov. 17	Nov. 20	4	245	50.00	980	200.00	117.35	23.95	1,097.35	223.95
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 21	Nov. 22	2	200	50.30	400	100.65	3,391.87	853.30	3,791.87	953.95
Spain	Peseta	Nov. 23	Nov. 24	1	2,993.50	49.98	2,993.50	49.98			2,993.50	49.98
Total								500.64		877.25		1,377.89
Hon. J. Irving Whalley:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 21	Nov. 25	5	17.16.6	50.00	90.0.0	250.00	46.3.0	129.20	136.3.0	379.20
U.S.S.R	do	Nov. 25	Nov. 28	3	17.16.6	50.00	54.0.0	150.00			54.0.0	150.00
Do	Austrian schilling.								901.25	35.00	901.25	35.00
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	Nov. 28	Dec. 1	3	717.5	50.00	2,152.5	150.00	1,519	105.85	3,671.5	255.85
Austria	Schilling	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	1	1,300	50.00	1,300	50.00	426.2	16.50	1,726.2	66.50
Hungary	Forint	Dec. 2	Dec. 3	1	2,400	50.00	2,400	50.00	1,453	30.25	3,853	80.25
Greece	Drachma	Dec. 3	Dec. 7	4	1,500	50.00	6,000	200.00	1,772	59.06	7,772	259.06
Italy	Lira	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	31,050	50.00	62,100	100.00	48,835	78.12	100,935	178.12
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	2	2,993	50.00	8,979	150.00	4,879.3	81.32	13,858	231.32
Portugal	Escudo	Dec. 11	Dec. 13	2	1,435	50.00	1,435	50.00	1,878	65.41	3,313	115.41
Total								1,150.00		600.71		1,750.71

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 55, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. E. Y. Berry:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 21	Nov. 25	5	17.16.6	50.00	90.0.0	250.00	46.3.0	129.20	136.3.0	379.20
U.S.S.R.	do	Nov. 25	Nov. 28	3	17.16.6	50.00	54.0.0	150.00			54.0.0	150.00
Do	Austrian schilling.								901.25	35.00	901.25	35.00
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	Nov. 28	Dec. 1	3	717.5	50.00	2,152.5	150.00	1,519	105.85	3,671.5	255.85
Austria	Schilling	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	1	1,300.0	50.00	1,300	50.00	426.2	16.50	1,726.2	66.50
Hungary	Forint	Dec. 2	Dec. 3	1	2,400.0	50.00	2,400	50.00	1,453	30.25	3,853	80.25
Greece	Drachma	Dec. 3	Dec. 7	4	1,500.0	50.00	6,000	200.00	1,772	59.06	7,772	259.06
Italy	Lira	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	31,050.0	50.00	62,100	100.00	48,835	78.12	110,935	178.12
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	2	2,993.0	50.00	8,979	150.00	4,879.3	81.32	13,858	231.32
Portugal	Escudo	Dec. 11	Dec. 13	2	1,435.0	50.00	1,435	50.00	1,878	65.41	3,313	115.41
Total								1,150.00		600.71		1,750.71
Boyd Crawford: Bermuda	Pound	Feb. 9	Feb. 16	8	12	33.50	96.19	268.76			96.19	268.76

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 55, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Programs, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Roy J. Bullock:												
Brazil	Cruzeiro	Aug. 1	Aug. 28	10	1,560	23.00	358,800	230.00	286,270	246.80	1,367,410	1,000.80
				18	1,378	28.00	722,340	524.00				
Peru	Sol	Aug. 28	Sept. 17	20	670	25.00	13,400	500.00	585.60	21.85	13,985.60	521.85
Panama	U.S. dollar	Sept. 17	Sept. 19	2		28.00		56.00				56.00
United States	Dollar	Sept. 19	July 31	1		16.00		16.00		14.25		30.25
Germany	Deutsche mark								4,011.20	1,009.36	4,011.20	1,009.36
Total								1,326.00		1,292.26		2,618.26

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$2,532.01
Appropriated funds: H.Res. 590, 88th Cong	86.25
Total	2,618.26

ROY J. BULLOCK,
Senior Staff Consultant, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 55, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Programs, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert F. Brandt:												
United States	U.S. dollar	Mar. 1	Jan. 31	1		16.00		16.00		47.22		63.22
Netherlands	Guilder								3,419.09	947.78	3,419.09	947.78
Nigeria	Pound	Feb. 1	Feb. 27	27	11-0-0	31.00	297-4-0	837.00	52-19-0	148.97	350-3-0	985.97
Liberia	U.S. dollar	Feb. 27	Mar. 1	3		39.00		117.00				117.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	Aug. 1	Aug. 28	10	1,560	23.00	358,800	230.00	267,700	230.77	1,348,840	984.77
				18	1,378	28.00	722,340	524.00				
Peru	Sol	Aug. 28	Sept. 17	20	670	25.00	13,400	500.00	2,273.60	84.83	16,673.60	584.83
Panama	U.S. dollar	Sept. 17	Sept. 19	2		28.00		56.00				56.00
United States	do	Sept. 19	July 31	1		16.00		16.00		16.25		32.25
Germany	Deutsche mark								4,011.20	1,009.36	4,011.20	1,009.36
Total								2,296.00		2,485.18		4,781.18

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$4,512.71
Appropriated funds: H. Res. 590, 88th Cong., 2d sess	268.47
Total	4,781.18

ROBERT F. BRANDT,
Staff Consultant, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 55, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Programs, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Harry C. Cromer:												
United States	U.S. dollar	Mar. 1	Jan. 31	1		16.00		16.00		48.72		64.72
Netherlands	Guilder								3,390.09	941.39	3,390.09	941.39
Nigeria	Pound	Feb. 1	Feb. 25	25	11-0-0	31.00	275-4-0	775.00	81-11-0	229.43	356-15-0	1,004.43
Liberia	U.S. dollar	Feb. 25	Mar. —	5		39.00		195.00				195.00
Panama	do	Sept. 17	Sept. 19	2		28.00		56.00				56.00
United States	do	Sept. 19	July 31	1		16.00		16.00		25.25		41.25
Germany	Deutsche mark								4,107.20	1,033.52	4,107.20	1,033.52
Brazil	Cruzeiro	Aug. 1	Aug. 28	10	1,560	23.00	358,800	230.00	286,390	246.88	1,367,530	1,000.88
				18	1,378	28.00	722,340	524.00				
Peru	Sol	Aug. 28	Sept. 17	20	670	25.00	13,400	500.00	4,399.60	164.12	17,799.60	664.12
Total								2,312.00		2,689.31		5,001.31

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$4,644.34
Appropriated funds: H. Res. 590, 88th Cong. 2d sess	356.97
Total	5,001.31

HARRY C. CROMER,
Staff Consultant, Foreign Affairs.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 55, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Phillip B. Billings:												
Iceland	Deutsche mark	July 12	July 14	3					1,855.60	467.05	1,855.60	467.05
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 24	Nov. 26	3	1,500	50	4,500	150			4,500	150.00
Total								150		467.05		617.05

