has helped to win for the United States many new friends. However, some self-imposed critics of our aid programs have unjustly commented about the work in Latin America of the Agency for International Development, and about the Alliance for Progress.

Clarence Moore, publisher of the Times of Havana, in exile, has captured, in a recent column in his newspaper, the unfairness of these critics. His brilliant, almost classic commentary on the Alliance, and on a speech by James H. Boren, director of Partners of the Alliance Programs, ought to be read by all, and I therefore, commend it to your attention:

THE EASY CHAIR

(By Clarence Moore)

Apt quotations are always a pleasure to discover and a further pleasure to pass along. One of these turned up the other day in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that compendium of words good and bad.

It caught the fancy of President Johnson who used it a week or two later in partial form in a speech and, in turn, must have impressed Time magazine since it chose to quote Johnson's speech, including the words I found and liked. My earliest attribution is to an AID official speaking before the Connecticut Partners of the Alliance early in May of this year. Where he came by his source is not known, but he told the Partners with some bitterness of earlier experiences.

He had formerly been assigned with AID in Peru. He had worked long hours in the slums and the barriadas in close touch with the federations of campesinos. It was back-breaking work that took him into the source waters of the Andes where he came down with chills and fever. Later, back in the United States, he was suddenly seized with chills and, on his way to a doctor, turned on his radio to a well-known commentator. The commentator described all AID officials as vagrants who drank martinis before breakfast and then went to plush offices where they thought up ways to waste the U.S. tax dollar. After announcing his pride at being an official of AID and his enthusiasm for his job, the AID executive told the Partners a story from long ago:

"To that commentator, and to those armchair critics who parrot his cliches, I say with Gen. Lucius Paulus, as he said in the second century B.C. 'commanders should be counseled chiefly by persons of known talent and those who are present at the scene of action.' General Paulus went on to say:

" 'If, therefore, anyone thinks himself qualified to give advice respecting the war which I am to conduct, let him not refuse the assistance to the state, but let him come with me into Macedonia.

" 'He shall be furnished with a ship, a tent, even his traveling charges shall be defrayed. But if he thinks this is too much trouble, and prefers the repose of a city life to the toils of war, let him not on land assume the office of a pilot.' "

The Alliance is surrounded by an extraordinary number of critics who have no hankering to go to Macedonia. These persons are quite willing to take their soundings from the repose of their city rooms. Few of them have ever pitched their tents outside the limited jurisdiction of their own circulation managers.

The general seems to have had them pegged pretty well over 2,000 years ago. If he were around today, he would find that it can still be awfully lonely in Macedonia.

As Mr. Moore's column indicated, Mr. Boren has been among our ablest workers for AID. I understand that two American coworkers of his in Lima, Peru, Dr. Keating and Dr. Mike Chiappetta had given him the quotation "come with me into Macedonia." Mr. Boren found it useful in encouraging friends and visitors to see Lima as well as the rural countryside. In fact, the quotation has proved to be so meaningful that other Government officials who saw it on his wall, where he fittingly had framed it, have besieged Mr. Boren with numerous requests for copies, which he has supplied. Hopefully, armchair critics of AID will soon become acquainted with this quotation, too, and paying its heed, would learn about AID firsthand by going, "into Macedonia."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 29, 1965

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

Rev. R. Cecil Mills, D.D., Canaan Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths.

Lord of every land and nation, we thank Thee for men whose faith in Thee has made them great in the history of our country. Make us realize that only those lands are truly prosperous and happy whose leaders are led by the spirit of God. As we give Thee thanks for courageous Christian leadership in the days gone by, we pray Thee for men at the head of affairs in our Nation during these troubled days in whose hearts is the fear of the Lord and whose greatest ambition is to serve Thee and do Thy will. So shall our beloved land fulfill the mission Thou hast appointed unto it.

Give us a consciousness of guilt, not only for personal sins but also for the great collective sins of mankind, from which we cannot escape a share of responsibility. Help us to believe in the saving power of the Gospel when applied through the lives of redeemed men to the sins of society. Let us never be complacent or at ease so long as our fellow men are unjustly oppressed.

And grant unto us universal peace and good will among all men.

In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 625. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7997) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, SHIPLEY, GIAIMO, MAHON, JONAS, MINSHALL, RHODES of Arizona, and BOW.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until midnight, July 29, to file reports on the bills H.R. 8027 and H.R. 6964.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what are those bills?

Mr. ALBERT. The first has to do with the Law Enforcement Association, and the second deals with the rehabilitation of prisoners.

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

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

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COAST GUARD OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Coast Guard of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have permission to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on International Trade of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC FINANCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcom-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

mittee on Domestic Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT'S STATEMENTS ON VIETNAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 492) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 492

Resolved, That there be printed as a House document the statements of the President of the United States on July 28, 1965, on the Nation's commitment in Vietnam; and that fifty thousand additional copies shall be printed, of which thirty thousand copies shall be for the House document room and twenty thousand copies shall be for the Senate document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives which was read and referred to the Committee on House Administration:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1965.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives the contests for seats in the House of Representatives from the First Congressional District of the State of Mississippi, Augusta Wheadon against Thomas G. Abernethy, the Second Congressional District of the State of Mississippi, Fannie Lou Hamer against Jamie L. Whitten, the Fourth Congressional District of Mississippi, Annie DeVine against Prentiss Walker, and the Fifth Congressional District of Mississippi, Victoria Jackson Gray against William M. Colmer, notices of which have been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House; and also transmit herewith original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto, including the copy of the unsigned notice to contest the election held in the Third Congressional District of the State of Mississippi and related papers.

In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act relating to contested-election cases," the Clerk has opened and printed the testimony in the above cases as seemed proper to the Clerk, there being complete disagreement by the parties as to the portions of the testimony to be printed, the notice of contest, the answer thereto and original papers and exhibits have been sealed up and are ready to be referred to the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives.

Two copies of the printed testimony in the aforesaid cases have been mailed to the contestants, and the same number to the contestees, which together with briefs of the parties, when received, will be laid before the committee of the House to which the matter shall be referred.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order 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. 210]

Bonner	Jones, Mo.	Redlin
Bow	Karth	Resnick
Cahill	Keogh	Ryan
Colmer	Lindsay	Shipley
Conyers	McEwen	Sickles
Duncan, Oreg.	Michel	Toll
Halleck	Morton	Ullman
Harvey, Ind.	Powell	Watson

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 405 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

TO AMEND THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist upon the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FALLON, BLATNIK, JONES of Alabama, CRAMER, and BALDWIN.

H.R. 9750, H.R. 9869, AND H.R. 9875

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to refer the bills, H.R. 9750, H.R. 9869, and H.R. 9875, to the Committee on Agriculture.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state the titles of those bills so we may know what he is dealing with?

Mr. HARRIS. They are identical bills to H.R. 9743 which was re-referred, at the request of the author and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, having to do with the utilization of certain animals on the basis of the method that the animals are obtained.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL CONFEREE ON H.R. 5401

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to add one additional conferee to the conference with the Senate on H.R. 5401, which is the transportation bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] as the additional conferee, and the Clerk will notify the Senate of this action.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 271 OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. 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. 8856) to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

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. 8856, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the second time this legislation has been brought to the floor for consideration. It was previously

brought to the floor under suspension of the rules which requires a two-thirds vote in the affirmative. The vote was 216 to 139 and, therefore, the bill having failed to get two-thirds in the affirmative, it was necessary to bring it up under the rule which allows an hour for each side to present their case.

H.R. 8856 would amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. The five-member Atomic Energy Commission unanimously supports this bill, as does the Justice Department. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy also unanimously recommends that this bill be enacted.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of this bill, and the reasons why the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recommends its enactment, were explained in my statement on the floor on July 12. In view of this fact, and in light of the comprehensive report on this bill filed by our committee, I will simply point out several significant facts about H.R. 8856.

First. Because of the interest which has been generated concerning the dispute over the overhead powerline, it is easy to overlook perhaps the most pressing reason for the passage of this bill. I refer to the potential threat that is posed by an interpretation of the Atomic Energy Act which would allow every local governing body to control AEC's own facilities for the generation or transmission of electric power. The effect of such an interpretation of congressional intent is most serious. The Chairman of the AEC, Dr. Glenn Seaborg, again called this to the attention of our committee in a letter dated July 14, 1965 which I inserted in the daily RECORD on July 27, at page A4121. Dr. Seaborg said:

> In reviewing the debate on the floor of the House last Monday concerning the bill to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act, we noted confusion on the part of some participants concerning the urgency of the need for passage of this legislation.
>
> I want to make clear that the Atomic Energy Commission is greatly concerned that if the bill is not passed, there may be at any time, interferences with the conduct of major AEC program missions due to the limitations placed on this agency's authority by the decision of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Many AEC installations, including those involved in production of weapons and weapons materials, which are heavily dependent upon the availability of reliable sources of electric power, have been placed in jeopardy by that decision. The subject bill would remove that potential threat and restore to AEC the same powers possessed by other Federal agencies.

I want to emphasize this by repeating it. It will "restore to AEC the same powers possessed by other Federal agencies," and possessed by the AEC up until this particular decision, and used by the AEC on numerous occasions.

I read further from Dr. Seaborg's letter:

> The Atomic Energy Commission therefore supports the early passage of this bill because of its impact on the national defense and security.

As stated in our committee's report, even if there were no dispute over this Stanford powerline this bill should be enacted without further delay.

Second. There were some questions raised by Members of the House on July 12 as to why Congress does not simply do nothing about clarifying section 271 until all possible judicial remedies have been exhausted by the Government. Some have questioned whether it is proper for Congress to reaffirm what it meant when it enacted section 271, until the Supreme Court has passed on this matter.

I can appreciate the concern of those who ask these questions, because there is no member of our committee who desires, in any way, to interfere with normal judicial procedures. This is important. Of course, H.R. 8856 does no such thing.

In this connection, I call the Members attention to a letter dated July 16, 1965, from the Department of Justice which I placed in the daily RECORD on July 26 at page A4052. In this letter the Department of Justice supports the enactment of H.R. 8856 even though further judicial review could still be sought by the Government and points out the adverse consequences of a delay in enactment of this bill. As I have said, the full text of this letter is printed in the daily RECORD.

This bill does not make new law; it merely clarifies what Congress meant all along when it passed section 271. Is it reasonable for Congress to sit back and leave to the courts the resolution of a problem which involves solely the intent of Congress?

Let me repeat that: Is it reasonable for Congress to sit back and leave to the courts the resolution of a problem which involves solely the intent of Congress? To do that would be to abdicate our responsibility.

We must also consider the effect of our ignoring this problem on the operation of the Government's accelerator at Stanford. This facility must have power. I will quote again from Dr. Seaborg's July 14 letter to our committee found on page A4121 of the July 27 daily RECORD:

> The existing 60-kilovolt power supply will be inadequate for project needs by the end of calendar year 1965. Construction of the accelerator is expected to be completed by March 1966. Unless 220-kilovolt power is available by then from an additional power line, maximum scientific productivity of research from this $114-million national facility will not be obtained and will not be reached until adequate power is obtained. An overhead transmission line can be constructed in about 6 month's time. (An underground line will require approximately 24 months to construct. Even if started now, undergrounding of the line would result in a delay in commencement of productive operation of the accelerator by approximately 18 months.)

Mr. Chairman, all of what I have said points to a simple conclusion—Congress should accept its responsibility and pass this proposed legislation without further delay. I reiterate that the Joint Committee unanimously favors H.R. 8856, and urges its adoption.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to depart from my prepared statement and comment on what is at stake in this particular case. I would like to direct the attention of the Members of this body to the telephone and powerlines that you see here in this photograph. These are in the county of San Mateo, which is a party to the court action. Here are some structures now existing in the city of Woodside. You can notice the double pole 60 feet high with all of the superstructure on it. This is La Canada Road in the city of Woodside. You will note 60-foot-high poles with powerlines on them, with telephone cables down below. This is the road on which they want to put the Federal powerline underground. Remember that there are 2,488 poles like this in the city of Woodside now. Some of those poles have been installed after the temporary city ordinance was passed in 1964, and they violated their own ordinance by waiver in doing so. This ordinance was passed after the authorization and the announcement of this accelerator. They renewed the ordinance for 1 year in 1965. It is a temporary ordinance which if not extended will automatically expire within a year of adoption. It was passed only after AEC advised the town it would institute condemnation proceedings.

Now I want to show a specimen of cable to you. This is the kind of cable that would be used to put the existing Woodside distribution lines underground. It would cost from $20,000 to $30,000 a mile. Notwithstanding the fact that this simple device could be put underground, the city of Woodside has not spent one dime in putting their own lines underground and thus eliminating their own 2,488 poles. So when we are talking about electric powerlines here, we are talking about two kinds—distribution lines and heavy voltage transmission lines. When we are talking about heavy voltage transmission, what we are talking about is 220-kilovolt lines. We need two of these 9-inch diameter conduits to get the same kind of wattage that we have in one 3-phase overhead line. This is the copper conductor. This is the insulation, and by 1971 we will need two 9-inch conduits like this if we go underground. Tremendous heat is generated in this steel pipe. It has to be carried off by oil pumped at 200 pounds per square inch pressure and cooled and recirculated as cool, dry oil. It would cost $1 million a mile to put the required two conduits underground.

Remember that this is a national accelerator for the use of scientists all over the United States. This was an accelerator authorized by your Congress as well as mine. Originally it was intended to put the lines up on large towers which would have cost only $668,000, to put the line in for the 5 miles. However, out of consideration for the esthetic desires of the community the AEC agreed to the better looking steel pole structures at a total cost of approximately $1 million.

Now I want to show you the territory involved. This dark green area here on the map on page 24 of the May 1965 committee hearing record is the town of Woodside. The rest is San Mateo County. I want to point out to you that at this time a 220-kilovolt line comes across this way, across the city of Palo Alto, a larger city.

It comes around San Mateo County, crosses the tip of Woodside and goes on around. Tapping into that is the 220-kilovolt line we expect to put in along the Scopsville Route. We are not going to put in the ordinary 120-foot towers which

you put in in your State and we put in my part of the State. As a concession to these people in Woodside we are going to put in lower height ornamental steel poles. These pole structures come in as one-pole, two-pole and three-pole structures. This is a picture of a two-pole structure. It is made of steel. It is 70 feet high. It is 10 feet higher than these existing 60-foot wooden poles with myriads of crossarms which you see in these pictures of Woodside today. There will be three-pole structures in the city of Woodside 1,000 feet apart; one structure has one pole, one has two poles, and one has three poles in the structure itself.

These poles will have three lines about an inch in diameter. The heat from these lines will be dissipated in the air as is the heat from all high voltage 220 kilovolts and above transmission lines at this time in the United States, except 35 miles of underground line—and I will get to that in a minute. Three of these 1-inch diameter lines will carry the necessary wattage to this accelerator at 220 kilovolts.

The Federal Government can put this ornamental line in for $1,050,000. If we go underground with two of those 9-inch diameter conduits it will cost $1 million a mile or a total of $5,400,000. This is what you are voting on, you Members who are interested in economy. You are going to vote whether to spend $5,400,000 to get electricity to this national facility or you are going to spend $1,050,000, a difference of better than $4 million.