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 55, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Europe, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Marian A. Czarnecki:												
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 25	Nov. 21	5	17.16.6	50	90-0-0	250	46.3.0	129.20	136-3-0	379.20
U.S.S.R.	do	Nov. 25	Nov. 28	3	17.16.6	50	54-0-0	150			54-0-0	150.00
Do	Austrian schilling.								901.25	35.00	901.25	35.00
Czechoslovakia	Krona	Nov. 28	Dec. 1	3	717.5	50	2,152.5	150	1,519	105.85	3,671.5	255.85
Austria	Schilling	Dec. 1	Dec. 2	1	1,300	50	1,300	50	426.2	16.50	1,726.2	66.50
Hungary	Forint	Dec. 2	Dec. 3	1	2,400	50	2,400	50	1,453	30.25	3,853	80.25
Greece	Drachma	Dec. 3	Dec. 7	4	1,500	50	6,000	200	1,772	59.06	7,772	259.06
Italy	Lira	Dec. 7	Dec. 9	2	31,050	50	62,100	100	48,835	78.12	110,935	178.12
Spain	Peseta	Dec. 9	Dec. 11	2	2,993	50	8,979	150	4,879.3	81.32	13,858	231.32
Portugal	Escudo	Dec. 11	Dec. 13	2	1,435	50	1,435	50	1,878	65.41	3,313	115.41
Total				23				1,150		600.71		1,750.71

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 81, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Full committee:	
Hon. William S. Moorhead, Jan. 10-13	$85.60
Mrs. C. R. Davis, Dec. 8-23	2,529.44
James A. Lanigan, Dec. 8-23	2,532.93
Vincent J. Augliere, Dec. 8-23	2,530.62
Miss Dolores L. Fel'Dotto, Dec. 8-23	2,544.42
Subtotal	10,223.01
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. William L. Dawson, chairman:	
Hon. Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Nov. 12-22	543.00
Total	10,766.01

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

FEBRUARY 26, 1965.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 81, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
William S. Moorhead: England	Pound	Jan. 10	Jan. 13	4		27		108	(1)	(1)	(2)	85.60

[1] None paid for out of counterpart funds.

[2] Returned $22.40 (£8).

JANUARY 21, 1964.

WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
Committee on Government Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 81, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Returned	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Christine Ray Davis:												
Japan	Yen	Dec. 8	Dec. 11	4		50.00		200.00				
Returned to Embassy representative.											55.56	144.44
China	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 11	Dec. 14	4		50.00		199.57				199.57
Austria	Schilling	Dec. 15	Dec. 16	2		48.57		97.13		61.12		158.25
Poland	Zloty	Dec. 18	Dec. 19	1		26.00		26.00				
Returned to Embassy representative.											20.82	5.18
France	Franc	Dec. 19	Dec. 23	5		50.00		250.00				250.00
Round-trip transportation from Honolulu, Hawaii, returning to the District of Columbia, furnished by State Department.										1,772.00		1,772.00
Total								772.70		1,833.12	76.38	2,529.44

FEBRUARY 26, 1965.

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 81, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James A. Lanigan:												
Japan	Yen	Dec. 8	Dec. 11	4		50.00		200.00				
Returned to embassy representative.											50.00	150.00
China	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 11	Dec. 13	3		50.00		149.68				149.68
Pakistan	Rupee	Dec. 14	Dec. 15	1		32.00		32.00				32.00
Austria	Schilling	Dec. 15	Dec. 16	2		48.57		97.13		61.12		158.25
Poland	Zloty	Dec. 18	Dec. 19	1		26.00		26.00				
Returned to embassy representative.											5.00	21.00
France	Franc	Dec. 19	Dec. 23	5		50.00		250.00				250.00
Round-trip transportation from Honolulu, Hawaii, returning to the District of Columbia, furnished by State Department.										1,772.00		1,772.00
Total								754.81		1,833.12	55.00	2,532.93

FEBRUARY 26, 1965.

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 81, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Vincent Augliere:												
Japan	Yen	Dec. 8	Dec. 11	4		50.00		200.00				
Returned to Embassy representative.											55.56	144.44
China	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 11	Dec. 13	3		50.00		149.68		2.60		152.28
Pakistan	Rupee	Dec. 14	Dec. 15	1		31.99		31.99				31.99
Austria	Schilling	Dec. 15	Dec. 16	2		48.57		97.13		8.16 61.12		166.41
Poland	Zloty	Dec. 18	Dec. 19	1		26.00		26.00				
Returned to Embassy representative.											12.50	13.50
France	Franc	Dec. 19	Dec. 23	5		50.00		250.00				250.00
Round-trip transportation from Honolulu, Hawaii, returning to the District of Columbia, furnished by State Department.										1,772.00		1,772.00
Total								754.80		1,843.88	68.06	2,530.62

FEBRUARY 26, 1965.

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 81, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Dolores L. Fel'Dotto:												
Japan	Yen	Dec. 8	Dec. 11	4		50.00		200.00				
Returned to Embassy representative.											55.56	144.44
China	Hong Kong dollar.	Dec. 11	Dec. 14	4		50.00		199.57				199.57
Austria	Schilling	Dec. 15	Dec. 16	2		48.57		97.13		61.12		158.25
Poland	Zloty	Dec. 18	Dec. 19	1		26.00		26.00				
Returned to Embassy representative.											5.84	20.16
France	Franc	Dec. 19	Dec. 23	5		50.00		250.00				250.00
Round-trip transportation from Honolulu, Hawaii, returning to the District of Columbia, furnished by State Department.										1,772.00		1,772.00
Total								772.70		1,833.12	61.40	2,544.42

FEBRUARY 26, 1965.

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, *Member of Congress, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, between Nov. 12 and Nov. 22, 1964*

Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
France [1]	Franc	600	120.00	594	118.80	248	49.60	273	54.60	1,715	343.00
Italy	Lira	52,500	84.00	45,000	72.00	17,500	28.00	10,000	16.00	125,000	200.00
Total			204.00		190.80		77.60		70.60		543.00

[1] Transportation from Washington to Paris and from Paris to Washington furnished by U.S. Air Force plane flying delegates to and from NATO Conference.

NOTE.—5 francs equal $1; 625 lire equal $1.

DECEMBER 29, 1964.