But you are going to do another thing. You are going to set a precedent for putting high-voltage lines underground. You are going to set a precedent so that any little locality can come in and say that the Federal Government does not have the right of eminent domain. That is what the precedent means if it is allowed to stand. Any city can say you cannot take a heavy voltage Federal line across it; any county can say that.

What will this cost you in the future, if you allow this precedent to stand? You are going to be told about beauty today. You are going to be told about the President's plan for beauty. But when the White House Conference on Natural Beauty had their meeting here in Washington, this subject matter was under consideration and the participants recognized the difference between high and low voltage lines. Mr. Swidler, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, said that while putting in ordinary distribution lines underground is feasible, it is not yet feasible to put all the heavy transmission lines underground. I refer you to page 36 of our hearing record.

As I said before, there are approximately 35 miles of these high voltage lines—220 kilovolts or above—in the United States; 20 of them in the city of New York.

They are in service tunnels where they can get to them to fix them in the event something goes wrong, if the oil stops pumping, if moisture gets into the line and there is a short, you have to find the melting and you have to fix it.

If an overhead line happens to be damaged you can fix it in a matter of hours.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have laid the proposition before you, the essential ingredients of it. You are going to hear a lot this afternoon from the opponents of this measure. I intend to reserve the balance of my time to answer such arguments as are brought up.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, as you know, this is the second time this bill has been considered by the committee. I would like on this occasion to pay tribute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] for the diligent and effective work he has done with respect to this matter and also to Mr. Clapp and Mr. McCloskey who were associated with him in his appearances before our committee.

Mr. Chairman, if presentation, if persuasiveness in putting over a case were the guidelines under which we should exercise a judgment instead of the facts then I would be voting with the distinguished gentleman from California today. He certainly has done as much as he can with the kind of case that he has.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8856.

The distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has summarized the reasons for our committee's recommendation that this bill be enacted. I wish to express my strong support of the committee's recommendation, and my belief that this legislation is needed for reasons which transcend the dispute over the Stanford powerline. I also want to explain some of the pertinent facts we considered concerning the powerline dispute.

TRANSMISSION VERSUS DISTRIBUTION LINES

The line in question is a high-voltage—220 kilovolts—transmission line. Unlike the case of lower voltage electric distribution lines which carry electricity directly to homes, stores, and so forth, the experts have concluded that burial of high-voltage transmission lines for so-called esthetic reasons is not warranted, because the cost for burying high-voltage transmission lines is very much greater than the relatively low cost for burying low-voltage distribution lines.

The cost, for example, for a 220,000-volt underground transmission line is 10 to 20 times as expensive per mile as a typical 12,000-volt underground distribution line. The estimated cost of such an underground high-voltage transmission line is approximately $500,000 per mile and the comparable cost for an underground low-voltage distribution line is approximately $30,000.

The committee has received an estimate that if the American public were to start subsidizing underground installation in cases where overhead lines would normally be used, the extra cost of electric lines for new construction in the next 12 to 15 years would be roughly $50 billion. This is without counting conversion of existing overhead lines.

THE ADDITIONAL COST TO THE TAXPAYERS OF AN UNDERGROUND LINE

The net additional cost to the taxpayers of this country of going underground in this particular case must be viewed as well over $4 million. Moreover, this amount does not take into account the costs associated with delaying completion of the Stanford accelerator project. At this point, constructing the line underground could take about 12 to 18 months longer than constructing an overhead line. Unless power is available when the facility is completed, its full use will not be possible. The tangible and intangible costs of this delay should therefore be added to the burden which the taxpayer would be asked to assume if this line went underground.

THE FALSE ESTHETICS ISSUE

The AEC has taken several unusual steps to improve the appearance of the proposed overhead powerline. At an additional cost of several hundred thousand dollars, the AEC has agreed to use specially designed, relatively short ornamental poles to carry a single transmission line, although a double line suspended from conventional 120-foot transmission towers would have been cheaper and more advantageous from a project standpoint. A total of 36 pole structures are involved in this controversy, three of which are within the town of Woodside. The AEC is willing to accept the substantial added cost of these more attractive pole structures, although the net effect is actually to provide less reliable service for the Stanford accelerator. In addition, the plans and specifications for this line call for clearing of land only at the pole structure sites themselves, and for access to the sites. Accordingly, there will be no unsightly swath of felled trees and underbrush such as is common for most overhead powerlines.

In light of these facts, no adequate reason has been provided to the committee, during all the hearings held on this subject, why the taxpayers of the United States should be asked to shoulder the extra cost of an underground line for the benefit of the local residents, particularly in view of the present appearance of the Woodside area from an esthetic standpoint. There are currently thousands of poles in the Woodside area, and a number have been erected in the town of Woodside and San Mateo County while the controversy over the Stanford powerline has been going on. To submit to the demands of the local residents in this case would not only be unjustified, but would open the door to charges of favoritism, and demands for equal treatment at other Government sites all over the country.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see every electric line in the United States underground. In my city of Montebello there is the march of pole lines from Boulder Dam, 120 feet high. There are no ornamental poles 70 feet high, but a tower that goes on across the countryside. It would cost a million dollars a mile to put them underground.

That is the cost of putting these lines underground.

Let me call attention to our hearings. On page 120 the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. said if they put these lines underground it would add $533,000 annually to the cost of the electricity for as long as we use it. If we used it 20 years it is 20 times $533,000. That is the additional cost in California for putting these lines underground on the electricity itself. That is only one unit.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. My understanding is that the President's wife has embarked upon a program of beautifying the countryside of this Nation. If so, and I assume it is because much publicity has been given to it, do we have any indication whether the President's wife approves putting powerlines aboveground?

Mr. BATES. I do not know that Mrs. Johnson has passed judgment on this particular matter, but I understand one of these beautification committees has considered this proposal, and also the prospect of putting powerlines underground throughout the country. But they thought that $50 billion might be better spent somewhere else.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts. We have large AEC installations in my district in Tennessee and we are very happy to see those powerlines because it indicates people are working or are going to work. I strongly support this bill.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, last week the Roads Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives began hearings on a series of four highway beautification bills which were submitted to the Congress by the President this year. One of these bills recommended that Congress take action to pass legislation to require the tearing down of all billboards on Federal interstate highway routes except in commercial or industrially zoned areas.

Another of those bills recommends that Congress pass legislation to require that junkyards be eliminated on Federal interstate highway routes except in industrial or commercially zoned areas.

Another of those bills recommended that the Congress require the States to allocate 3 percent of all the Federal interstate highway funds that we grant to the States purely for highway beautification purposes.

The fourth of the bills requires that one-third of Federal grants for State secondary routes be allocated strictly for highway beautification purposes.

Now there could not be a more inconsistent proposal from the standpoint of the administration than the proposal that is here before us today. Because where in the case of the four highway beautification bills, the administration has said it is a blot on the national landscape to have billboards and junkyards visible to the eyes of the people as they travel on these routes, the administration in the bill before us today is proposing that it itself put up poles that will be a detriment to the scenic beauty of a small community—a very lovely community—that would like to avoid having this type of high voltage line overhead.

If the administration means what it says when it recommends to the Congress that we pass legislation in the field of highway beautification—and I might say that when it says 3 percent of all our grants for Federal interstate highways should go for highway beautification, that means at least $90 million a year because we are today allocating on a scale of $3 billion per year for Federal interstate highway grants. So the administration is telling the Congress, we want you to spend $90 million more than before purely for highway beautification. And the administration further said, We want you to increase taxes to do this.

The administration has submitted recommendations to the Congress to increase the highway users tax for beautification purposes.

In view of all these facts, it seems to me we should carry out the announced intention of the administration to work toward and add to the beautification of our Nation. If we are going to achieve this objective, we should defeat this bill. We should recognize the right of the local community to insist that these high-voltage powerlines be placed underground. This would be the consistent thing to do.

Furthermore, this court case has not even gone through the last stage available to the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice still has the right to appeal the case to the U.S. Supreme Court. It seems to me in any case, this bill should be turned down at this point until the U.S. Department of Justice exhausts the judicial remedies available to it under the appeal procedure to the U.S. Supreme Court.

For these reasons, I oppose this bill, H.R. 8856, and I hope the House will defeat this measure today.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I wish that this bill were as simple as the proponents say it is, but it is not a simple little bill by any manner of means. What you are being asked to do here today will have very far-reaching effects, far beyond a little town out in California and a few little powerlines to a facility of the Atomic Energy Commission.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 211]

Baring	Friedel	Powell
Blatnik	Fulton, Tenn.	Ryan
Bonner	Fuqua	Springer
Bow	Garmatz	Toll
Cahill	Halleck	Tupper
Colmer	Jones, Mo.	Ullman
Cramer	Karth	Watson
Diggs	Keogh	
Evins, Tenn.	Lindsay	
Fallon	McEwen	
Ford, William D.	McVicker	
	Morton	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] having assumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, 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. 8856) to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 402 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, as I stated, this is not a simple little bill. This bill is not one just involving a little town in California that has a dispute with a power company or where a few power poles and lines shall be erected. This bill determines whether or not this Congress wants to do two things. First, to interfere with the judicial processes and the courts of this country. Second, to give to the Atomic Energy Commission power it never had.

The chairman of the committee, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy told you, and the report is complete, that the U.S. court of appeals has determined that the Atomic Energy Commission never had and Congress never gave them the power they thought they had.

The town of Woodside, Calif., got into a dispute with a public utility as to where the public utility high voltage lines carrying power to a facility of the Atomic Energy Commission should be placed and how they should be placed.

The town of Woodside said they had the right to determine this matter and refused to grant the public utility the necessary rights-of-way. The public utility then went to the Atomic Energy Commission and said in effect that the AEC was being challenged. The AEC wrote the town mayor that they hoped the Government would not have to acquire portions of the right-of-way for the public utility.

The Atomic Energy Commission then instituted condemnation proceedings and the Federal Court dismissed the town's answers.

The town appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals and on May 20, 1965, the court reversed the lower court's decision holding that section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act did not give the AEC the right of eminent domain to erect and maintain

powerlines. On May 25, 1965, this bill was introduced to give to the AEC the power that the Federal courts determined they never had. If you pass this bill you are in effect saying that if you are the winner in a court case against the Federal Government, all you can expect is to have Congress pass a bill denying you the right to your verdict even before you have a chance to enjoy it.

The decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals stated the Atomic Energy Commission never had any right to construct powerlines where they desired, if it did not meet the local requirements. Congress, when it amended the AEC Act in 1954 specified that in the generation, sale or transmission of electric power produced through the use of nuclear facilities licensed by the AEC, the local authorities on Federal, State, and local levels would retain their usual jurisdiction they have historically had over the generation, transmission, and sale of electric power.

The local and State or the proper governing bodies were allowed to say where and how electric generation and transmission facilities would come into their communities.

If this bill passes, notice what it will do. It will give to the Atomic Energy Commission the right to go into any town, any community anywhere in the United States and to tell the local people that they have no right in their local area to make any regulation with respect to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power which would in any way regulate, control or restrict the activities of the AEC in the generation of electricity through the use of nuclear facilities licensed by the Commission.

They talk about money. That is a side issue.

They talk about delay. If the public utility would have gone ahead and put their high-voltage lines underground it would be completed now. Their own record shows that proceedings were started in January 1963. That was 30 months ago. It has been said it will take 24 months to put these lines underground. If the public utility had gone ahead at that time, the lines would be underground and the power would be on the lines today.

I urge you to do what was done when this bill was brought up under suspension of the rules. Vote it down. If the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy does not like it, let the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy urge the Justice Department to appeal the case to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have never heard a case so misstated as was done by the gentleman who just left the well of the House. Of course, I know he did it because of lack of knowledge on the subject, and he would not do it willingly if he had read the court's opinion and knew what the court said. I read from the court decision:

> The general sovereign immunity of the Federal Government, its agencies and instrumentalities, from State or local control of its governmental functions, is established under the supremacy clause of article VI of the Constitution. (*Mayo* v. *United States*, 319 U.S. 441.) It follows that the activities of AEC in connection with the construction and operation of the transmission line in question, are wholly immune from local control, unless it can be established that Congress has directed that AEC subject itself thereto.

Discussing the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 the court goes on to say:

> The act provides that the Federal Government, through AEC, is to exercise exclusive control over the development and use of atomic energy and special nuclear material for all purposes. Sections 1 and 2 of the act, 42 U.S.C. 2011–2013. To effectuate this purpose, Congress conferred upon AEC authority to, among other things, license the use of nuclear energy for industrial or commercial purposes (secs. 101–103 of the act, 42 U.S.C. 2131–2133) and further, Congress not only authorized AEC to promote and conduct research in the nuclear field, but directed that AEC do so. Sections 31–33 of the act, 42 U.S.C. 2051–2053.
>
> For the purpose of enabling AEC to fulfill these duties and perform these functions, the act gives that agency specific authority to acquire such material, property, equipment, and facilities, establish or construct such buildings and facilities, and modify such buildings and facilities, as it may deem necessary. AEC is also expressly authorized to acquire, purchase, lease, and hold real and personal property, as agent to and on behalf of the United States. Section 161 of the act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 2201 (e) and (g).
>
> Without doubt the sovereign immunity derived from the supremacy clause, coupled with these statutory provisions, authorize AEC to construct and operate an overhead transmission line in disregard of local authority or regulations, absent some statutory provision limiting AEC's authority in this regard. It is equally clear that neither the act, nor any other Federal statutes called to our attention, contains an express limitation of this kind.
>
> The question remains whether sections 271 or 274(k) of the act, relied upon by appellants, constitute, by necessary implication, such a limitation.

I was on the committee when the 1954 act was passed under the sponsorship of Congressman Sterling Cole, of New York, in this body and Senator HICKENLOOPER in the other body. Senator HICKENLOOPER has a statement in the committee hearing record on page 51 saying it was not the intent of the Congress to take away from the AEC the right which every Federal agency has.

I read further from the letter from the Justice Department, dated June 16, 1965, on page 172 of the Joint Committee hearings. Speaking about the language of our bill the Justice Department says:

> This language would in no respect give the Commission an exemption from State or local regulation greater than that enjoyed by other Federal agencies. The court of appeals itself recognized at page 8 of the slipsheet opinion that local regulation was applicable only by implication solely by virtue of the special statutory provision and that no such limitation on the Commission's power is to be found elsewhere. The amendment to section 271 will serve merely to apply existing Federal—

The gentleman read the word "Federal" but did not pay much attention to it. The Department of Justice letter goes on to say:

> The amendment to section 271 will serve merely to apply existing Federal, State, and local public utility regulations to the licensees of the Commission so as not to give them an advantage over other public utilities, thus preserving the historical powers over public utilities.

Our report on page 6 says:

> The bill recommended by the committee would clarify the language of section 271 so as to correct any such erroneous conclusion that Congress intended that AEC's activities, as authorized by Congress, be limited by the authority or regulations of local authorities with respect to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power.

And now consider this additional sentence in the committee report:

> It would acordingly reaffirm the intent of Congress that AEC possess the same sovereign immunity, under the supremacy clause of article VI of the Constitution, that other Federal agencies possess.

That is the major purpose of the bill.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the argument just presented by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], wherein he said that if this bill is adopted, it is going to enable the Atomic Energy Commission literally to go into any village, town, or hamlet in the United States and tell them what they can or cannot do.

Ladies and gentleman, I think those of you who know me at all and know the positions I have taken on issues that come before this House know that I would not be here in the well this afternoon urging your support of this legislation if I felt that that were the issue before us; that is, that by the adoption of this bill we were going to pit the colossus of the Federal Government against every little town in the country. Believe me, that is not the issue. If it were, as I say, my position would be very much in opposition of what it is today. The question here is very simple, I think. It is a narrow question, that is, what was the intent of Congress in 1954 when it passed the Atomic Energy Act and included this section 271.

You heard just a few minutes ago from the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], the assurance from one of the cosponsors of the legislation, and have the assurance of the senior Senator from Iowa, Senator HICKENLOOPER, when he said in his testimony or in his statement to our committee:

> It is clear to me that this language does not confer any authority on any "Federal, State, or local agency." It was intended neither to add to nor detract from any existing power which such a body had.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Yes. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The excerpt that the gentleman from Illinois read was from the testimony on page 52 of the

hearings by the gentleman from Iowa, Senator HICKENLOOPER, who was at that time the chairman of the Joint Committee in the 83d Congress and who handled the bill on the floor. As to the intent of Congress at that time, if the chairman's statement cannot be considered as intent, I do not know what can be.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I think that the gentleman's contribution to the debate is useful and significant, for this further and additional reason. I go back now to one of the statements made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] where he said this represents an arrogant and unwarranted interference on the part of the Congress with the judicial process. We are trying to step in and tell the Federal courts of this country what they can or cannot do. Again, nothing could be farther from the fact. We are simply, according to the statement that was just read, made by the chairman, by this act, trying to clarify the intent of Congress. Who, or what body, would be in a better position to do that than this very Congress which adopted the initial legislation, to say now and forevermore, and hopefully, this was the intent of Congress at the time this act was passed.

The letter from the Department of Justice, for what that may be worth—and I think it is valuable—gives us some valuable insight into this problem and further authority for the fact that there is nothing improper about what we are trying to do here today. We are not trying to step on the Federal courts or to change the judicial process by asserting in this bill today that it was not our intent in passing this section in 1954 to literally do away with part of the Constitution, because that is what you have to do if you adopt the Court's decision. You have to say that article VI of the U.S. Constitution, the supremacy clause, means nothing with respect to the AEC.

Here is an agency which carries out among its program missions some of the most important defense activities of the Government. Some of the activities and installations of the AEC are connected and concerned with manufacturing the weapons that constitute part of our nuclear deterrent. Are we going to say that these activities by the Atomic Energy Commission are to be subordinated to any local ordinance or any local regulation that may be passed after the fact, as was the case in Woodside, Calif.? I cannot believe that this Congress should be taking a step of this kind by turning down this bill today and assume that kind of responsibility.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The Atomic Energy Commission has used this power throughout its life. It has put in high-voltage transmission lines. It has never been challenged before until this time on this particular subject.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman is correct. What we are asking today for the Atomic Energy Commission is simply what every other Federal agency now has with respect to the power that it has under the Constitution; authority to condemn for a public purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of the legislation.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I appreciate the gentleman's statement which goes a long way toward clarifying the situation in my mind and I think in the minds of many of us who are not quite as technically familiar with the detail as some of those who have spoken. But I have one question which I hope the gentleman can answer succinctly. Will this bill in any way give additional power to the Atomic Energy Commission which it does not now have?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. No, absolutely not. It would merely confirm the power it should have and does have I think, already, under the Constitution and under the law.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose during the time allotted me to devote myself primarily to the question of separation of powers which is involved and also to the question of constitutionality. I am not going to discuss the beautification issue or the technical aspects of this underground powerline.

The previous speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] and also the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], seem to have pinpointed their argument on the thesis that we are here today to reaffirm the congressional intent of Congress in 1954. The gentleman from California has so stated. To paraphrase his statement he said:

> This is not the making of a new law—we are only reaffirming what a previous Congress meant.

Mr. Chairman, the 83d Congress adjourned sine die December 2, 1954. The House of Representatives is not a continuing body. On December 2, 1954, the record of the 83d Congress was written and it was final and it was not subject to second-guesses or afterthoughts.

Apropos right now is this quotation from the Rubaiyat:

> The Moving Finger writes; and, having writ,
> Moves on: nor all your Piety nor Wit
> Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line,
> Nor all your Tears wash out a Word of it.

We can write new law here today, and if this bill is passed, it will have a public law number and it will become a part of the statutes. It will be law. That is what we are doing. If this law were to apply to Woodside we would be writing ex post facto law. But we are not establishing congressional intent in 1954.

Mr. Chairman, congressional intent can only be established by a court and the only factors that a court can consider are the printed hearings, the report, the debate and the official documents pertaining to the passage of that bill.

Mr. Chairman, the courts have spoken in this case. They have upheld the Woodside ordinance as being consistent with the intent of Congress.

The United States Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit has so stated.

We cannot determine in 1965 what was intended in 1954.

Mr. Chairman, a letter from the Senator from Iowa cannot determine the intent in 1954. The feelings of the gentleman from California are not pertinent at this time, because the court is the only agency which has a right to determine congressional intent. Once a Congress has adjourned sine die, only the courts can speak.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is up to us here today to ask ourselves if we are willing to write new law and assume the judicial power unto the legislative branch. If we legislate—and that is what we are doing—to undo a local ordinance which has been upheld by the courts, we legislate on an ex post facto basis.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, let us consider for just a moment this question of what the legislative intent was in 1954. I am willing to talk about it.

Let us read from the committee report:

> Because of these unique provisions in the act pertaining to AEC's licensing and regulation of persons operating reactors which could be used to produce electricity, there was some feeling of uneasiness among the drafters of the legislation over the effect of the new law upon other agencies—Federal, State, and local—having jurisdiction over the generation, sale, and transmission of electric power. It was recognized by the drafters that the authority of these other agencies with respect to the generation, sale, and transmission of electric power produced through the use of nuclear facilities was not affected by this new law; and that AEC's regulatory control was limited to considerations involving the common defense and security and the protection of the health and safety of the public with respect to the special hazards associated with the operation of nuclear facilities.

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

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

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I continue quoting from the report:

> Nevertheless, section 271 was added to make its explicit that licensees of the AEC who produced power through the use of nuclear facilities would otherwise remain subject to the authority of all appropriate Federal, State, and local authorities with respect to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power.

Note the word "appropriate."

Mr. Chairman, I raise this question: Is the county of San Mateo, is the city of Woodside, an appropriate agency to grant a land-use permit in accordance with the laws of the State of California?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an answer to that question?

Mr. GUBSER. I shall yield to the gentleman in just a moment.

If it is not an appropriate agency then why did the AEC execute a contract with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. which was subject to the ability of Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to secure a land use permit?

The very existence of that contract to which the AEC was a party presumes the right of the city of Woodside to regulate the conditions under which the

powerline could be built. And it naturally follows that if Woodside had the power to grant the land use permit it also has the power to deny it. The courts have upheld that right and if it is to be questioned further it should properly be carried to the U.S. Supreme Court on appeal.

Why are we asked to come here and legislate on a purely ex post facto basis? We are attempting today to undo something legislatively which was a right in accordance with the law passed in 1954, and which the courts of this Nation have said was a right.

Let us look at the bill for a moment. I am concerned with the word "any" on the first page. Let me read part of it:

Provided, That this section shall not be deemed to confer upon any Federal, State, or local agency any authority to regulate, control, or restrict any activities of the Commission.

That apparently means that local zoning ordinances are not worth a hoot. Does it mean, for instance, that the Atomic Energy Commission can dump raw sewage into a creek running alongside Woodside, in violation of the California pollution laws? I do not know. I am asking.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an answer?

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

Mr. HOSMER. Of course it does not mean that. The only thing that the amendment of 271 is talking about is the transmission of electric power; 271 was put in to make sure that the local authorities could regulate the sale of electricity that was generated in nuclear power reactors. It had nothing to do with the AEC or this question of AEC buying electricity. The court said it has, so we are here to straighten this out, and give them that power.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman. That is a clear-cut answer to my question, and it is satisfactory. But I point out that it establishes legislative intent prospectively, and does not assume the right to determine legislative intent retroactively. Either way one looks at this bill it follows a wrong course of action.

If we attempt to legislate the intent of a 1954 Congress in the year 1965 we are assuming a judicial prerogative in this legislative body.

On the other hand, if we pass a bill which retroactively undoes what the courts have upheld we are passing ex post facto law in defense of the spirit and perhaps the letter of the U.S. Constitution.

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I take the time of this Committee because a dozen communities within my district are presently threatened by the Federal Power Commission and the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, which would run powerlines through residential communities, through a State park, where the State park commission passed a resolution against overhead powerlines and through several communities which passed specific ordinances requiring powerlines to go underground.

One gentleman who spoke previously said this is not a question of the power of villages and towns to defend themselves against the great colossus, the Federal Government, but what he said is not true. Nothing presents this issue more dramatically than when one of your communities is planning its residential growth, and along comes the AEC or FPC saying, "We want to put a huge powerline, towers and right-of-way through your community in violation of all your zoning ordinances, in violation of all your zoning, and in violation of your expressed intent."

Mr. Chairman, the amendment to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 before the House today is a classic example of the confrontation that is taking place with depressing frequency between the people and various special interest Government agencies, like the AEC and the FPC.

On the one hand are the citizens of Woodside, Calif., attempting to protect and defend their property. On the other hand, the technicians and accountants of the Atomic Energy Commission all fighting for mils of power production.

I urge my colleagues to consider that passage of this legislation would be more than merely a simple injustice to the residents of a small community in California. It would also be a threat to every other town and village in the Nation.

The issue here is simple. The AEC wants to string high-tension wires over the beautiful residential community of Woodside. The citizens of Woodside want to protect their homes and property from this destruction. The courts have ruled for Woodside.

Now the AEC wants to change the rules, so that the AEC can win.

I want to remind my colleagues that this is a matter now being adjudicated by the courts. It would be an unwarranted intrusion indeed for the Congress to act.

We must defeat this amendment today and serve notice on the special interest agencies of the Federal and State Governments that the Congress of the United States will no longer countenance wanton destruction of private property.

It has been said, with considerable truth, I am afraid, that the greatest threat to natural beauty in the United States today comes from unrestrained activity by Federal agencies.

This is very unfortunate and I hope that the program enunciated by President Johnson in his message on natural beauty will eventually filter down to the technicians in these agencies. But more unfortunate still is the helplessness of the average citizen like you and me in the face of a federally supported onslaught on his private property.

What good does it do the citizens of Woodside, Calif., or Westchester, N.Y., or any other community to plan and zone and beautify their residential communities when a Federal agency can come in and upset it all by condemnation?

The power we have given the FPC and the power that this amendment now seeks to give the AEC is an awesome one. It permits these special interest agencies to condemn not only private property, but property which has been set aside for the people as parks and even lawfully enacted zoning and planning regulations. In Putnam County, N.Y., which is in my district, the FPC is preparing now to approve a powerline route that cuts right through the heart of a public park belonging to the State of New York. It is preparing to authorize this route in spite of the opposition of the State council of parks as expressed in a unanimous resolution. It has seriously considered a route that would destroy a badly needed school site. Under the Federal Power Act, the State is powerless to stop them. It has happened in Westchester and Woodside. It can happen in any community represented here today.

Is this the power my distinguished colleagues wish to extend now to the AEC?

The AEC says that the citizens of Woodside had an opportunity to express themselves in public hearings on the subject. So they did and they expressed themselves clearly as opposed. We in Westchester and Putnam Counties have also had a chance to express our feelings about an FPC project in our area. We know exactly how that works and it is time that Congress took affirmative steps to correct the inequities. What justice can an individual expect when he is pleading his case before a Federal commission which is, by virtue of its very charter, an interested party to the case?

The AEC says that to put the lines underground would be too expensive. A lot of people have said this, but there has been no real effort to find out how underground installations can be made economical and effective. The figures that the AEC quotes come not from disinterested research but from the same power companies that do not want to be forced to put their lines underground. How good are the figures? Commissioner Charles R. Ross, of the FPC, who knows these companies well, commented in his dissent from the majority in the Con Edison-Storm King case this year:

As the examiner has pointed out, staff had serious reservations about the reliability of company estimates. I do too. Too often, when a utility doesn't wish to do something, it becomes prohibitively expensive.

Here today we have seen an example of the unreliability of figures being given us. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], said that these underground lines cost $1 million per mile. The gentleman from Massachusetts, who spoke for the other side, said they cost a half million dollars a mile. We have just saved a half million dollars a mile. That is pretty good.

Let me say that the same thing happened in the Con Ed case before the FPC. Consolidated Edison said it would cost 20 times the price to put the lines underground, but by the time they finished their testimony it was down to eight times. We are told that actually the price for which these lines can be put underground is minimal indeed—perhaps two or three times the price to

put the lines overhead. And that does not take into consideration the maintenance of overhead lines, the loss of value to communities, and many other price factors about which not a word has been said so far as the local communities are concerned.

Proponents of this measure have quoted figures from the panel on underground transmission of the White House Conference on Natural Beauty.

This is a fine, impartial jury, indeed. There was the chairman of the board of Detroit Edison, a vice president of Commonwealth Edison, an executive vice president of Westinghouse, the president of a public power association, a State power commissioner, a general manager of a municipal power department, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. In short, seven of the eight authorities that participated in the panel had a vested interest in not being forced to go underground. I hope that no American is ever faced with such a judge and such a jury.

Now let us look at the record. Ten years ago these same power interests were opposing efforts to make them put distribution lines underground. They pointed out that it was then 10 times more expensive to put these lines underground than to string them on poles through the cities and towns and villages of America. Fortunately, however, they could not seek refuge under the wing of the Federal Power Act, and they had to follow local ordinances. Today, they proudly report that the cost ratio is only 1½ to 1. Good, but they never would have found this out unless they had been forced to.

The whole question of economics has never been adequately explored. The AEC complains about the cost of going underground. What about the cost to local residents of going above the ground?

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

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, experts estimate that 300 acres of residential property is damaged and devalued by every mile of overhead powerlines. How much does this cost the citizens of Woodside in depreciated values, in lost tax revenue?

The committee expressed surprise that nobody in Woodside had offered to come forward and pay for going underground. This is reminiscent of the statement made by Governor Rockefeller when a group of citizens were trying to save Storm King Mountain from Con Edison.

"If they care so much, why don't they go and buy the mountain," the Governor asked.

These two suggestions rank among the most outrageous I have ever heard made by public officials. Let them eat cake, indeed. Now, we do not want to lose our heads over this, but how many times do the citizens of Woodside have to buy the land before it is safe.

There is another equally important reason to oppose this measure. The AEC and the FPC have been talking for some time now about putting lines underground, but they have done nothing about it. The FPC, in a recent decision on a Consolidated Edison license which involved many miles of overhead high tension powerlines through my district, predicted that within just a few years it would be requiring all lines to be placed underground.