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
Member, Committee on Government Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 606, 2d sess., 88th Cong., Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Emanuel Celler:												
Germany	Deutsche mark								3,312.80	833.42	3,312.80	833.42
Switzerland	Swiss franc			5	120.73	28.00	603.61	139.69			603.61	139.69
Peter W. Rodino, Jr.:												
Germany	Deutsche mark								3,371.28	848.21	3,371.28	848.21
France	Franc			1	147	30.00	147	30.00			147	30.00
Switzerland	Swiss franc			11	120.73	30.00	1,328.03	307.34	308	71.28	1,636.03	378.62
Garner E. Shriver:												
Germany	Deutsche mark								3,250.00	817.62	3,250	817.62
France	Franc			4	147	30.00	588	120.00			588	120.00
Switzerland	Swiss franc			5	120.73	28.00	603.61	139.69			603.61	139.69
Walter M. Besterman:												
Germany	Deutsche mark								3,313.20	833.26	3,313.20	833.26
Switzerland	Swiss franc			20	126.76	28.00	2,535.20	586.72			2,535.20	586.72
Garner J. Cline:												
Germany	Deutsche mark								3,281.64	825.57	3,281.64	825.57
France	Franc			4	127	30.00	588	120.00			588	120.00
Switzerland	Swiss franc			11	120.73	28.00	1,328.03	07.34	208	71.28	1,636.03	378.62
Total								1,750.78		4,300.64		6,051.42

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Hon. FRANK CHELF, *Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, between Nov. 10 and Nov. 19, 1964*

Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Netherlands	Guilder					2,987.48	832.40			2,987.48	832.40
France	Franc	620.54	126.64	695.60	141.96	227.36	46.40	171.50	35.00	1,715	350.00
Switzerland	Swiss franc	137.32	31.88	334.08	77.34	110	25.50	64.60	14.96	646	149.68
Total			158.52		219.30		904.30		49.96		1,332.08

FRANK CHELF.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS, *Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, between Nov. 8 and Dec. 8, 1964*

Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Netherlands	Guilder	447.19	124.22	518.76	144.10	3,019.18	841.19	108	30	4,093.13	1,139.51
Norway	Krone	380.10	53.33	551.71	77.42	66.13	9.25	71.18	10	1,069.12	150.00
Denmark	do	642	92.86	498	72.14	104	15.00	138	20	1,382	200.00
Belgium	Franc	3,410	68.20	2,965	59.30	375	7.50	750	15	7,500	150.00
France	do	369	75.20	293	59.80	80	16.33	73	15	815	166.33
Germany	Deutsche mark	286.40	71.60	155.60	38.90	98	24.50	60	15	600	150.00
Italy	Lira	50,375	80.60	51,188	81.90	10,937	17.50	12,500	20	125,000	200.00
Switzerland	Swiss franc	588.14	136.20	640.20	148.31	964	223.47	151.16	35	2,343.50	542.98
United Kingdom	Pound	30-15-0	86.30	24-10-0	68.68	8-15-0	24.50	7-3-0	20	71-3-0	199.48
Total			788.51		750.55		1,179.24		180		2,898.30

E. E. WILLIS.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Hon. PETER W. RODINO, *Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, between Nov. 8 and Dec. 21, 1964*

Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Italy	Lira	85,188	136.30	111,687	178.70	81,900	131.04	21,875	35.00	300,650	481.04
Poland	Zloty	222	9.25	282	11.75			60	2.50	564	23.50
Switzerland	Swiss franc	372.28	86.20	404.21	93.59			86.30	20.00	862.30	199.79
Germany	Deutsche mark	332.80	83.20	587.20	146.80	5,261.91	1,323.75	80	20.00	6,261.91	1,573.75
Austria	Schilling	5,013	194.85	5,931	230.24	2,034	79.02	1,156	45.00	14,134	549.11
Denmark	Krone	673	97.33	904	130.60	73.71	10.65	173	25.00	1,823.71	263.58
Hungary	Forint	1,998	41.20	1,572	33.60			480	10.00	4,050	84.80
France	Franc	502.40	102.54	379.60	77.46	457	93.27	98	20.00	1,437	293.27
Rumania	Leu	243	23.50	343	33.13			72	7.00	658	63.63
Total			774.37		935.87		1,637.73		184.50		3,532.47

PETER W. RODINO.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Hon. BYRON G. ROGERS, *Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, between Nov. 8 and Dec. 2, 1964*

Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Italy	Lira	26,413	42.26	29,837	47.74			6,250	10.00	62,500	100.00
Poland	Zloty	624	[1] 26.00							624	26.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	322.80	83.20	595.20	148.80	5,325.50	1,339.70	72	18.00	6,325.50	1,589.70
Hungary	Forint	1,600	33.34							1,600	33.34
Rumania	Leu	243	23.50	164	15.89			52	5.00	459	44.39
Switzerland	Swiss franc	297.20	68.76	382.10	88.53	97	22.50	86	20.00	862.30	199.79
France	Franc	537.10	109.62	344.90	70.38	457	93.27	98	20.00	1,437	293.27
Austria	Schilling	1,969	76.32	2,531	98.51	2,034	79.02	500	19.42	7,034	273.27
Total			437.00		469.85		1,534.49		92.42		2,559.76

[1] Per diem.

BYRON G. ROGERS.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Hon. ARCH A. MOORE, JR., *Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives*

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Austria	Schilling	3,183	123.80	2,916	113.08	629	24.50	772	30	7,500.00	291.38
France	Franc	264	53.80	177	36.20	656	133.88	49	10	1,146.00	233.88
Hungary	Forint	1,992	41.50	1,980	41.25	348	7.25	480	10	4,800.00	100.00
Italy	Lira	33,563	53.70	22,687	36.30			6,250	10	62,500.00	100.00
Poland	Zloty		[1] 26.00	624						624.00	26.00
Rumania	Leu	243	23.50	301	29.07	77	7.50	52	5	673.00	65.07
Netherlands	Guilder					4,864.53	1,355.40			4,864.53	1,355.40
Total			296.30		255.90		1,528.53		65		2,171.73

[1] Per diem.

ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Hon. WILLIAM T. CAHILL, *Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, between Nov. 5 and Nov. 18, 1964*

Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Netherlands	Guilder					1,834.20	509.50			1,834.20	509.50
France	Franc	775.82	158.33	495.73	101.17	51.45	10.50	147	30	1,470	300.00
Switzerland	Swiss franc	6.2153	141.83	623.18	144.30	122.12	28.50	151.20	35	1,509.03	349.63
Total			300.16		245.47		548.50		65		1,159.13

WILLIAM T. CAHILL.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Hon. CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., *Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, between Nov. 8 and Nov. 14, 1964*

Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Netherlands	Guilder					2,987.48	832.40			2,987.48	832.40
Switzerland	Swiss franc	332.70	77.03	627.75	145.47	203	46.99	130	30.20	1,293.45	299.69
Total			77.03		145.47		879.39		30.20		1,132.09

CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by William R. Foley, general counsel, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, between Nov. 10 and Dec. 8, 1964

Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
United Kingdom	Pound	30-3-0	84.50	25-2-0	70.48	8-15-0	24.50	7-3-0	20	71-3-0	199.48
Switzerland	Swiss franc	361	83.63	393	91.09	43.20	10.00	64.80	15	862	199.72
Norway	Krone	366.50	51.30	519.13	72.94	75.60	10.50	107.40	15	1,069.13	149.74
Netherlands	Guilder	442.03	122.60	526.60	145.72	3,803.32	1,059.52	108	30	4,879.95	1,357.84
Belgium	Franc	3,275	65.50	2,950	59.00	525	10.50	750	15	7,500	150.00
Denmark	Krone	646	93.40	512	74.10	86	12.50	138	20	1,382	200.00
France	Franc	393	80.25	269	54.75	80	16.33	73	15	815	166.33
Germany	Deutsche mark	277.60	69.40	162.40	40.60	100	25.00	60	15	600	150.00
Italy	Lira	53,282	85.25	48,281	77.25	10,937	17.50	12,500	20	125,000	200.00
Total			735.83		685.93		1,186.35		165		2,773.11

WILLIAM R. FOLEY.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Garner J. Cline, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, between Nov. 8 and Dec. 14, 1964

Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Austria	Schilling	2,370	92.23	3,203	124.64	3,686	143.20	627	24	9,886	384.07
Denmark	Kroner	499	72.30	433	62.43	179.01	25.87	104	15	1,215.01	175.60
France	Franc	505.88	103.24	376.12	76.76	457	93.27	98	20	1,437	293.27
Germany	Deutsche mark	331.60	82.90	568.40	142.10	5,261.91	1,323.75	100	25	6,261.91	1,573.75
Hungary	Forint	1,959	40.80	1,035	21.54			336	7	3,330	69.34
Italy	Lira	98,937	158.30	126,063	201.70	63,700	101.92	25,000	40	313,700	501.92
Poland	Zloty	220	9.17	432	18.00			72	3	724	30.17
Rumania	Leu	243	23.50	472	45.60			72	7	787	76.10
Switzerland	Swiss franc	441.88	102.27	528	122.47			108	25	1,077.88	249.74
Total			684.71		815.24		1,688.01		166		3,353.96

GARNER J. CLINE.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds,[1] Committee on Public Works, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John C. Kluczynski:											
Japan	Yen	54,200	151	36,100	100	7,455.00	21.00	10,500	29	108,255.00	301.00
Do	Deutsche mark					6,264.00	1,566.00			6,264.00	1,566.00
Frank M. Clark:											
Japan	Yen	54,200	151	36,100	100	7,455.00	21.00	10,500	29	108,255.00	301.00
Do	Deutsche mark					6,264.00	1,566.00			6,264.00	1,566.00
Arnold Olsen:											
Japan	Yen	54,200	151	32,500	90	7,455.00	21.00	4,020	11	98,175.00	273.00
Do	Deutsche mark					6,877.60	1,720.44			6,877.60	1,720.44
Robert T. McLoskey:											
Japan	Yen	54,200	151	36,100	100	7,455.00	21.00	10,500	29	108,255.00	301.00
Do	Deutsche mark					6,264.00	1,566.00			6,264.00	1,566.00
Joseph R. Brennan:											
Japan	Yen	54,200	151	36,100	100	7,455.00	21.00	10,500	29	108,255.00	301.00
Do	Deutsche mark					6,264.00	1,566.00			6,264.00	1,566.00
Total			755		490		8,089.44		127.00		9,461.44

[1] H. Res. 652, 88th Cong.

JANUARY 2, 1965.

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 143, 1st sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
George P. Miller:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 11	Nov. 14	4	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	Nov. 14	Nov. 18	4	287.50	50.00	1,151	199.83	123	21.40	1,274	221.23
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	3	195	50.00	585	150.21	157	40.26	742	190.47
Malaysia	Dollar	Nov. 20	Nov. 22	3	150	50.00	458.85	149.71	275	89.65	733.85	239.36
Australia	Pound	Nov. 22	Nov. 28	7	22-10-0	50.00	134-6-0	301.08			134-6-0	301.08
New Zealand	do	Nov. 28	Dec. 1	3	17-17-0	50.00	35-16-0	98.94	38-1-0	106.56	73-17-0	206.50
Fiji Islands	do	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	4	17-17-0	50.00	53-11-0	150.00			53-11-0	150.00