It is time to make a start. Every powerline placed overhead today anticipates a further cost of placing it underground tomorrow. By roundly defeating this bill, we can demonstrate dramatically how seriously Congress views the importance of placing lines underground now. The FPC, AEC and other Federal agencies should take notice.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this objectionable bill and to stand up in defense of the right of the private citizen and his local governments to determine the use to which their lands will be put. I urge them, too, to put the FPC and AEC on firm notice that we expect action now on putting powerlines underground.

It can happen here. It happened in Woodside, Calif.; it happened in Westchester County, N.Y.; it happened in Huntington, Long Island; it can happen in any district in the Nation.

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of California. I should like to commend the distinguished gentleman from New York not only for his well documented statement today but for his past efforts in enabling the House to reach mature judgments on the problems confronting us. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and add a footnote of my own that this particular community, although adversely affected by this proposed legislation, is only one willful application of a national problem that we must come to grips with. This provides the House, in my judgment, with the most timely method by which we can inform all national agencies that we are determined to prevent national agencies and their actions from contributing to the destruction of the scenic life of this land of ours.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, our colleague from California made a statement that some of the items mentioned were a complete misrepresentation. I want to call his attention to something that is completely misrepresented. For one thing, he knows that these poles are merely a red herring he has been dragging over this floor on every occasion and in every hearing. The city of Woodside has already passed a resolution that these poles shall come down. He also knows that there has not been a pole erected in Woodside since they passed the resolution. You have the statement of the mayor on that in your hearings, and you know that is true. The mayor told you that they had permitted some poles before they passed the resolution, but there has not been, outside of those that were permitted prior to the resolution, one pole erected in Woodside, and there will not be.

Now, the gentleman asked about a matter of limitations. They do not want the Atomic Energy Commission to be limited. Now, that is apparent. It is very apparent from the amendment they want adopted because this removes any kind of a limitation. I do not care how you read it. You can cut it any way you want to. If they only meant that this applied, as the other gentleman from California mentioned, to the question of generation, sale, and transmission of power, they would have said so, but they did not say that. They said, "restrict any activity." Now, tell me any agency of the Federal Government that has a clause in their act that is comparable to this act that you want this Congress to pass. That has not been mentioned. They say, "Oh, give the power that the AEC wants and which every other agency has." I am asking you to give us an example of another agency that has the same wording you are asking Congress to pass at this time. Of course, you do not want it limited. The Atomic Energy Commission wants complete control over the State and community to go in and do anything whatsoever it wishes. Any activity. Yesterday I mentioned that.

They have a problem from their Hanford plant for all along the Columbia River on account of the incidence of cancer and leukemia which is increasing along the Columbia River as a result of the radioisotopes from the Hanford plant. And they are going to have trouble with that. Of course, they want to remove the State from having anything to say about it. They want to go into a State and violate the health ordinances, the safety ordinances, or any other kind of ordinances and they do not want merely the power to put in poles for transmission of power; if they wanted that they would have said so. But they say "any activity" that they want.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. If this amendment passes will the local unit of government be prohibited from having jurisdiction and control over the final outcome of this particular problem?

Mr. YOUNGER. I do not think there is any question about it in the future. I doubt that this would apply to Woodside. The attorney that beat AEC in the court is of the opinion that they cannot go back in court and take the present congressional action. They will have to go in under the old act. So I am not saying that this is going to cover Woodside. I am talking about the districts that you gentlemen represent; and the district that you save by your "no" vote today may be your own district within the next month or 2 months.

Now as to the cost. This has been read into the RECORD a number of times. Here is a letter from the vice president and general operating manager of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.:

With respect to the Jefferson-SLAC route, Pacific Gas & Electric estimates the cost of a single circuit, 180-megawatt, combination overhead (1.71 miles), underground (4.75 miles) line from Jefferson substation to be $2,217,000 and the cost of a single cir-

cuit, 300-megawatt line, along the same route to be $2,762,000.

That is the word from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. There is the question, when is this needed? Why all the urgency? In the testimony before the committee on page 11 this statement was made by Mr. Panofsky, who is the manager of the installation:

To summarize, postponement of the 220-kilovolt service to a date later than March 1966, would progressively impair the research effectiveness of the SLAC laboratory by forcing operation at lower energy and lower data rate and by making it impossible for us to serve multiple users. By fiscal year 1968 the harm would be exceedingly serious.

This matter does not become serious until 1968 by their own statement. So why all of the hurry?

The question was also raised about this installation's doing military work. You know, there is a very interesting case that was before the National Labor Relations Board in regard to the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. They were trying to get control, and they had a hearing before the NLRB. Here are the findings and here is what the NLRB said:

All employees are employees of Stanford, and the director and deputy director report directly to the president of the university. The president, in turn, is responsible to a self-perpetuating board of trustees who exert ultimate control over SLAC as well as other aspects of the university.

Then they make a statement in regard to the use, which is very significant—and I would like to have you listen to this:

The research being conducted at SLAC is not being performed for the Government; it has exerted no impact on national defense, nor is it expected to do so. The center is considered a part of the campus and access thereto is apparently unrestricted.

The work is not classified and the results are available to all interested parties; Soviet-bloc visitors are and have been permitted free access to the facility. * * * No research is conducted for commercial firms and no firm has shown interest in any of the work at SLAC. In fact, no commercially utilizable research is envisioned.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is from a hearing by the National Labor Relations Board which went into this matter very carefully.

So, Mr. Chairman, when they come up with all this argument of how important this situation is and how apparently we must hurry to get this overhead line in, I refer you to our own NLRB which conducted the complete investigation of the activities of this particular installation at Stanford.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other point that I would like to make, and this is a resolution passed by the Democratic Committee of San Mateo County:

Resolved, That the San Mateo County Council of Democratic Clubs goes on record supporting the township of Woodside in its fight to prevent the Atomic Energy Commission from flouting local laws and the legislative desires of the people to maintain the natural beauty of their area by obtaining a special act of Congress to permit them (AEC) to put up overhead powerlines through Woodside to the Stanford linear accelerator.

This is signed by Claire W. Penn, corresponding secretary of the San Mateo County Council of Democrats.

Mr. Chairman, I have one other matter here that has not been in the RECORD but which I think is very important.

It is most surprising to me that here you have an agency, the AEC, which is supposed to have breakthroughs. They are supposed to spend money on research and be not afraid to do something because it might be difficult or someone says it cannot be done. That is the type of work that the AEC ought to be doing. But do the members of the Committee realize that over in England when they talk about putting in these powerlines, they put a heavy powerline in. I would like to read to you from a news article which I have on this matter.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I shall be glad to yield the gentleman some additional time.

Mr. YOUNGER. I shall get more time later on and I will read this into the RECORD at that time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS]

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to make some inquiries of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], who handled this bill, in order to get the matter in clear focus in my own mind.

Now, is it my understanding, I ask the gentleman from California, am I correct in my assumption that prior to the inclusion of section 271 in the Atomic Energy Act, the Atomic Energy Commission did have the power of eminent domain?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, not only prior to it but afterwards. This authority was only changed, in effect, by this circuit court interpretation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. But the matter had not been heretofore determined by the courts?

The circuit court held that because 271 was in the act the Atomic Energy Commission did not have the power of eminent domain because it had been taken away from them.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That was in effect their decision. One of the previous courts had held otherwise.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. What this bill is doing is giving back to the Atomic Energy Commission the power of eminent domain which the circuit court took away from them in that decision?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; and other Federal agencies have the same power.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am talking about the Atomic Energy Commission. Let us keep it on one thing.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Why was 271 included in the Atomic Energy Act in the first instance?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That has been explained, but I will state it in the words of Senator HICKENLOOPER.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I want it in your words. I have read Mr. HICKENLOOPER's words.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It was put in to make it explicit that licensees of the AEC who produced power through the use of nuclear facilities would otherwise remain subject to the authority of all appropriate Federal, State, and local authorities with respect to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And that applies in this instance.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Let me ask one further question. The gentleman was there at the time. Was there any discussion when you were talking about 271 that they wanted to prevent the Atomic Energy Commission from building any kind of atomic energy equipment inside of the city limits of any municipal corporation, and therefore there was taken away from the Commission the power of eminent domain to do that?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There was no such discussion.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If this bill passes, then the Atomic Energy Commission could put a reactor in the center of the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. This bill has nothing to do with that.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I repeat, the Atomic Energy Commission could put a reactor in the center of Los Angeles if they wanted to do so.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There are criteria for locating reactors, which a statutory body passes upon, an independent statutory authority known as the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. Section 271 has nothing to do with that.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The Atomic Energy Commission can veto your advisory committee and do anything it wants to under the power of eminent domain. I am not saying what it would do, I am talking about what powers it has.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Whatever power the AEC has as a Federal agency it can exercise.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If this bill passes they would have that power to place a reactor anywhere they wanted to.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Not unless they had it before.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thought you said they did have it before.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They had the power of eminent domain the same as the Department of the Interior, but it has to be exercised subject to congressional control.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. What actually happened, as I read Senator HICKENLOOPER's remarks, he had one thing in mind, and other people might have had something else in mind, but the language was very loose, was it not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It has been so construed. We did not consider it to be loose.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The point is that the city of Woodside, or San Mateo, wanted to stop the AEC from putting the line through and these people invoked what they thought was the law supporting them.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. After the Congress authorized the accelerator the city

passed a temporary ordinance in 1964 which prohibited the passing of a high-voltage line through their municipality.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. They did that because they read the act, and they concluded they had the right to do it?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I assume that is a logical conclusion.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The point is this—and I will make it brief—it appears to me what has been done in this case is that the Federal Government came in thinking it had certain rights, and found out it did not have those rights. Who is to blame for their not having those rights I do not know. But they got into a lawsuit, and the Federal Government, when it found out it was going to lose the lawsuit, came up here and said to the Congress: "We want you to change the rules in the middle of the stream."

Now if that is going to be the policy that is going to be pursued—and I am not talking about this particular case—I am talking about the general policy—if that is going to be the policy that is going to be pursued, there is not any use in ever getting into a suit with the Federal Government because if they lose the suit they will come up here and get the Congress to change the law before the man who won the victory can benefit by it.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. In this case it happened to be a nuisance suit that went wrong and the plaintiff was totally amazed as was the defense in this case. So now we are trying to get things straightened out right so that this Government agency will have the same power that any other Government agency has.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is the gentleman's conclusion. The Federal court held that it was not a nuisance but a bona fide proceeding, well founded in law. Upholding the very conclusion I heretofore stated.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to the Committee that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, composed of Members of the other body and of this body as well, and of which I am a member, have given long and careful consideration to this bill. We held two hearings on it and discussed it at several committee meetings.

Speaking as a ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House as well as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I believe H.R. 8856 is a sound piece of legislation which should be enacted without further delay.

Now there have been some questions raised and the able chairman of the Joint Committee, our colleague, the gentleman from California, referred to a letter from the Department of Justice of June 16, 1965, which in effect approved the procedure that we are taking in remedying the situation that needs to be remedied.

In addition to this letter of June 16, 1965, we have another letter from the Department of Justice dated July 16, 1965. Mr. Chairman, I should like to read that letter into the RECORD at this time. This letter is addressed to the chairman of the Joint Committee. It is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1965.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to the request of counsel for your committee for our views as to the propriety of changing the language of section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2018), despite the fact that its interpretation is presently before the courts. We have also been asked for an estimate of the time required to resolve this question in the courts, assuming further proceedings are to be taken by the Federal Government, in the absence of clarifying legislation.

The proposed legislation now under consideration is intended to clarify the law in order to make clear the original intent of Congress in enacting section 271. We are informed that the Atomic Energy Commission is of the opinion that its program requires that the transmission facilities become available without further delay and that the Commission supports the early passage of this bill because of its impact on the national defense and security. In view of this, the enactment of the proposed legislation at an early date would not be improper despite the fact that further judicial review of the ninth circuit decision could yet be sought and would provide the only means of meeting the emergency situation.

The time involved in seeking further judicial review of the court of appeals decision absent clarifying legislation can only be estimated. Though such petitions are normally denied, there is a possibility that the court of appeals might grant a petition for rehearing. The Government has until August 18, 1965, to file such a petition. A decision by the court of appeals as to whether to grant any such application might reasonably be expected within 10 days or so after the filing of a petition for rehearing. If such a petition were granted, additional time for briefing might be allowed and thereafter a date for oral argument would be set by the court of appeals. A ruling could reasonably be expected within about 30 days after the oral argument.

If the court of appeals denies a petition for rehearing, or if it is granted and the decision is unchanged, further judicial review of the decision by the court of appeals could be had by the filing in the Supreme Court of a petition for a writ of certiorari. The time for filing such a petition would expire 90 days after final action by the court of appeals. The Supreme Court would probably not act on a petition for a writ of certiorari until sometime between December 1965 and February 1966, depending upon the time consumed by the foregoing processes. If certiorari were granted, considering the time required for briefing and argument, it is possible, under normal procedures, that the court would not dispose of the matter until June of 1966, or, under some circumstances, until the latter part of 1966. Thus, absent clarifying legislation, the delay in pursuing further judicial review would be substantial.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN L. WEISL, Jr.,
Assistant Attorney General.

If I may in part repeat what the chairman of the committee said, I will also quote from the Department of Justice's letter of June 16, 1965:

Upon a reconsideration of this matter following enactment, in our view the court would sustain the Government's position, for the holding seems clear that absent section 271 the court would not have found that the AEC was subject to the authority and regulation of local agencies.

This language would in no respect give the Commission an exemption from State or local regulation greater than that enjoyed by other Federal agencies. The court of appeals itself recognized at page 8 of the slipsheet opinion that local regulation was applicable only by implication solely by virtue of the special statutory provision and that no such limitation on the Commission's power is to be found elsewhere. Licensees of the Commission are subject to the regulatory provisions of the Federal Power Act, pursuant to section 272 of the act (42 U.S.C. 2019). * * * The amendment to section 271 will serve merely to apply existing Federal, State, and local public utility regulations to the licensees of the Commission so as not to give them an advantage over other public utilities, thus preserving the historical powers over public utilities.

Nothing in the amendment to section 271 will affect the relationship of the Commission to the States with respect to public safety regulations over matters such as radiation hazards, since this is specifically spelled out in section 274 of the act (42 U.S.C. 2031).

Finally, I wish to quote from the Joint Committee's report on H.R. 8856:

The bill recommended by the committee would clarify the language of section 271 so as to correct any such erroneous conclusion that Congress intended that AEC's activities, as authorized by Congress, be limited by the authority or regulations of local authorities with respect to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power. It would accordingly reaffirm the intent of Congress that AEC possess the same sovereign immunity, under the supremacy clause of article VI of the Constitution, that other Federal agencies possess. This is the major purpose of this bill.

This bill has nothing to do with regulatory control over radiation hazards pertaining to nuclear facilities licensed by AEC; this is covered by other provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which are left unimpaired by this bill. Moreover, consistent with the original intent of section 271, this bill would have no effect with regard to AEC's authority to dispose of energy.

Mr. Chairman, it has been clearly explained that there is a difference of opinion which grew out of section 271 as originally enacted. This is an attempt to make unmistakably clear what was the intent of the members of the committee, and Congress as a whole, at that time.

For all these reasons I urge, in the national interest, the prompt enactment of this legislation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I should like to answer the statement which the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] made, with the following language.

During the hearings before our committee on H.R. 8856, and elsewhere, there have been claims made by lawyers for the town of Woodside that there are various statutory and even constitutional objections to the AEC's proceeding to condemn land and to construct and maintain an overhead powerline to service the Stanford linear accelerator, apart from the court of appeals' interpretation of section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act.

I want to make it clear that our committee does not believe these arguments by the town's lawyers have any validity. Neither did the court of appeals which decided this case, nor the lower Federal court. Neither does the Justice Department nor the Atomic Energy Commission.

As stated in our committee's report:

The bill (H.R. 8856) would make it clear that Congress did not intend to strip AEC of the power it would normally possess, under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and in accordance with the supremacy clause of article VI of the Constitution, to construct and operate an overhead transmission line to service this facility. Accordingly, the AEC could condemn the necessary easements for an overhead electric power transmission line for this purpose, and could construct and maintain such powerline, either with its own forces or through contractual arrangements, notwithstanding any State or local laws or regulations to the contrary, including those of the town of Woodside and the county of San Mateo at issue in the case before the court of appeals (p. 6).

Our report further states:

The committee also unanimously favors this bill because it will allow the AEC to proceed expeditiously with its present plans to construct an overhead line to service (the Stanford linear accelerator) (p. 7).

And further:

The amendment of this section (sec. 271) effected by this bill is intended as a clarification of the meaning of section 271 as originally enacted. Accordingly, it does not represent a change in this law applicable only to future judicial proceedings, but is intended to apply equally to any judicial proceedings currently in existence (p. 10).

Enactment of H.R. 8856 will demonstrate clearly that the intent of Congress conforms with these excerpts from our committee's report.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Colorado 3 additional minutes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I wish to associate myself with the logical and reasonable explanation of what is involved in this amendment as just made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], one of the most able representatives of the legal profession who we have here in Congress. He has placed his finger on the problem involved in this legislation and he has done it so that every one of us can understand just why this legislation is here.

As so often happens in debates of this kind, extraneous material is always brought in in order to throw a scare into us. The gentleman from California, my very good friend [Mr. YOUNGER], referred to a pamphlet which many of us have received recently known as the "Oregon Malignancy Pattern Psychologically Related to Hanford Washington Radioisotope Story." I received this pamphlet myself in the last few days and also received a letter from the National Association of Sanitarians. I was quite alarmed to receive a letter from Denver, Colo., accompanied by this pamphlet to which reference has been made. I would like to read a sentence from the letter so you know there is no scare to be thrown into this debate:

The amount of radioactivity that enters rivers and groundwater from the various Atomic Energy Commission plants is well below the standards set by the Federal Radiation Council for potable water.

In other words, even the one who transmitted the letter, a Mr. Pohlit, of Denver, Colo., states there is no danger at the present time.

However, the pamphlet does raise some question, and I immediately got in touch with Dr. Roy Cleer, director of the Public Health Service of the State of Colorado, and asked him about the pamphlet and about those who are members of the National Association of Sanitarians. I asked him for an evaluation of this pamphlet. The request was made last night by phone. This morning I got the answer by phone. He tells me that he and his group have gone over this publication and he is acquainted with the gentleman who sent it to us. It is purely a statistical publication and has nothing at all to do with this scare bugaboo that has been thrown into this debate. I wish it to be known that the man who is responsible for this publication was formerly a representative of the service in a mental program. The author is undoubtedly a good statistician. The organization is supposed to be a reputable organization, but it is just not fair to the Members of Congress when we are given a pamphlet with what is contained in this and then have it thrown up to us that there is a lot of danger coming to the general public because of the operation of the Atomic Energy Commission plants, the reactors, etc. It just is not true. The AEC of the Government of the United States as well as the departments of health in the Federal Government and in the States are protecting our health. The matter contained in the publication referred to does not have any germaneness as far as this particular legislation is concerned.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at this late hour in the debate I think it finally should be brought to the attention of the House just where it is that my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER], and his associates want to bury this powerline at a cost of many millions of dollars to the U.S. Government. I asked that this picture remain in the Chamber because this is where he wants us to bury this line, across the street from this great, big existing power pole and all of those like it that go down this street for 4 or 5 miles.

I do not think anybody wants to cast his vote today for such a ridiculous proposition as that. The various people who have talked against this legislation have tried to lay heavy emphasis on the allegation that there is interference being had with court procedures, and that an attempt is being made to pass an ex post facto law. If those gentlemen had done any legal research they would have found that that question was settled back in 1792 in Hayburn's case, and it has been settled dozens and dozens and dozens of times; in ex parte McCardle in 1868; the Clinton Bridge case in 1871; and, getting up into this century in United States against Southern Underwriters Association in 1944, and a whole host of other cases. So that great prop which has been one of the big props under opposition to this bill has already been disposed of by the court over and over again.

And if you go along with the opposition, you would simply spend $5 million extra to bury a line across the street from a bunch of power poles in Woodside. How could we do anything crazier?

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] brought up an allegation that the Government and the public utilities had lost against the town of Woodside, and now they are running to Congress. Do you know who lost this case first? It was the city of Woodside; when the public utility wanted to build this, the city of Woodside went to the California Public Utility Commission and sued the utility, saying, "Make them put the powerline underground."

Do you know what the California Public Utilities Commission told the city of Woodside? They told them this:

We are not persuaded that any esthetic considerations involved should require the expenditure of an additional $3,888,000, which would be paid for by the customers of Pacific Gas & Electric.

That is what the extra cost would be to bury this line—for burial alone—not including all the other additional cost which I will mention later.

So then, when the city of Woodside lost at the State level, it came running back to Washington to ask for your taxpayers' money instead of California's ratepayers' money to bury this line.

I do not think any of you are really honestly going to let your taxpaying constituents be suckered into that kind of a proposition. This city that is involved here has about 4,300 people, and it already has almost 2,500 of these unsightly power poles. All that Uncle Sam wants to put in there is three power poles. These lines in Woodside today run past beautiful homes with more than one ugly power pole for every two of those affluent citizens. It is difficult to work up any sympathy for Woodside's fight to prevent these poles that are absolutely vitally necessary to get power to a $114 million installation.

The Atomic Energy Commission has put all that money in for the Government for a real purpose. It is up to us to back them up. These 3 poles that go into Woodside are hardly a rape of the landscape, particularly since this town has, despite Mr. YOUNGER'S contention, put up 26 more poles since it passed its resolution against overground lines. Compare that to the three the Government wants to put in. This line must be built

if this costly and potentially the most productive in history scientific tool is to go into operation.

I am sorry that this fight that is being made against this AEC installation is being made by Californians, because California, along with 45 other States, is seeking the next big scientific tool, the 200-BEV machine. I wonder what the AEC thinks about putting machines in California when it looks around and sees a lot of California Representatives hostile to the one they have put in there already. That may have a lesson to somebody else.

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

Mr. HOSMER. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, that the city of Woodside has said they would put up $150,000 for the purpose of burying this line. Do you know how much it is going to cost in all to bury it? It is going to cost $5 million just for burial. Incidentally, if you bury two of them, at $500,000 a mile, that is where you get the total cost of $5 million for this and it is necessary to bury two circuits. Then in order to do it, it is going to take 18 to 24 months of construction time and delay. During everyone of those months it is going to cost the U.S. Government and you taxpayers $1.5 million in demurrage on the $114 million accelerator that is not getting into operation.

So, Mr. Chairman, the total cost of the Quixote struggle here could run out to between $32 and $40 million, $6 to $8 million a mile, for going underground.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I say this is a deadly ridiculous proposition. If the city of Woodside wants to do something real esthetic, they can take their $150,000 and they can buy some of this underground distribution system cable and, you know, it will cost them only at most $30,000 a mile to bury it underground, this distribution cable, as contrasted to transmission cable. If they will just do that, they will get rid of, by my calculation, about 1,200 of their existing, ugly power poles which are scarring their landscape.

Mr. Chairman, if this city is really serious about esthetics, if it is really serious, it has a way to clean itself up and take 1,200 power poles out of there at the reasonable cost of $150,000. Compare that to this fuss about only three power pole structures. Three high voltage power pole structures which the Government has gone out and hired some of the best people in the United States to design esthetically in order to make them look pretty for Woodside. This alone has jumped the cost of this high powerline 50 percent in order to accommodate these people, and yet they are still screaming at us.

Now, my friends, I ask you to come to a reasoned and intelligent decision when you cast your vote.

It is totally impossible to justify laying out U.S. funds of this magnitude to help Woodside residents, who, with a median income of almost $10,000 a year, can well afford to help themselves—but who have not done so.

Moreover, it would be like removing a splinter from a finger when the patient is riddled with buckshot to do so considering Woodside's existing 2,500 power poles which do not seem to bother it.

Actually, the AEC already has gone far in trying to meet Woodside's objection to the powerlines. AEC is consenting to a 50-percent increase in the cost of its line to avoid using ugly power towers. Instead, the wires will ride on artistically designed tapering metal poles which are shorter than the usual filigreed towers for high-power transmission and far more graceful than either the towers or any of the 2,500 many-armed poles existing in Woodside.

The wires will be strung by helicopters to keep heavy machinery from cutting swaths along the slopes. Trees and shrubs along the wires will not be cleared. Shrubbery will be planted to help mask the bases of the poles.

All this will raise the cost to Federal taxpayers from $660,000 to over $1 million for the line.

The White House Conference on Natural Beauty found it was neither worth the cost nor was it technically advisable to bury high-voltage wires of the kind involved here because of the elaborate cooling and maintenance difficulties. Chairman Swidler of the Federal Power Commission, has written a letter to the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy affirming this fact.

Despite all that has been done to work this problem out in a reasonable manner and despite the position of the White House Conference on Natural Beauty and the position of the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Woodside refuses to be satisfied. The poles have become the focus of the Woodside riding crop and jodhpurs set's frustrated opposition to encroachment of modern society.

Woodside seeks to play the role of a David challenging Goliath. Actually, it is playing the role of a kidnapping pirate demanding ransom—in this case between $32 and $40 million—for permitting essential power to be hooked into the $114 million Stanford linear accelerator. In doing so, it also recklessly would establish a precedent for undergrounding very high tension lines which, if followed, could involve the United States in the expenditure of billions and billions of dollars for underground cable wherever it carries on the necessary functions of Government in all the 50 States.

The issue before us also has other serious implications to the Nation, its nuclear progress, and its nuclear defense. The interpretation of section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 made by the circuit court, if left uncorrected, would subject the activities of this agency to local laws and ordinances of any and all kinds no matter how capricious, no matter how great an impediment to the work and duties of the AEC.

There is no other department or agency of Government which is required to operate under a prohibitive handicap of this nature, nor should there be, nor should the AEC be so burdened.

The only issue before the Congress today is that of whether we shall restore to the Atomic Energy Commission its power to function normally and effectively in like manner to all other parts of the Government.

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for the final time on his side, 30 seconds.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to make a decision on which they can go home and hold up their heads proudly and say, "I did what was right for my country and I did what was right intellectually and what was sound. I put the AEC back on the same par of every other Government agency and department," because that is all, my friends, the passage of this bill will do. It will give the AEC the same power as any other Government agency.

On these grounds, I urge your intelligent and reasoned support for the necessary amendment of section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with our agreement with the opposition, and they now having used 55 minutes, based upon our agreement to yield to them 60 minutes I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California.

The statement which the gentleman from California, chairman of the committee, read a while ago, is a very fine, self-serving declaration by their attorneys, but bear in mind their attorneys issued the same kind of a statement before they went to court. They were very positive they had this right, but the circuit court under a unanimous decision said they did not. So the statement they issue now, I think, carries no more weight than it did before the circuit court set it aside.

Talking about money, the AEC still has $10 million of their unexpended contingency fund. Originally they had $24 million, now they still have $10 million. So that on the question of money they would not have to get an additional appropriation or anything of that kind.

I want to tell you now something about this underground line I just learned about, and I would like to read a statement from the Monday, May 3, 1965, issue of the Financial Times of London:

The following excerpts are extracted from several news articles which appeared in the New York edition of the Financial Times of London, on Monday, May 3, 1965, and make reference to the Perelli General Co., a 50-year-old international company, started in Italy:

"Perelli General supplied the first 301-kv. oil-filled cables to Canada for the Kitimat project of Alcan and also supplied the first 330-kv. oil-filled cables for the Snowy Mountains hydroelectric scheme in Australia. At the present moment, supertension cable contracts are in the course of completion in South Africa, India, and New Zealand. Perelli General is the first British company to complete all type tests for 400-kv. cable and is, therefore, ready to take export orders for this voltage as soon as a demand shows itself."

The following comments under the heading: "400-Kilovolt Cable From New £3m. Extension" were made by S. G. Crooks, director and manager of the production division of the Perelli General Co.:

"The record of reliable performance in service of well over 2,000 route miles of cable and associated accessories which were installed by 1960 is almost unprecedented in high voltage electrical apparatus, and the almost complete absence of electrical failures is a remarkable tribute to the oil-filled cable principle.

"Included in the testing equipment is a 525-kv. a.c. transformer set having a sufficient capacity to test the longest length and highest voltage cable likely to be produced in the foreseeable future. In view of the rapidity with which development can occur, the transformer has been so designed that it can be easily modified to give 750-kv. a.c. current if required."

Here we have a great agency with an appropriation of over $2 billion, a scientific agency that is supposed to make great breakthroughs in science. They are not supposed to be afraid of anything that it is said cannot be done. Here, England has 2,000 miles of high-tension cable underground. Here the AEC gives one excuse after another to put in even 6 miles in order to satisfy a community that needs the help of the Government. As I say, it is not only this community, but it may be your community next. So when they talk about only 50 miles of underground cable in the United States, it seems to me that the AEC ought to blush with shame to think they would come before this Congress and ask not to put the high-tension line underground, when England has 2,000 miles.

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

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GUBSER. There is one point that has not been made in this debate and at this time I thank the gentleman for allowing me to make it. In a baseball game when an umpire is agreed upon by the two teams, they are not allowed to change the umpire in the middle of the game simply because they do not like the umpire's decision. My point is that the Atomic Energy Commission has chosen its forum for the resolution of this controversy; namely, the courts of the United States, the district and circuit courts. Is it proper and is it right that we by this bit of legislation should allow the Atomic Energy Commission to change umpires simply because they do not like a called third strike? Should they not be required to pursue the forum they have chosen and appeal this to the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. YOUNGER. I think that is right.

I would like to make just this one further comment. My friend, the gentleman from California, was talking about the $5 million and he said, "We get this because the cost per mile is $500,000." Well there are 6 miles of this and at $500,000 it would be $3 million and twice $3 million is $6 million.

Mr. HOSMER. I think that is a better figure—$6 million.

Mr. YOUNGER. Well, that is your figure but you do not even multiply correctly when you have the figures before you.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8856.

As I stated during the debates on this bill on July 12, I am convinced this measure is sound from a conservation standpoint. I would not support the bill if I thought otherwise.

Enactment of this bill would in no way result in "blight" of a community as has sometimes been charged. The Federal Government has acted responsibly in this case to further the cause of preserving the natural beauty of this area, consistent with the efficient conduct of the public business and prudent use of public funds.