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 143, 1st sess., 88th Cong., Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
George P. Miller—Continued												
Denmark	Krone	Sept. 5	Sept. 7	3	198.88	26.00	360	52.14	205.24	29.73	565.24	81.87
France	Franc	Sept. 10	Sept. 15	6	147	30.00	882	180.00			882	180.00
Poland	Zloty	Sept. 7	Sept. 10	4	624	26.00	2,496	104.00			2,496	104.00
Germany	Deutsche mark								3,940.80	991.65	3,940.80	991.65
Emilio Q. Daddario:												
France	Franc								139.00	28.37	139	28.37
Germany	Deutsche mark	Aug. 16	Aug. 17	2	200	50.00	96	24.16			96	24.16
Switzerland	Franc	Mar. 24	Mar. 28	4	228	50.00	605	140.01			605	140.01
Olin E. Teague:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 11	Nov. 14	4	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	Nov. 14	Nov. 18	4	287.50	50.00	1,151	199.83	123	21.40	1,274	221.23
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	3	195	50.00	585	150.21	157	40.26	742	190.47
Malaysia	Dollar	Nov. 20	Nov. 22	3	150	50.00	452.65	147.69	275	89.65	727.65	237.34
Australia	Pound	Nov. 22	Nov. 28	7	22-10-0	50.00	134-5-0	300.97			134-5-0	300.97
New Zealand	do	Nov. 28	Dec. 1	3	17-17-0	50.00	20-6-4	56.58	38-1-0	106.56	57-14-4	163.14
Fiji Islands	do	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	4	17-17-0	50.00	53-11-0	150.00			53-11-0	150.00
Joseph E. Karth:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 11	Nov. 14	4	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	Nov. 14	Nov. 18	4	287.50	50.00	1,151	199.83	123	21.40	1,274	221.23
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	3	195	50.00	585	150.21	157	40.26	742	190.47
Malaysia	Dollar	Nov. 20	Nov. 22	3	150	50.00	458.85	149.71	275	89.65	733.85	239.36
Australia	Pound	Nov. 22	Nov. 28	7	22-10-0	50.00	134-5-0	300.97			134-5-0	300.97
New Zealand	do	Nov. 28	Dec. 1	3	17-17-0	50.00	35-16-3	99.72	38-1-0	106.56	73-17-3	206.28
Fiji Islands	do	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	4	17-17-0	50.00	53-11-0	150.00			53-11-0	150.00
Bob Casey:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 11	Nov. 14	4	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	Nov. 14	Nov. 18	4	287.50	50.00	1,151	199.83	123	21.40	1,274	221.23
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	3	195	50.00	585	150.21	157	40.26	742	190.47
Malaysia	Dollar	Nov. 20	Nov. 22	3	150	50.00	458.85	149.71	275	89.65	733.85	239.36
Australia	Pound	Nov. 22	Nov. 28	7	22-10-0	50.00	134-5-0	300.97			134-5-0	300.97
New Zealand	do	Nov. 28	Dec. 1	3	17-17-0	50.00	35-16-3	99.72	38-1-0	106.56	73-17-3	206.28
Fiji Islands	do	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	4	17-17-0	50.00	53-11-0	150.00			53-11-0	150.00
William K. VanPelt:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 11	Nov. 14	4	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	Nov. 14	Nov. 18	4	287.50	50.00	1,151	199.83	123	21.40	1,274	221.23
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	3	195	50.00	585	150.21	157	40.26	742	190.47
Malaysia	Dollar	Nov. 20	Nov. 22	3	150	50.00	458.85	149.71	275	89.65	733.85	239.36
Australia	Pound	Nov. 22	Nov. 28	7	22-10-0	50.00	134-5-0	300.97			134-5-0	300.97
New Zealand	do	Nov. 28	Dec. 1	3	17-17-0	50.00	35-16-3	99.73	38-1-0	106.56	73-17-3	206.29
Fiji Islands	do	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	4	17-17-0	50.00	53-11-0	150.00			53-11-0	150.00
Charles F. Ducander:												
Japan	Yen	Nov. 11	Nov. 14	4	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	Nov. 14	Nov. 18	4	287.50	50.00	1,151	199.83	123	21.40	1,274	221.23
Philippines	Peso	Nov. 18	Nov. 20	3	195	50.00	585	150.21	157	40.26	742	190.47
Malaysia	Dollar	Nov. 20	Nov. 22	3	150	50.00	458.85	149.71	275	89.65	733.35	239.36
Australia	Pound	Nov. 22	Nov. 28	7	22-10-0	50.00	134-5-0	300.97			134-5-0	300.97
New Zealand	do	Nov. 28	Dec. 1	3	17-17-0	50.00	35-16-3	99.72	38-1-0	106.56	73-17-3	206.28
Fiji Islands	do	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	4	17-17-0	50.00	53-11-0	150.00			53-11-0	150.00
Denmark	Krone	Sept. 5	Sept. 7	3	198.88	26.00	360	52.14	205.24	29.73	565.24	81.87
France	Franc	Sept. 10	Sept. 15	6	147	30.00	882	180.00			882	180.00
Poland	Zloty	Sept. 7	Sept. 10	4	624	26.00	2,496	104.00			2,496	104.00
Germany	Deutsche mark								3,940.80	991.65	3,940.80	991.65
Joe D. Waggonner, Jr.:												
Belgium	Franc	Oct. 27	Oct. 27	1	2,500	50.00	2,500	50.00			2,500	50.00
Denmark	Krone	Oct. 29	Nov. 1	4	344	50.00	1,385	200.17	200.07	28.92	1,585.07	229.09
France	Franc	Nov. 1	Nov. 3	3	245.50	50.00	735	150.00			735	150.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	Oct. 27	Oct. 29	3	200	50.00	600	150.00	3,317.60	834.83	3,917.60	984.83
United Kingdom	Pound	Oct. 23	Oct. 27	4	17-17-0	50.00	70-5-6	195.62			70-5-6	195.62
Alphonzo Bell:												
Denmark	Krone	Sept. 4 Aug. 31	Sept. 7 Sept. 4	4 5	198.88	26.00	550	79.66	205.24	29.73	755.24	109.39
France	Franc	Sept. 11	Sept. 13	3	147	30.00	1,176	240.00			1,176	240.00
Netherlands	Guilder								3,611.31	1,000.64	3,611.31	1,000.64
Poland	Zloty	Sept. 7	Sept. 11	4	624	26.00	2,496	104.00			2,496	104.00
William F. Ryan:												
Ireland	Pound	Nov. 12	Nov. 13	1	17-5-0	50.00	3	8.40			3	8.40
England	do	Nov. 13	Nov. 15	2	17-17-0	50.00	17-4-8	48.25	8-19-4	24.97	26-40-0	73.22
France	Franc	Nov. 15	Nov. 18	3	245	50.00	355	72.50			355	72.50
Italy	Lira	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1	31,250	50.00	12,500	19.00			12,500	19.00
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 19	Nov. 20	1	1,500	50.00	500	16.66			500	16.66
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 20	Nov. 21	1	450	50.00	205	22.78			205	22.78
Lebanon	do	Nov. 21	Nov. 22	1	114.55	37.50	64.62	21.12			64.62	21.12
Jordan	Dinar	Nov. 22	Nov. 24	2	17,885	50.00	14,135	39.54			14,135	39.54
Israel	Pound	Nov. 24	Nov. 28	5	87	29.00	235	78.71			235	78.71
Spain	Peseta	Nov. 28	Nov. 30	2	3,000	50.00	2,425	57.09			2,425	57.09
W. H. Boone:												
Ireland	Pound	Nov. 12	Nov. 13	1	17-5-0	50.00	3	8.40			3	8.40
England	do	Nov. 13	Nov. 15	2	17-17-0	50.00	17-4-8	48.25	8-19-4	24.97	26-40-0	73.22
France	Franc	Nov. 15	Nov. 18	3	245	50.00	355	72.50			355	72.50
Italy	Lira	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	1	31,250	50.00	12,500	19.00			12,500	19.00
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 19	Nov. 20	1	1,500	50.00	500	16.66			500	16.66
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 20	Nov. 21	1	450	50.00	205	22.78			205	22.78
Lebanon	do	Nov. 21	Nov. 22	1	114.55	37.50	64.62	21.12			64.62	21.12
Jordan	Dinar	Nov. 22	Nov. 24	2	17,885	50.00	14,135	39.54			14,135	39.54
Israel	Pound	Nov. 24	Nov. 26	3	87	29.00	62	20.67			62	20.67
Spain	Peseta	Nov. 26	Nov. 30	4	3,000	50.00	4,974	82.90			4,974	82.90
William J. Randall:												
France	Franc	Nov. 22	Nov. 24	2½	245.50	50.00	785	157.00			785	157.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	Nov. 19	Nov. 21	3	200	50.00	391.35	98.49			391.35	98.49
Italy	Lira	Nov. 24	Nov. 27	3	31,250	50.00	56,875	91.00			56,875	91.00
Portugal	Escudo	Nov. 29	Nov. 30	1	1,446.5	50.00	133	4.51			133	4.51
Spain	Peseta	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	1½	3,000	50.00	4,236	70.75			4,236	70.75
United Kingdom	Pound	Nov. 17	Nov. 19	3	17-17-0	50.00	41-17-11	116.55			41-17-11	116.55
(Transportation charges not yet billed.)										523.10		523.10

MARCH 3, 1965.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Victor A. Knox:												
England	Pound	Mar. 20	Mar. 21	2	9-13-0	27	19-6-0	54				54.00
Switzerland	Franc	Mar. 22	Mar. 27	6	121	28	726	168		[1] 509.10		677.10
France	do	Mar. 27	Mar. 30	3	147	30	441	90		[1] 511.20		601.20
Total				11		85		312		1,020.30		1,332.30

[1] Includes round trip air transportation.

AUGUST 20, 1964.