During the debates on July 12, there were several questions raised about the validity of cost estimates for underground lines. There were suggestions that these estimates were not being supplied as the result of disinterested research, but rather by power companies who do not favor underground powerlines. The thought was also expressed that no real effort has been expended to find out how underground installations can be made economical and effective.

In view of these questions the Joint Committee asked for the views of the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. Chairman Swidler's response, dated July 21, 1965, was printed in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 26, 1965, at page A4053. Among other things, Chairman Swidler's letter noted the tremendous difference in cost between underground and overhead lines, a 10-to-1 cost ratio being reasonably representative. He said there is no reliable basis for projecting how much time and effort will be required to reduce underground transmission costs substantially. He further noted that there are thousands of miles of overhead high voltage lines in operation today in areas of scenic interest and that many more thousands are in the planning stage.

In connection with the particular dispute over the powerline for the Stanford linear accelerator, I also wish to emphasize that an official agency of the State of California—the California Public Utilities Commission—has determined that an underground line would cost almost five times as much as the ornamental overhead line AEC has proposed. This determination was made after a 7-day hearing in which the interested parties, including the town of Woodside, were fully represented. The California Public Utilities Commission, after a thorough study, also concluded that the so-called aesthetic considerations relative to the Woodside area did not justify the added costs of going underground. If the State of California does not think this is warranted, why should the Federal Government bear this expense?

Finally, I wish to insert in the RECORD excerpts from materials furnished to the vice chairman of the Joint Committee by the National Association of Counties, by letter dated June 30, 1965, pertaining to British experience with high-voltage transmission lines. These materials indicate why two successive governments in Britain, one Conservative and one Labor, have permitted overhead lines across their country.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I believe there is general recognition among informed quarters of the greatly increased cost of underground versus overhead lines, the lack of public acceptance of these increased costs, and the very significant amount of research which would be required to reduce the costs of placing transmission lines underground.

The excerpts follow:

EXCERPT FROM ATTACHMENT TO LETTER TO SENATOR PASTORE, JUNE 30, 1965, FROM NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES

1. Article of June 12, 1965, from the Surveyor and Municipal Engineer—a British journal, entitled "Powerlines: Underground or Overhead?" by J. H. M. Sykes:

"Although the ratios of cost shown in America and Britain differ considerably, they are both high: Even to spend £6¾ million in place of each £1 million would require a degree of justification not yet advanced anywhere.

"I have discussed this problem in detail in many countries. Nowhere have I heard any arguments advanced to indicate that undergrounding of major power links could ever be carried out more cheaply than has been suggested above. It is hoped that these notes have indicated where the items of inescapable high cost lie, so that each reader can see for himself that they could never be appreciably reduced unless some sensational breakthrough appears—and in spite of intensive research in many countries, this is not even in sight."

2. From speech by Mr. Richard Crossman, Minister of Housing and Local Government, May 25, 1965:

"And yet two successive governments, one Conservative and one Labor, have decided to let the board string them [transmission lines] right across southern England. And the reason quite simply is that public opinion is not ready to pay the extra cost which would fall on the consumer; and who can doubt that the vast majority of consumers today would regard £1 million a mile for electric cables as a price too high to pay for preserving the countryside? Instead we do our best to mitigate the damage. I have arranged for the National Parks Commission to be consulted at an early stage in the planning of these lines and the CEGB have agreed to employ expert landscape architects and take immense pains to select routes that do the least damage."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the article read by the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER]. I do not know the source of the article, but if there is any authenticity to the claims in that story, it is certainly something of which the industry in our country must be unaware. I am certain our industry holds leadership in the development of electrical energy, and transmission of it.

The latest information the Federal Power Commission has supplied to the Joint Committee on mileage of underground lines in this country is contained in a letter submitted to the committee by Mr. Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, of July 21, 1965. It can be found on page A4053 of the July 26, 1965, daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The information we have officially is that there were about 25 miles of underground circuits at 220 kilovolts or higher in the United States at the end of 1964, and that, by the end of 1965, there may be another 25 miles.

I should like also to point out it is a little hard to believe the story that there are 2,000 miles of underground high-voltage or super-voltage lines, as the article read by the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] says, in existence in England, because our records show that there are about 1,500 miles of underground cables now in service in this country in the general range of 69 to 138 kilovolts.

The story just read to the House is, to me, fantastic. It would indicate a lack of progress on the part of our electrical energy industry in this country, if it has not followed the development in some other country.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would say, on my knowledge of the statistics, I would challenge the statement of the gentleman, if he said—and I listened very carefully, and I do not believe he quite said it—that there were lines of more than 300 kilovolts, and he related that to 2,000 miles of underground high-voltage lines. He did not say, as I recall, that there were 2,000 miles of lines of that voltage of 220 kilovolts or above. Did the gentleman make that statement?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes, I did.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I challenge the gentleman's statement.

Mr. YOUNGER. It is not my statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not know what the gentleman reads from—fairy books or some other fantasy—but I challenge the gentleman's statement.

Mr. YOUNGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I refuse to yield further.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman does not yield because he does not want the facts.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That kind of information is not fact—does not stand up in court, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, for the very reason that I do want the facts in the RECORD, I read the material I have just submitted to the House. This is from the official source, the Federal Power Commission.

I wish to point out in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that one court supported the AEC position in this matter. It is true on an appeal the decision of the District Court was overruled.

I also remember the consideration of this particular section 271 at the time it was drafted. Like the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], I was present during the drafting sessions for that legislation in 1954. I agree with Mr. HOLIFIELD and every other member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy who has appeared here, and who are unanimous in support of this legislation today. I agree as to what was the intent of the committee at that time, and what we believe to be the intent of the Congress when it enacted the 1954 Atomic Energy Act.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, how much time is there remaining to this side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I believe that is all I will need, Mr. Chairman, to conclude debate.

I will just ask the Members this question: Do they want to spend $5 million to put 5 miles of underground cable in Mr. YOUNGER's district, and leave thousands of miles of overhead lines in their own States on towers and poles? If they do, then I say vote against this bill, but if they want to vote to save $4.5 million and not set a dangerous precedent, then I say vote for the bill.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 8856, the amendment recommended to the House by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which would allow the Atomic Energy Commission and the Pacific Electric Co. to construct an electric transmission line to bring electric power to the Stanford AEC accelerator facility.

The issue in this case is not whether or not this project should be approved, but rather whether or not a little town known as Woodside, Calif., has the right to insist that the AEC place its transmission line underground rather than to be permitted, contrary to the wishes of the people of Woodside, to erect 200 feet of overhead electric powerlines.

The proposed amendment comes at a time when this matter is still before the Federal courts and at a time when the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals on May 20, 1965, held that the general sovereign immunity of the Atomic Energy Commission does not supersede State or local control of its governmental functions.

I do not hold to the principle that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., the local power company involved, should be permitted to install these overhead powerlines from towers running from Woodside, Calif., or any other city in America without the local authority having some voice in the matter.

In my opinion, Congress never intended to confer unlimited authority upon the Atomic Energy Commission and to strip local agencies of their rights to regulate and control, within reason, the matter of the introduction of such eyesores in their communties.

We have a tremendous emphasis being placed upon the development of beauty in America. I would certainly abhor the introduction of 200-foot AEC transmission towers in Bay Village, Ohio, where I reside, and I sympathize entirely with the people of Woodside, Calif.

The bill being introduced in the House today comes at a time when the matter is still to be finally adjudicated in our Federal courts. The AEC is losing its battle in the courts and it now comes to the Congress for relief. As far as I am concerned, their plea falls on deaf ears.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to have the opportunity of voting against this bill.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8856.

As the joint committee's report on this bill states:

> The purpose of the bill recommended by the committee is to remedy a problem which extends far beyond the dispute over the SLAC powerline. The committee believes it would be desirable for this legislation to be enacted even if there were no outstanding disagreement over this line, to avoid future erroneous interpretations of congressional intent underlying section 271.

The overriding necessity for this legislation, from the standpoint of the national security and welfare, was reiterated in the letter to the Joint Committee from the Chairman of the AEC, dated July 14, 1965, which was included in the July 27 daily RECORD at page A4121.

I fully appreciate the desires of the local residents to safeguard their private interests. However, Congress must act in the interest of all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the Members to approve H.R. 8856 without amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the objectives of my able colleague from New York [Mr. OTTINGER], and of others who are fighting against this bill, but I believe they are mistaken in choosing this particular battleground for their fight. I agree with them that much greater efforts must be made by the Federal Government to put powerlines underground so as to protect the beauty of our countryside. In my judgment, more money needs to be spent on research to develop cheaper and more efficient methods of putting powerlines underground.

It may well be that the Congress should legislate to achieve these objectives. It may well be that the Congress should decide when, and under what circumstances, the Atomic Energy Commission should have the authority to put overhead transmission lines across a community in violation of the zoning laws of that community. But such legislation would be a complicated matter. The Congress would have to lay down criteria so as to establish a proper balance between considerations of conservation and beautification and of local desires, on the one hand, and considerations of national defense and of area industrial and economic development on the other. The Congress would have to take into account the related problem of superhighway routes, where local preferences often have to give way to the broad interests of the Nation, the State, or the area. Such legislation would require extensive hearings and committee consideration.

To attempt to legislate on this complex subject by opposing a change to clarify the original intent of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 seems to me a misplaced gesture. The effort is almost certain to fail, and this result may create a misleading impression as to the extent of interest in the Congress in protecting local communities from arbitrary and harmful Federal action and in the objectives of conservation and beautification.

All the proposed amendment to the Atomic Energy Act would do is to add the proviso that section 271 "shall not be

deemed to confer upon any Federal, State, or local agency any authority to regulate, control, or restrict any activities of the Commission." As will be seen, this amendment does not alter or take away any powers from State or local governments that they would otherwise have. It merely seeks to clarify section 271 so that its original intent, as outlined in the committee report, will not be frustrated by an unexpected court interpretation of the language originally used.

In other words, the proponents of this bill are not seeking to make any substantive change in the original Atomic Energy Act. On the contrary, it is the opponents who are seeking to effect a substantive change in the act—a change which would take away from the Atomic Energy Commission necessary powers of eminent domain which other Federal agencies have.

If by some unlikely chance this bill should be defeated, it would probably be because of widespread sympathy in this House for the plight of the community immediately affected, Woodside, Calif. This would be an example of the lawyers' saying that "hard cases make bad law."

If that should happen, the meaning of section 271 would remain obscure, widespread and costly litigation would ensue, and neither the national interest nor the cause of beautification would be in the long run served.

For these reasons, in spite of my agreement with the objectives of some of the opponents of this bill, I intend to vote for H.R. 8856 because I am satisfied that it merely clarifies the original intent of Congress.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8856 which in effect would give the Atomic Energy Commission the power to string overhead power lines through Woodside, Calif., in violation of its ordinance requiring such lines to be placed underground. This is an appalling piece of legislation. The President has made natural beauty a national goal and it is difficult to see how one can support this crusade for beauty and at the same time vote for the bill before us.

Two days ago, this body approved a brand new program of grants for urban beautification and improvement. We authorized $100 million in matching Federal funds to encourage local communities to undertake park improvements, tree planting, playgrounds, and upgrading of malls and city squares. Today we have a bill before us which not only discourages local communities in these efforts but insists that they retreat before a Federal agency which seeks unashamedly to despoil the landscape by answering the functional requirements of power transmission in the ugliest way possible.

Furthermore, it is proposed that we put 3 percent of our highway funds, $90 million into highway beautification—not new beautification—but $90 million toward cleaning up the mess we already have. What good is it to do away with billboards and auto junkyards on the one hand and to permit overhead electric transmission powerlines to mar the skyscape on the other? And it is not only the overhead powerlines. In order to have overhead powerlines, you have got to get them up there and this means poles—huge, ugly poles every hundred or so yards. The committee report states that since March 1964, 59 new poles have been erected in anticipation of the powerlines through Woodside—poles which the gentleman from California describes in such a way as to suggest that they are pleasing to the eye. I say to him that ugliness by any other name is still ugliness and if we do not begin to recognize how tragically the face of America is being changed, how rapidly we are gutting our landscapes, ruining our water resources and poisoning the very air we breathe, it will be too late to salvage more than isolated oases of the unparalleled grandeur and beauty that only a few generations ago stretched from ocean to ocean.

The irony of handing to the Atomic Energy Commission the authority to string a maze of powerlines over a residential community in defiance of the wishes and actions of that community is really too much. It flies in the face of good reason and sound judgment and is absolutely unwarranted by any standard of commonsense. There is no reason on earth—quite literally—why the AEC should not put these powerlines underground. It is going to have to be done eventually and as my good colleague from New York has pointed out every powerline placed overhead today anticipates a further cost of placing it underground tomorrow.

Our atomic effort is not going to collapse overnight if we refuse the AEC this authority, Mr. Chairman. I seriously urge defeat of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 271. AGENCY JURISDICTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect the authority or regulations of any Federal, State, or local agency with respect to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power produced through the use of nuclear facilities licensed by the Commission: *Provided,* That this section shall not be deemed to confer upon any Federal, State, or local agency any authority to regulate, control, or restrict any activities of the Commission."

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to read this from the New York edition of the Financial Times of London of Monday, May 3, 1965. The whole article is about the Perelli Co.:

The record of reliable performance in service of well over 2,000 route miles of cable and associated accessories which were installed by 1960 is almost unprecedented in high voltage electrical apparatus, and the almost complete absence of electrical failures is a remarkable tribute to the oil-filled cable principle.