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 551, 1st sess., 88th Cong., House delegation to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Balance forward												12,414.31
Delegation expenses:												
Office and conference room, France.	Franc										3,496.45	713.56
Gratuities, France	do										324.35	66.19
NATO reception, France	do										182.00	37.14
Overtime costs, France	do										1,328.60	271.14
Transportation, France	do										2,666.58	544.20
Communications, France	do										814.25	166.17
Official representation, France	do										1,900.10	387.76
Official representation, England.	Pound										71.16.11	200.01
Transportation, Greece	Drachma										12,002	400.07
Total												15,200.55
Hon. Leslie C. Arends:												
France	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 21	10	245	50	2,450	500			2,450	500
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	3	450	50	1,350	150			1,350	150
Total								650				650
Hon. Charles E. Chamberlain:												
France	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 21	10	245	50	2,450	500			2,450	500
Italy	Lira	Nov. 21	Nov. 22	2	31,250	50	62,500	100			62,500	100
Turkey	do	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	3	450	50	1,350	150			1,350	150
Total								750				750
Hon. Frank M. Clark: France	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 21	10	245	50	2,450	500			2,450	500
Hon. Wayne L. Hays:												
France	do	May 27	May 31	5	147	30	735	150	639.20	130.46	1,384.20	280.46
England	Pound	June 1		1	9-13-0	27	9-13-0	27			9-13-0	27.00
France	Franc	Nov. 5	Nov. 9	4	245	50	980	200	2,043.79	417.10	3,023.79	617.10
England	Pound	Nov. 9	Nov. 11	3	17-16-6	50	53-8-6	150			53-8-6	150.00
France	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 18	6	245	50	1,470	300	690.20	140.86	2,160.20	440.86
England	Pound	Nov. 18	Nov. 29	12	17-16-6	50	2-15-8	600			2-15-8	600.00
Total								1,427.00		688.42		2,115.42
Hon. Craig Hosmer:												
France	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 21	10	245	50	2,450	500			2,450	500.00
Italy	Lira	Nov. 21	Nov. 22	2	31,250	50	62,500	100			62,500	100.00
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 23	Nov. 26	4	1,500	50	6,000	200			6,000	200.00
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	3	450	50	1,350	150			1,350	150.00
Total								950.00				950.00
Hon. Winfield K. Denton:												
France	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 21	10	245	50	2,450	500.00			2,450	500.00
England	Pound	Nov. 21	Nov. 23	3	17-16-6	50	53-17-11	150.04			53-17-11	150.04
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 24	Nov. 26	3	1,500	50	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	3	450	50	1,350	150.00			1,350	150.00
Total								950.04				950.04
Hon. John V. Lindsay:												
France	Franc	May 10	May 11	2			256	52.30			256	52.30
Do	do	Nov. 15	Nov. 21	7	245	50	1,715	350.00			1,715	350.00
	Deutsche mark	May 10	May 11	2					1,886	474.47	1,886	474.47
Total								402.30		474.47		876.77
Hon. L. Mendel Rivers:												
France	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 21	10	245	50	2,450	500			2,450	500
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	3	450	50	1,350	150			1,350	150
Total								650				650
Hon. Peter W. Rodino:												
France	Franc	May 12		1	147	50	147	30			147	30
Do	do	Nov. 17	Nov. 21	5	245	50	1,225	250			1,225	250
Total								280				280

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, travel authorized by H. Res. 551, 1st sess., 88th Cong., House delegation to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Boyd Crawford:												
France	Franc	Nov. 5	Nov. 9	4	245	50	980	200	2,043.79	417.10	3,023.79	617.10
England	Pound	Nov. 9	Nov. 11	3	17-16-6	50	53-8-6	150			53-8-6	150.00
France	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 18	6	245	50	1,470	300	690.20	140.86	2,160.20	440.86
England	Pound	Nov. 18	Nov. 29	12	17-16-6	50	215-8	600			215-8	600.00
Total												1,807.96
Philip B. Billings:												
Iceland	Krona	July 12	July 14	3	1,202.60	28	3,607.80	84.00			3,607.80	84.00
France	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 21	10	245	50	2,450	500.00			2,450	500.00
England	Pound	Nov. 21	Nov. 23	3	17-16-6	50	53-17-11	150.04			53-17-11	150.04
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	3	450	50	1,350	150.00			1,350	150.00
Total								884.04				884.04
Thomas M. Gilbert:												
France	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 21	10	245	50	2,450	500.00			2,450	500.00
England	Pound	Nov. 21	Nov. 23	3	17-16-6	50	53-17-11	150.04			53-17-11	150.04
Greece	Drachma	Nov. 24	Nov. 26	3	1,500	50	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00
Turkey	Lira	Nov. 27	Nov. 29	3	450	50	1,350	150.00			1,350	150.00
Total								950.04				950.04
Miss Jean Litten:												
France	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 21	10	245	50	2,450	500.00			2,450	500.00
England	Pound	Nov. 21	Nov. 23	3		50	53-17-11	150.04			53-17-11	150.04
Total								650.04				650.04
Miss Patricia Peak: France	Franc	Nov. 11	Nov. 19	8	245	50	1,960	400			1,960	400

MAR. 4, 1965.

WAYNE L. HAYS,
Chairman, House Delegation to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds,[1] Interparliamentary Union, 3d Pan American Conference, Washington, D.C., and Cape Kennedy, Fla., Feb. 5–9, 1964

	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
George B. Galloway	Dollar		24.72								24.72
Frank Lanza	do		20.60		3.29						23.89
Maria Rosa Li	do		20.60								20.60
Clemente Segovia	do		20.60								20.60
Joseph Montoya	do								30.00		30.00
Homer Ferguson	do		22.35								22.35
James Douglas	do						616.00				616.00
Darrell St. Claire	do		24.72		16.14				18.00		58.86
Delegation expenses:											
Official luncheons, receptions, dinners.	do				2,440.40						2,440.40
Ceremonial wreaths	do								61.80		61.80
Hotel offices	do								340.23		340.23
Communications	do								116.31		116.31
Stationery	do								54.36		54.36
Interpreting services	do								2,306.17		2,306.17
Office services	do								368.92		368.92
Messenger and guard services	do								214.71		214.71
Total			133.59		2,459.83		616.00		3,510.50		6,719.92

[1] 22 U.S.C.A. 276.

KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
Chairman, American Group.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds,[1] Spring Conference, Interparliamentary Union, Lucerne, Switzerland, Mar. 25 to Apr. 5, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Katharine St. George: Switzerland	Franc	1,550	362.86	1,089.25	255.00			19.30	4.48	2,658.55	622.34
W. R. Poage:											
Spain	Peseta			5,188	86.73			1,000	16.75	6,188	103.48
Switzerland	Franc	641	149.93	773	180.89			118	27.58	1,532	358.40
Emilio Q. Daddario:											
Spain	Peseta			20	.34			61	1.02	81	1.36
Switzerland	Franc	576	134.89	742.75	173.95			127.90	29.96	1,446.65	338.80
Alexander Pirnie:											
Spain	Peseta			4,065	67.67			600	10.08	4,665	77.75
Switzerland	Franc	342	80.09	346	81.03			41	9.60	729	170.72

See footnote at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds,[1] Spring Conference, Interparliamentary Union, Lucern, Switzerland, Mar. 25 to Apr. 5, 1964—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert McClory:											
Spain	Peseta			235	3.94					235	3.94
Switzerland	Franc	545	127.45	1,045.50	244.85	50	11.71	131.70	30.81	1,772.20	414.82
F. Bradford Morse:											
Spain	Peseta			160	2.69					160	2.69
Switzerland	Franc	641	149.93	1,043.75	244.37	70	16.40	289.60	67.78	2,044.35	478.48
Dr. George B. Galloway:											
Spain	Peseta			177	2.96					177	2.96
Switzerland	Franc	651	152.25	1,082.50	253.30			164.30	37.87	1,897.80	443.42
United States	Dollar				35.00				15.00		50.00
Dr. Charles Zinn: Switzerland	Franc	641	149.93	615	143.85	50	11.71	219.50	51.35	1,525.50	356.84
Thomas R. Pickering: Switzerland	do	145	33.96							145	33.96
Total			1,341.29		1,776.57		39.82		302.28		3,459.96

[1] 22 U.S.C.A. 276, $3,459.96.

KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
Chairman, American Group.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds,[1] 53d Conference, Interparliamentary Union, Copenhagen, Denmark Aug. 14 to Sept. 1, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Katharine St. George:											
Norway	Krone	460.00	64.50	119.20	16.71					579.20	81.21
Sweden	Krona	215.00	41.90	322.20	62.78			45.00	8.76	582.20	113.44
Denmark	Krone	2,346.00	340.00	480.90	69.68			364.85	52.86	3,191.75	462.54
W. R. Poage: Denmark	do	805.00	116.06	461.60	66.88			70.50	10.21	1,337.10	193.15
Emilio Q. Daddario:											
Norway	Krone	230.00	32.25	363.88	51.02	30.00	4.20	30.00	4.20	653.88	91.67
Sweden	Krona	270.00	52.63	60.15	11.72					330.15	64.35
Denmark	Krone	1,518.00	220.00	1,014.80	147.06			302.10	43.78	1,834.90	410.84
Paul C. Jones:											
Norway	do	230.00	32.25	199.88	28.02			50.00	7.01	479.88	67.28
Sweden	Krona	270.00	52.63	279.50	54.47			40.00	7.79	588.50	114.89
Denmark	Krone	1,518.00	220.00	1,257.25	182.20			248.00	34.48	3,013.25	436.68
H. Allen Smith:											
Norway	do	230.00	32.25	242.00	33.93					472.00	66.18
Sweden	Krona	270.00	52.63	430.65	83.93			49.00	9.55	749.65	146.11
Denmark	Krone	1,518.00	220.00	1,738.55	251.95	75.00	10.86	441.50	63.97	3,773.05	546.78
Charles B. Hoeven:											
Norway	do	230.00	32.25	351.76	49.32			42.00	5.89	623.76	87.46
Sweden	Krona	270.00	52.63	186.55	36.36			43.75	8.52	500.30	97.51
Denmark	Krone	1,518.00	220.00	1,185.30	171.78			82.25	11.92	2,785.55	403.70
Bradford Morse: Denmark	do	966.00	140.00	1,094.25	247.58			203.35	40.46	2,263.60	428.04
Edward Derwinski: Denmark	do	1,127.00	163.33	623.05	90.28			117.25	16.98	1,867.30	270.59
E. Ross Adair:											
Norway	do	230.00	32.25	562.60	78.89			71.00	9.95	863.60	[2] 121.09
Sweden	Krona	270.00	52.63	239.50	46.68			25.00	4.87	534.50	104.18
Denmark	Krone	1,265.00	183.33	1,088.80	157.78			478.25	69.30	2,832.05	410.41
Thor C. Tollefson:											
Norway	do	230.00	32.25	430.00	60.30			139.75	19.59	799.75	112.14
Sweden	Krona	270.00	52.63	196.95	38.38					466.95	91.01
Denmark	Krone	1,771.00	256.66	894.30	129.60			107.50	6.90	2,772.80	393.16
Alexander Pirnie:											
Norway	do	230.00	32.25	251.76	35.30			64.00	8.97	545.76	76.52
Sweden	Krona	80.00	15.59	133.45	26.01			9.00	1.75	222.45	43.35
Denmark	Krone	1,265.00	183.33	772.20	111.90			351.65	50.95	2,388.85	346.1
J. Irving Whalley:											
Norway	do	266.00	37.30					3.00	.42	269.00	37.72
Sweden	Krona	270.00	52.63	182.40	35.55			64.00	12.46	516.40	100.64
Denmark	Krone	2,277.00	330.00	386.50	56.01			309.50	44.85	2,973.00	430.86
Robert McClory:											
Norway	do	306.00	42.91	27.00	3.78					333.00	46.69
Do	U.S. dollar				10.51				2.64		13.15
Sweden	Krona	270.00	52.63	562.50	109.64			55.00	10.72	887.50	172.99
Denmark	Krone	1,472.00	213.33	728.55	105.57			723.45	104.83	2,924.00	423.73
Dr. George B. Galloway:											
Norway	do	230.00	32.25	533.50	74.81			70.00	9.81	833.50	116.87
Sweden	Krona	110.00	21.44	494.40	96.36			150.00	29.23	754.40	147.03
Denmark	Krone	1,932.00	280.00	1,500.45	217.44			286.15	41.46	3,718.60	538.90
Do	do			[3] 221.45	[3] 32.09					[3] 221.45	[3] 32.09
William C. Olson: Denmark	do	684.25	99.16	602.50	87.31			51.00	7.39	1,337.75	193.86
Dr. Charles Zinn:											
Norway	do	228.00	31.97	14.20	1.99					242.20	33.96
Sweden	Krona	170.00	33.13	263.70	51.39			20.00	3.89	453.70	88.41
Denmark	Krone	1,771.00	256.66	1,032.05	149.57			302.85	43.89	3,105.90	450.12
Total			4,409.64		3,372.53		15.06		810.25		8,607.48

[1] 22 U.S.C.A. 276.
[2] $55 of this amount returned to the U.S. Treasury by Hon. E. ROSS ADAIR.
[3] Delegation expense.

KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
Chairman, American Group.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds,[1] Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mark Andrews	Dollar		51.50		4.23				7.35		63.08
Cornelius E. Gallagher	do		51.50		7.60				3.03		62.13
Harold T. Johnson	do		53.56		7.48						61.04
Robert McClory	do		49.44		3.66						53.10
Harris B. McDowell, Jr	do		57.68		5.82				.25		63.75
William T. Murphy	do		49.44		5.87						55.31
M. L. O'Brien	do		33.99		1.97				1.90		37.86
John M. Slack, Jr	do		51.50		6.09						57.59
George M. Wallhauser	do		51.50		7.17						58.67
A. C. F. Westphal	do		36.05		1.81						37.86
J. Irving Whalley	do		51.50		4.90				1.00		57.40
Delegation expenses	do								5,688.01		5,688.01
Total			537.66		56.60				5,701.54		6,295.80

[1] Public Law 86-42.

MARCH 4, 1965.

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
Chairman, House Delegation, Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds,[1] House of Representatives delegation, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Harris B. McDowell	U.S. dollar		76.83				104.76				181.59
Hon. Harold T. Johnson	do		14.68								14.68
Hon. Ronald Brooks Cameron	do		57.51				84.31				141.82
Hon. Ben Reifel	do		56.02				84.31				140.33
Helen L. Hashagen	do		32.23								32.23
Delegation expenses (such as meals, interpreters, official visits, etc.).									7,748.82		7,748.82
Total			237.27				273.38		7,748.82		8,259.47

[1] H. Res. 283, 86th Cong.

ROBERT N. C. NIX, *Chairman.*

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, advisers to U.S. delegate, International Lead and Zinc Study Group, U.S. House of Representatives, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Phillip Burton:												
Spain	Peseta	Oct. 24	Oct. 29	6	2,994	50.00	17,964	299.95	4,734	79.05	22,698	379.00
Travel	Deutsche mark								4,304	1,083.14	4,304	1,083.14
M. A. Pearl:												
Spain	Peseta	Oct. 21	Oct. 30	10	2,994	50.00	29,940	499.92	4,735	79.06	34,675	578.98
Travel	Guilder								1,470	407.32	1,470	407.32
Total								799.87		1,648.57		2,448.44

NOTE.—The named Member of Congress and the staff member were designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives as advisers to the U.S. delegate at the meetings of the International Lead and Zinc Study Group and its constituent committees.