That does not say they are strung out over poles.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask the gentleman, my genial colleague from California, if he realized when they talk about high-voltage lines generally, that it starts at 60,000 volts. I am quite sure that that amount of mileage in relation to that amount of voltage is probably pretty reasonable. When you get up into 220,000 volts and higher, you get up into these things of which we have a sample here in the well. The thing missing from that sample is the oil under pressure which has to go inside in order to cool it and a pumping system which has to be on the ground above in order to pump the oil and bring it out and dump the heat into the atmosphere. I suppose in my colloquy with my genial friend from California a moment ago as to whether the cost was $5 million or $6 million, they probably were not including the above-ground cost of this pumping and the other paraphernalia needed.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] having assumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, 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. 8856) to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 474, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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 pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. YOUNGER. 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 275, nays 126, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

YEAS—275

Adair	Bennett	Casey
Adams	Bingham	Chelf
Albert	Blatnik	Clevenger
Anderson, Ill.	Boggs	Cohelan
Anderson, Tenn.	Boland	Conable
Andrews, George W.	Bolling	Conyers
Andrews, Glenn	Bolton	Corman
Annunzio	Brademas	Craley
Aspinall	Brock	Culver
Ayres	Brooks	Daddario
Bandstra	Broomfield	Daniels
Barrett	Brown, Calif.	Davis, Ga.
Bates	Buchanan	Dawson
Battin	Burke	de la Garza
Beckworth	Burleson	Delaney
Bell	Burton, Utah	Denton
	Byrne, Pa.	Derwinski
	Callan	Dickinson
	Cameron	Diggs

Dingell	Jarman	Rhodes, Pa.
Donohue	Jennings	Rivers, S.C.
Downing	Joelson	Roberts
Dulski	Johnson, Calif.	Robison
Duncan, Oreg	Johnson, Okla.	Rodino
Duncan, Tenn.	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Dyal	Karsten	Rogers, Fla.
Edmondson	Kastenmeier	Ronan
Edwards, Ala.	Kee	Roncalio
Edwards, Calif.	Keith	Rooney, N.Y.
Erlenborn	Kelly	Rooney, Pa.
Evans, Colo.	King, Calif.	Roosevelt
Everett	King, Utah	Rosenthal
Fallon	Kirwan	Rostenkowski
Farbstein	Kluczynski	Roudebush
Farnsley	Landrum	Roush
Farnum	Leggett	Roybal
Fascell	Long, La.	Rumsfeld
Feighan	Long, Md.	St Germain
Findley	Love	St. Onge
Fino	McCulloch	Schisler
Fisher	McDowell	Schmidhauser
Flood	McFall	Secrest
Foley	McGrath	Selden
Ford,	Machen	Senner
William D.	Mackay	Shipley
Fountain	Mackie	Shriver
Frelinghuysen	Madden	Sickles
Friedel	Mahon	Sikes
Fuqua	Marsh	Sisk
Gallagher	Mathias	Slack
Garmatz	Matsunaga	Smith, Iowa
Gettys	Matthews	Smith, N.Y.
Giaimo	May	Smith, Va.
Gibbons	Meeds	Springer
Gonzalez	Michel	Stafford
Goodell	Miller	Stalbaum
Grabowski	Mills	Stanton
Gray	Minish	Steed
Green, Oreg.	Minshall	Stephens
Green, Pa.	Moeller	Stratton
Greigg	Monagan	Stubblefield
Grider	Moorhead	Sullivan
Griffin	Morgan	Taylor
Griffiths	Morris	Teague, Tex.
Grover	Morrison	Tenzer
Gurney	Mosher	Thomas
Hagan, Ga.	Moss	Thompson, N.J.
Hagen, Calif.	Murphy, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Halpern	Murphy, N.Y.	Todd
Hamilton	Murray	Trimble
Hanna	Natcher	Tunney
Hansen, Wash.	Nedzi	Tuten
Hardy	Nix	Udall
Harris	O'Hara, Ill.	Van Deerlin
Harsha	O'Hara, Mich.	Vanik
Harvey, Ind.	O'Konski	Vigorito
Hathaway	Olsen, Mont.	Vivian
Hawkins	O'Neal, Ga.	Waggonner
Hays	Passman	Walker, N. Mex.
Hébert	Patman	Watts
Hechler	Patten	Weltner
Helstoski	Perkins	White, Tex.
Herlong	Pickle	Whitten
Hicks	Pike	Widnall
Holifield	Pirnie	Willis
Holland	Pool	Wilson,
Hosmer	Powell	Charles H.
Howard	Price	Wolff
Hull	Pucinski	Wright
Hungate	Purcell	Wyatt
Huot	Quie	Yates
Ichord	Quillen	Zablocki
Irwin	Randall	
Jacobs	Rhodes, Ariz.	

NAYS—126

Abbitt	Clawson, Del	Hall
Abernethy	Cleveland	Hanley
Addabbo	Collier	Hansen, Idaho
Andrews,	Conte	Harvey, Mich.
N. Dak.	Cooley	Henderson
Arends	Corbett	Horton
Ashbrook	Cunningham	Hutchinson
Ashley	Curtin	Johnson, Pa.
Ashmore	Curtis	Jonas
Baldwin	Dague	King, N.Y.
Belcher	Davis, Wis	Kornegay
Berry	Dent	Krebs
Betts	Devine	Kunkel
Bray	Dole	Laird
Brown, Ohio	Dorn	Langen
Broyhill, N.C.	Dow	Latta
Broyhill, Va.	Dowdy	Lennon
Burton, Calif.	Dwyer	Lipscomb
Byrnes, Wis.	Flynt	McCarthy
Cabell	Fogarty	McClory
Callaway	Ford, Gerald R.	McDade
Carey	Fraser	McMillan
Carter	Fulton, Pa.	Macdonald
Cederberg	Gathings	MacGregor
Chamberlain	Gilbert	Mailliard
Clancy	Gilligan	Martin, Ala.
Clark	Gross	Martin, Mass.
Clausen,	Gubser	Martin, Nebr.
Don H.	Haley	Mink
Mize	Reid, N.Y.	Sweeney
Moore	Reifel	Talcott
Morse	Reinecke	Teague, Calif.
Multer	Reuss	Thomson, Wis.
Nelsen	Rivers, Alaska	Tuck
Olson, Minn.	Rogers, Tex.	Tupper
O'Neill, Mass.	Satterfield	Utt
Ottinger	Saylor	Walker, Miss.
Pelly	Scheuer	Watkins
Philbin	Schneebeli	Whalley
Poage	Schweiker	Whitener
Poff	Skubitz	Wydler
Race	Smith, Calif.	Younger
Reid, Ill.	Staggers	

NOT VOTING—33

Baring	Hansen, Iowa	Resnick
Bonner	Jones, Mo.	Ryan
Bow	Karth	Scott
Cahill	Keogh	Toll
Celler	Lindsay	Ullman
Colmer	McEwen	Watson
Cramer	McVicker	White, Idaho
Ellsworth	Morton	Williams
Evins, Tenn.	O'Brien	Wilson, Bob
Fulton, Tenn.	Pepper	Young
Halleck	Redlin	

So the bill was passed.

The clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mr. McVicker for, with Mr. Ryan against.
Mr. Hansen of Iowa for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.
Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Cramer against.
Mr. White of Idaho for, with Mr. McEwen against.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Watson against.
Mr. O'Brien for, with Mr. Scott against.
Mr. Karth for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Redlin with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Young.

Mr. HERLONG, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. BUCHANAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea." Mr. GATHINGS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

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. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 491) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed eighteen thousand additional copies of the public law enacted pursuant to H.R. 7984, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965; of which fifteen thousand copies shall be for the House document room and three thousand copies for the Senate document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE PUBLIC LAW CONTAINING SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS ENACTED IN 1965

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 456) which is at the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed thirty thousand additional copies of the public law containing the social security amendments enacted in 1965 pursuant to H.R. 6675; of which twenty-two thousand five hundred copies shall be for the House document room, five thousand copies shall be for the Senate document room, two thousand copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Finance.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND FURTHER THE PEACE CORPS ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. MORGAN. 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. 9026) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes.

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

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. 9026, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] will be recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9026 authorizes $115 million to finance the operations of the Peace Corps during fiscal year 1966. This is the same amount authorized for fiscal 1965. The amount appropriated last year under this authorization was $104,100,000.

The bill also includes a number of amendments to the Peace Corps Act, all of which relate to the operation and administration of the program. None of them change the nature or scope of the Peace Corps or involve changes in policy.

Mr. Speaker, all of us today recognize that the Peace Corps is a success. Since the Peace Corps began operations in 1961, it has passed beyond the experimental stage and has made a record for itself to which the people of the United States can point with pride.

Peace Corps volunteers are at work in 45 countries. Every country in which the Peace Corps now operates has asked for more volunteers, and there are two dozen additional countries which have asked for the Peace Corps.

The Peace Corps has terminated operations in three countries—Ceylon, Cyprus, and Indonesia. In none of these countries was there any indication whatever that the volunteers were unpopular. In fact, in at least one of these nations, the difficulty may have been that they were too popular.

To me, one of the most surprising things about the Peace Corps has been the fact that it has produced no diplomatic crises as a result of its operations. The most serious incident involving the Peace Corps was the case right after the Peace Corps began when the girl in Nigeria lost a postcard which included statements to which the Nigerians took offense. Nigeria has since become one of the strongest supporters of the Peace Corps, and we now have over 600 volunteers there. On page 201 of the committee hearings you will find an excerpt from the parliamentary debates of the House of Representatives of Nigeria praising the Peace Corps.

The most recent incident which received a certain amount of publicity involved a vote by a Communist-influenced group of students meeting with a member of the faculty at the National Engineering University in Lima, Peru, to oust four Peace Corps volunteers who were teaching at the university. Three of the four stayed on at the university, and the other remained in Peru. The press and other reaction at the university was overwhelmingly against the expulsion vote.

The Peace Corps is a target for the Communists in every country where it operates and, without exception, the attacks of the Communists have backfired.

Although the primary justification for the Peace Corps is the service which it renders to the people of the less developed countries, we should not overlook the impact which the Peace Corps has on our own people. Since the Peace Corps began, 13,725 volunteers have been sent overseas. Of these, 3,900 have already returned to the United States as a result of the completion of their 2 years of service, and by the end of 1965, 3,000 more will return. The Peace Corps now has 13,268 volunteers on board. The latest figures show that 46,000 persons applied for volunteer jobs during fiscal year 1965, and it is anticipated that 54,000 applications will be received during fiscal 1966.

The opportunity to serve in the Peace Corps has come to mean a lot to the young people of the United States, and I want to emphasize particularly that the Peace Corps appeals to older people as well. At present, there are 5 people who are over 70 years of age serving in the Peace Corps; 65 people who are over 60; 78 people who are over 50; 72 people over 40; and 246 who are over 30.

The several thousand volunteers who are returning to the United States each year will be better citizens as a result of their overseas service. There were a number of magazine and newspaper stories last spring which gave the impression that the returning Peace Corps volunteers were a frustrated, dissatisfied group who, after being big frogs in small puddles overseas, found it difficult to readjust to life in the United States and to find jobs. The facts indicate that this impression is entirely erroneous. The latest figures available indicate that only 3 percent of the returned volunteers were looking for employment; somewhere in the neighborhood of 40 percent were going to universities; 47 percent were employed, and 8 percent were either housewives or in military service.

Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps is making a major contribution not only in the countries where it operates overseas but to our own people.

Now, let me say something about the provisions of the bill which is before us.

As I stated before, the bill authorizes $115 million for fiscal 1966, the same amount authorized for fiscal 1965. This amount will finance an increase in the number of volunteers to a level of 15,110 by the end of fiscal 1966 as compared to the level of 13,710 at the end of August 1965.

This increase in the number of volunteers should not be regarded as comparable to the creation of a similar number of additional jobs in other Government agencies. There is a constant outflow of volunteers completing their service and a constant inflow of new recruits. It will be necessary to bring in 10,500 trainees during fiscal 1966 in order to provide a net increase of 1,400 volunteers by the end of that year.

The Peace Corps plans to use the 1,400 added volunteers primarily to expand the program in the countries where it already is in operation, although it may inaugurate programs in a few new countries.

The Peace Corps has made a good record in handling its money. The cost per volunteer has gone down consistently. In fiscal 1963, the average annual cost per volunteer was $9,074; in fiscal 1964, the cost had been brought down to $8,214, and the estimate for the fiscal year just ended is $7,950. It is anticipated that the cost per volunteer for fiscal 1966 will be $7,927.

The Peace Corps has never shown any tendency to put on a last-minute drive to make sure that all of its funds are obligated before the end of the fiscal year. Out of the appropriation of $104,100,000 for fiscal 1965 $12,100,000 was unused on June 30, 1965, and will lapse; that is, it will be returned to the Treasury. In this connection, I want to point out that only $3 million of this $12 million total was left over because there were fewer trainees than originally planned—$9 million, or 75 percent of the unused funds, are the result of operating economies.

Mr. Chairman, it seems clear to me that as long as foreign governments desire and make welcome Peace Corps volunteers, and as long as thousands of our finest citizens desire to serve in the Peace Corps, the Congress should provide the funds necessary to continue the program at a moderately increased level.

The remaining provisions of the bill deal with operating problems which the Peace Corps has encountered.

Section 2(a) of the bill—page 1, line 10—refers to the Internal Revenue Code. The language in the bill and in the report has been approved by the Ways and Means Committee.

The need for this provision arises from the fact that ordinarily volunteers receive the $75 a month readjustment allowance to which they are entitled in a lump sum at the end of 2 years of service. This provision of the bill makes it possible to treat this income for income tax purposes as though it were spread out over the 2-year period. The original Peace Corps Act amended the Internal Revenue Code to take care of this situation. The Revenue Act of 1964, however, replaced the provision relating to the Peace Corps with an averaging provision of more general application. The income of Peace Corps volunteers is so low, however, that most of them were not covered by this general averaging provision, and new language relating specifically to Peace Corps volunteers is necessary.

Section 2(b)(1) of the bill—page 2, line 8—does two things. First, it authorizes limited dental treatment of minor and easily correctible defects of applicants for enrollment in the Peace Corps before they enter training. It is essential that volunteers not be sent overseas who are in need of dental treatment, and if dental treatment is given during the training period, it may seriously interfere with the training program. Also, training is frequently given under conditions where adequate facilities for dental care are not available.

In addition, this subsection authorizes health examinations of volunteers within 6 months after the termination of their service. This is necessary because most volunteers terminate their service while overseas and, in some cases, they are located where comprehensive health examinations cannot be given. Peace Corps volunteers are entitled to post-service medical services and benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act, and it is in the interest of the U.S. Government to provide medical examinations for volunteers at the end of their service. This 6-month extension will permit making such examinations after volunteers have returned to the United States.

Section 2(b)(2) of the bill—page 2, line 15—authorizes an increase in the number of volunteers who may be assigned as secretaries overseas from 100 to 200. There is an increasing number of applications from persons possessing secretarial and clerical skills and experience who want to go overseas as volunteers. The Peace Corps has need for a limited number of secretaries in its overseas offices, and it is to the advantage of the United States to fill these jobs with volunteers rather than with personnel employed under the Foreign Service Act. The committee pointed out in its report its intention that "the number of volunteers assigned under this authority should be based on the needs for overseas secretarial service determined on

an austere basis rather than by the availability of volunteers with the necessary qualifications."

Section 2(b)(2)—page 2, line 20—also amends existing law so as to authorize U.S. disbursing officers to cash checks for volunteers in the same way that such service is rendered to U.S. Government employees.

Section 3 of the bill—page 2, line 23—authorizes the provision of health care to the child of a married volunteer if born during the volunteer's service. The Peace Corps does not accept married couples as volunteers if they have children under 18, but volunteers occasionally marry while in service and sometimes it is to the advantage of the Peace Corps to permit such a volunteer to continue in service. So far, over a 4-year period, married volunteers have become parents of approximately 30 children.

Section 4—beginning on page 3, line 3—deals with personnel and makes basic changes in existing law, although it does not represent a fundamental change in present administrative practice.

This section has no connection with Peace Corps volunteers or volunteer leaders. It affects only salaried operating personnel.

It is, and has been, the policy of Sargent Shriver not to build up a career organization either among the volunteers or among the administrative staff. Section 4 of the bill provides that in the future employees of the Peace Corps may be appointed to a maximum term of 5 years, with a possible reappointment in exceptional cases of an additional 5 years.

At present, the Peace Corps employs people under either the Civil Service Act or the Foreign Service Act. In order to accomplish the objective of establishing a unified noncareer service, the bill repeals the existing authority to hire personnel under the provisions of the Civil Service laws and requires that all hirings in the future, whether for service in Washington or overseas, must be under the provisions of the Foreign Service Act relating to the Foreign Service Reserve and Foreign Service Staff. All such appointments in the future are limited to 5 years, with possible renewal for 5 years in exceptional circumstances.