PHILLIP BURTON,
Congressional Adviser to Lead and Zinc Study Group Meetings.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

786. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a semiannual report of the Department contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement for period July 1 through December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 605 of Public Law 88-174; to the Committee on Armed Services.

787. A letter from the assistant to the president, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting a report of the academy for calendar year 1964, pursuant to section 4 of the charter of the academy; to the Committee on House Administration.

788. A letter from the assistant secretary-treasurer, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting a report of the institute for calendar year 1964, pursuant to section 4 of the charter of the institute; to the Committee on House Administration.

789. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation which would give effect to legislative recommendations Nos. 6, 14, 16, and 19 in the Commission's annual report; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

790. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the limitation on emergency relief for the repair or reconstruction of highways under section 125 of title 23, United States Code"; to the Committee on Public Works.

791. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget; Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

792. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502)"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

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. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 284. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 3708, a bill to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging"; without amendment (Rept. No. 200). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 285. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2362, a bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; without amendment (Rept. No. 201). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 245. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendments (Rept. No. 202). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 6614. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 6615. 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. 6616. 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.

H.R. 6617. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct certain expenses paid by him in connection with his education, or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents, at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6618. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 6619. A bill to repeal the "cooly trade" laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 6620. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to provide that an individual shall not be deprived of monthly insurance benefits thereunder solely because of marriage or remarriage, if such marriage or remarriage occurs after such individual attains age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 6621. A bill defining the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and all Federal courts inferior thereto, in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 6622. A bill to exempt the postal field service from section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 6623. A bill to provide a rent certificate program for low-income housing in private accommodations, to establish a priority for low- and middle-income housing in urban renewal projects, to provide additional rehabilitation and relocation assistance, to create a new veterans' mortgage insurance program, to continue the Federal Housing Administration college and elderly housing programs, to provide comprehensive compensation for condemnees, to insure efficiency and economy in the administration of Federal housing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6624. A bill to amend the Hatch Act to permit all officers and employees of the Government to exercise the full responsibility of citizenship and to take an active part in the political life of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 6625. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase by 10 percent the amount of retirement, annuity, and endowment payments excluded from income for the purposes of determining the eligibility of an individual for pension under that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 6626. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 6627. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional personal exemption for a taxpayer who is a student; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 6628. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6629. A bill to amend the National Firearms Act to impose special (occupational) taxes with respect to engaging in the business of importing, manufacturing, and dealing in destructive weapons such as bombs, grenades, rockets, missiles, bazookas, and antitank guns, to impose taxes with respect to the making and to the transfer of such weapons, and to increase the rates of special (occupational) tax, transfer tax, and making tax imposed by the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 6630. 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. 6631. 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. QUIE:

H.R. 6632. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, to improve the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 6633. 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. 6634. 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.

H.R. 6635. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on toll telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 6636. A bill to create a commission on the establishment of a Council of Free Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 6637. 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. CAREY:

H.R. 6638. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6639. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 6640. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to prohibit discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 6641. A bill to strengthen intergovernmental relations by improving cooperation and the coordination of federally aided activities between the Federal, State, and local levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 6642. A bill to permit the United States to pay its share of the costs and expenses of suits wherein it asserts third party liability for hospital and medical care; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6643. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the

United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6644. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide relief for those employees involuntarily separated from service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 6645. A bill to appropriate certain sums for the authorized survey of Fort Fisher Historic Site, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 6646. A bill to amend the Recreation and Public Purposes Act pertaining to the leasing of public lands to States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 6647. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 6648. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to proceedings against certain witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 6649. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide more liberal mortgage financing under FHA's regular residential housing program for veterans who have not availed themselves of home financing assistance under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 6650. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 6651. A bill to provide direct aid to States and territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 6652. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 with respect to the procedure for amending orders when due to disaster the cost of production is increased and to provide for hearings on the need for such amendment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6653. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 6654. A bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.J. Res. 395. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H. Con. Res. 366. Concurrent resolution that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision, withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H. Con. Res. 367. Concurrent resolution authorizing and requesting the President to take such steps as may be necessary to have placed on the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations at the next regular session, the issue of self-determination for all nations enslaved by Communist imperialism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H. Res. 286. Resolution authorizing cards of identification for certain officers and employees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Res. 287. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

133. By Mr. RYAN: Memorial of concurrent resolution of the senate and the assembly of the State of New York relative to requesting the Government of West Germany to enact legislation extending the statute of limitations pertaining to the prosecution of persons charged with World War II crimes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

134. By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of the house of delegates, West Virginia Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States, the U.S. Secretary of Defense, and the Panama Canal Company that Panama Canal tolls be reexamined at once with a view to a significant reduction of tolls applicable to such bulk cargoes as coal produced in West Virginia and shipped to Japan via the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

135. Also, memorial of the senate of West Virginia, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take action on the Knox Creek Dam in Pike County, Ky., to assist in providing flood control in the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River in West Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works.

136. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting consideration and approval of the Alaska Farmland Development Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

137. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the creation of a National Oceanographic Council; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

138. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the construction of a breakwater at Kodiak; to the Committee on Public Works.

139. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to adopting legislation necessary to continue the center operated by the Veterans' Administration at Bath, N.Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 6655. A bill for the relief of Pieter Cornelis Metzelaar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6656. A bill for the relief of Ettore Iavicoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6657. A bill for the relief of Marie Musthfa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 6658. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hilda Wenceslaa Perez de Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6659. A bill for the relief of George H. Peters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 6660. A bill for the relief of Paolo Scaffedi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 6661. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Baretta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6662. A bill for the relief of Isadora Amalfitano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 6663. A bill for the relief of Dean P. Bartelt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 6664. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fironz Talebli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 6665. A bill for the relief of Genowefa Iwanowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 6666. A bill to provide for the free entry of a 90-centimeter split-pole magnetic spectrograph system with orange-peel internal conversion spectrometer attached for the use of the University of Pittsburgh; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 6667. A bill for the relief of Paulette Landier Gingras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6668. A bill for the relief of Emil Feuerwerker and his wife, Vera Feuerwerker, and their children, Sara Feuerwerker and Moshe Feuerwerker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6669. A bill for the relief of Jacob Moas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 6670. A bill for the relief of Norga Florentina Madera Genao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 6671. A bill for the relief of the estates of certain former members of the U.S. Navy Band; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 6672. A bill for the relief of Adam Piechotka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 6673. A bill for the relief of Alec Arthur Fletcher and Jennifer Marjorie Fletcher; 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:

138. By the SPEAKER: Petition of chairman, American Citizens of Lithuanian Descent, Norwood, Mass., with reference to requesting assistance of the United States in restoring independence to Lithuania and other Baltic States and condemning Communist aggression in the free world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

139. Also, petition of chairman, the Ad Hoc Committee of Concerned Citizens, New Orleans, La., with reference to voting rights for all citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.