Section 5 of the bill—page 5—makes provision for those employees currently serving under the civil service or for the duration of operations under the Peace Corps Act. All personnel now holding career or career conditional appointments in the clerical grades—GS–8 and below—are assured of tenure during the duration of operations under the Peace Corps Act.

Persons above the GS–8 level who hold career or career conditional appointments are given 3 years to decide whether or not they will accept appointments to the Foreign Service Reserve or Staff. If they elect not to accept such appointment, they must leave the Peace Corps, but their civil service rights are unimpaired in seeking other jobs.

The bill makes no change in the veteran's preference status of anyone, although future appointments for veterans will be for 5 years or less, the same as anyone else.

Section 6 of the bill—page 7, line 4—amends the Peace Corps Act, which already authorizes the acceptance of gifts and property by the Peace Corps, to authorize the transfer of gifts of money received by the Peace Corps to organizations where Peace Corps volunteers are working. This is to take care of situations where a Parent-Teachers Association or other group in the United States wants to do something for a school or other community activity in an overseas locality where Peace Corps personnel are at work.

Section 7 of the bill—page 7, line 8—is purely technical. It strikes out reference to a law which was repealed when the Dual Compensation Act—Public Law 88–448—was enacted in 1964.

Mr. Chairman, on its record, the Peace Corps deserves the continued support of the Congress. It is promoting goodwill for and better understanding of the United States wherever it operates.

I feel confident that this bill will pass by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I should like to ask the gentleman in particular about some language on pages 15 and 17 of the report, in a completely nonantagonistic manner but just for the purpose of establishing a record. Perhaps a colloquy is most apropos between two of the physicians in the Congress.

I should like to address myself to the question of health care during and after the service of these Peace Corps enrollees.

I notice in the amendment included, and in the existing bill, the sum total would amount to care in any facility in any agency of the U.S. Government. I presume that means both in the continental United States as well as overseas, and would include military hospitals and veterans' hospitals as well as U.S. Public Health hospitals?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. Legally, any Government medical facility can be used, but, in fact, over 90 percent of the medical services would be rendered by the Public Health Service facilities. Physical examinations are frequently given by physicians in private practice who fill out the standard Government forms and are paid by the Peace Corps.

Mr. HALL. Ninety percent?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. Most of the medical service overseas for the Peace Corps is by the Public Health Service.

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HALL. If within the 6 months after they returned from overseas they needed hospitalization, they could be hospitalized under a contract in a civilian hospital? Does the gentleman foresee this would be done by the Public Health Service, or in veterans hospitals? I have in mind the Job Corps enrollees, as pointed out the other day, who were being admitted under some priority to veterans hospitals which had a long waiting list.

Mr. MORGAN. I know of no Peace Corps volunteer ever being treated in a veterans hospital. Volunteers who are sick or suffering from injury when they return come under the Government Employees' Compensation Act and are handled in the same way that any civilian employee would be taken care of.

Mr. HALL. Under the legislation, would that be possible? That is my question addressed to my colleague.

Mr. MORGAN I am not certain about that. The language of the Peace Corps Act authorizes the use of any U.S. Government medical facilities which are available. Overseas they sometimes use Army or Air Force hospitals if these are the closest. I can assure the gentleman that the Peace Corps has no program for treating Peace Corps people in veterans hospitals.

So far as the additional 6 months are concerned, this relates only to physical examinations, not to medical or dental care. Many of the Peace Corps volunteers, when they complete their service in a foreign country, do not return immediately to this country. They sometimes do some sightseeing on the way home from overseas.

This extension was granted because, as my friend from the medical profession knows, these employees are covered under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. It is necessary for them to have a physical examination after they return in order to determine whether they are entitled to further treatment. If there were any malingerers, they would be a burden to us for many years.

Mr. HALL. Not only that, but they might have some rare or exotic disease which would take that long to show up.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. HALL. I understand that problem.

If the gentleman will turn to page 17, I hope he will take a minute to explain further about the pregnancy provision, or the child born in wedlock. We realize that many of the young couples go overseas to the same assignment together, and this is quite possible. Is there any termination date within the determination of the President as to how long such a child might be taken care of? How does this compare with the service for a military man, who cannot resign for any cause from the service, who is not taken care of indeterminately after returning or after being mustered out of service?

Mr. MORGAN. This concerns a very small number of children. As the gentleman knows, I believe less than 30 children have been born to volunteers during their service. It involves a very small number of children. When the parent of the child leaves the Peace Corps service, medical care for the children automatically ends.

Mr. HALL. There is an automatic termination of the care of the child?

Mr. MORGAN. On the termination of their service. The babies are not eligible for treatment under the Federal Employees Compensation Act.

Mr. HALL. At least by 6 months after the parents leave the Peace Corps that would terminate?

Mr. MORGAN. Medical care stops at the termination of the volunteer's service except those entitled to care under the Federal Employees Compensation Act. The 6-month limit relates to physical examinations—not to medical care.

Mr. HALL. May I ask the gentleman to comment as to whether this compares more favorably or less favorably with provisions for a serviceman, who, as I have said, once being mustered out of the service, may or may not have rights for continued care within the service.

Mr. MORGAN. I imagine the good doctor means the serviceman's family, because the serviceman is covered?

Mr. HALL. That is correct.

Mr. MORGAN. The Peace Corps volunteers are more like servicemen than dependents of servicemen. The babies are cared for while the mother serves as a volunteer.

Mr. HALL. I certainly want to point out to my distinguished colleague and fellow physician in the well that it is not a question of how many children are born under this circumstance or cared for, but it is to establish the principle under which they might be cared for. That is the point on which I wish to make the record.

Mr. MORGAN. The Peace Corps does not accept married couples as volunteers if they have any children under 18 years of age. The children covered by this provision are dependents of the volunteers who are in service.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, a little more than 4 years ago when the Peace Corps was set up on a pilot basis many of us were quite honestly skeptical that it would fulfill its stated purpose, "to help foreign countries meet their urgent needs for skilled manpower." I was one of those who were skeptical.

Today, I consider the Peace Corps one of our better efforts. In these few years our volunteers have made a real impact on the people of the country where they serve. Even countries where hostility has been expressed in regard to our foreign policy are asking for an increased number of Peace Corps volunteers. In some instances our Corps people have been protected during revolutionary activity. We now have 8,644 volunteers working in 45 countries. Another 2 dozen countries have requested them.

Perhaps the fact that they are not associated with the Department of State as such has been an important part of their success. The Peace Corps follows the basic general policy of not becoming involved in any political activities, and it has an almost incredibly good record in this respect.

Our volunteers have made this a truly people-to-people program. I should like to think that Walter Judd, for years a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, must be very happy to see the dream he expressed so clearly a year before any action was taken on it become an accomplished fact.

Mr. Shriver has proven himself an outstanding Director of the Corps, as well as a superb public relations man. But were it not for the caliber of the dedicated Americans going abroad as volunteers, he could not have accomplished as much.

The Peace Corps is a wonderful outlet for the earnest, honest spirit of American youth and its deep need to serve others. The Peace Corps appeals to all races and creeds. This organization provides our young people, and some of our senior citizens as well, with their enthusiasm and their selflessness, a unique opportunity to do what needs to be done if America—the real America—is going to be understood across the world. It provides an opportunity for dedicated citizens to demonstrate the American dream to millions of people in other lands who will never have the opportunity of visiting us here.

Mr. Shriver reported that now about 17 other industrialized countries have or are considering Peace Corps operations because they were impressed by what the U.S. Peace Corps is doing. Those of you who have observed the utter ignorance and poverty, disease and despair in some of the developing countries appreciate how extensive a job needs to be done. The volunteers can and do offer hope for a better life. They induce struggling people to believe in themselves. They show what a community can do for itself.

People come by thousands wherever there is given half a chance to learn something, to get ahead. And if we do not teach them, someone else will—and it may lead them farther away from the goal of freedom and self-determination.

The returned volunteers with whom I have talked have shown a new sense of purpose. They have discovered that they can be very useful dealing in the fundamental things of life. Men and women have built schools, homes, barns side by side with distant world neighbors, in spite of language and culture barriers. They have shown people of other countries that we do not consider it beneath a Ph. D. or M.D. to dig a trench or plow a field—and then when evening comes take part in community activities that draw villages together.

There are more than 3,000 Peace Corps volunteers who have returned after 2 years abroad and are readjusting to American life. The readjustment is not always easy.

They had become used to doing without a great many things and notice that so much emphasis here is put on material comforts. It can be very depressing to these ex-volunteers to find so many Americans who "do not want to get involved" in anything except their own little private worlds. Their experience abroad has given them a totally different outlook about a lot of things. It seems evident that their Peace Corps service was eminently worth while and a most meaningful experience. We should have concern now that they be employed to make the best use of their added experiences. They are in a unique position to transmit to American communities an understanding and appreciation of the peoples and cultures to which they have been exposed.

Our committee has explored the costs, ratio of staff members to volunteers, and so forth, very carefully. As the chairman has told you, the cost per volunteer is growing less each year. By way of contrast, our committee's 1964 Report on AID indicates that under the Arthur D. Little contract made by AID in Nigeria, personnel costs are $67,700 per individual as against $8,000 per volunteer. The Peace Corps, it seems, is the least expensive of our projects.

Authorization is requested for $115 million to finance the operation of the Peace Corps during the next fiscal year. Mr. Shriver testified that this amount would make it possible to increase the number of volunteers serving overseas by 1,400. No difficulty is anticipated in the recruitment although applicants with certain especially needed skills are not signing up in very large numbers.

Ohio, my State, has produced the fourth largest number of volunteers of any State—654 in all. In our questioning of Mr. Shriver we learned that a very effective method is used to test an applicant and to prepare him for his job. They must meet both general and specific requirements in order to qualify. The selection process is based on experiences which indicate the kind of people who would be successful working overseas.

It is my earnest hope, Mr. Chairman, that the House will authorize the requested funds for the continuation of this excellent program.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to clear up one point that was made during the colloquy earlier. Wives of Peace Corps men are not included in hospitalization. The only women who are included in hospitalization are those women who are themselves volunteers, unlike the people in service, where a serviceman's wife is entitled to hospitalization.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year President Johnson said in recommending enactment of a Peace Corps authorization for fiscal year 1966:

> The Peace Corps can no longer be viewed as just a feather in our Nation's cap. It is an essential part of our democratic program in meeting our world responsibilities and opportunities. It has become a major instrument for economic and social development.

This bill carries out President Johnson's recommendations. It is a bill which every Member of this House should support with pride.

Too often people still think of the Peace Corps in terms of the great pitfalls into which it could have fallen but which it has managed to avoid entirely.

In 1961, many people were saying, "What is wrong with American youth? Why do they not shoulder their share of the Nation's responsibilities?" They doubted that Americans would volunteer to serve for 2 years in the Ivory Coast or Guatemala or Sabah or Afghanistan.

They were wrong. Since 1961, more than 150,000 Americans have volunteered for service in the Peace Corps.

In 1961, people were concerned about whether or not Peace Corps volunteers would be properly trained and selected.

Over 4 years, less than 10 percent of all the volunteers who have gone overseas have returned before completing their full 2-year term of service. Half of these returned for reasons beyond their control such as for a family emergency requiring their presence or for needed medical care.

In 1961, many people including many State Department personnel overseas dreaded the thought of hundreds of young Americans living and working overseas who might complicate or even hamper the conduct of our foreign policy.

Now even those Foreign Service officers who bewailed the coming of the volunteers sing their praises.

The ability of Peace Corps volunteers overseas to conduct themselves well even under the most demanding circumstances was vividly demonstrated during the recent crisis in the Dominican Republic. So well did the volunteers perform that the respected New York Times correspondent, Tad Szulc, called them the true heroes of the crisis.

But it is time that we stopped thinking of the Peace Corps in these terms. It is time, as President Johnson has suggested, that we think of the Peace Corps in terms of its genuinely solid achievements and its potential for even greater achievement in the future.

Let me just talk about one example. To date, about 3,500 Peace Corps volunteers have taught in schools in 17 African countries south of the Sahara.

They have taught about a quarter of a million Africans.

In six African countries, Peace Corps volunteers make up a third of the degree-holding teaching force.

All over Africa, hundreds of schools are open and in operation. In the absence of Peace Corps volunteers they would not exist. Thousands of children are being taught who otherwise would not be.

My wholehearted support of this bill and of the Peace Corps is not an unthinking support.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs held 3 days of hearings on this bill. Sargent Shriver appeared on 2 of those days, and every member of the committee had an opportunity to question him fully.

One of the questions the committee carefully considered was the effort by a Member of the other body to force Sargent Shriver to give up the directorship of the Peace Corps in view of his responsibilities as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

After due consideration, the committee rejected a similar motion by an overwhelmingly decisive vote.

It was clear from the hearings that Sargent Shriver was as "on top" of the Peace Corps as ever. In this regard, the committee's hearings speak for themselves.

Second, the committee was not about to be fooled by the "two hats" shibboleth. The issue is not how many "hats" does a man wear, but does he wear them well?

Furthermore, some men who have only one "hat" to wear have far greater responsibilities. Director of the Peace Corps and Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity are demanding and responsible jobs. But I submit that our President and our Secretary of State and our Secretary of Defense hold more demanding and responsible offices.

Indeed, in my opinion, by those standards, Mr. Shriver with his great talent and energy is underutilized.

There are issues of principle at stake here as well. Mr. Shriver was appointed to the offices he now holds by the President, the advice and consent of the Senate having been obtained in both cases. That having been done, short of impeachment, the power of removal is in the President alone. This principle was definitely recognized by this House in a famous debate in 1789, wherein James Madison expressed it as follows:

> The powers relative to offices are partly legislative and partly executive. The legislature creates the office, defines the powers, limits its duration and annexes its compensation. This done, the legislative power ceases. They ought to have nothing to do with designating the man to fill the office. That I conceive to be of an executive nature. We ought always to consider the Constitution with an eye to the principles on which it was founded. In this point of view, we shall readily conclude that if the legislature determines the powers, the honors, and emoluments of an office, we should be insecure if they were to designate the officer also. The nature of things restrains and confines the legislative and executive authorities in this respect; and hence it is that the Constitution stipulates for the independence of each branch of Government (1 Annals of Congress 581, 582).

Indeed, the Department of Justice has advised in a letter which has been made available to the committee that the so-called Javits amendment would constitute an "attempt by Congress to remove from office an officer of the executive branch in a manner not authorized by the Constitution."

The real issue in this discussion is whether or not Sargent Schriver has done his job well. As one associated with the Peace Corps since its inception I must conclude that Mr. Shriver has performed an exceptional service to this country. There are many things one can say of his great record with the Peace Corps but perhaps his greatest contribution is the spirit he has imbued in so many young dedicated and able people who desire to serve their country. He has helped to make patriotism, dedication, and service to our Nation fashionable.

Let me turn to two points of particular interest to me.

Like many members, the recent Life article on the former volunteer's so-called crisis of reentry in the United States caused me some concern. I asked Mr. Shriver about that during our committee's hearings and pages 48–50 and 141 and 142 of the hearings contain the facts which support Mr. Shriver's opinion that former volunteers do "make a proper reentry" even if some "get a little wet in the splash down."

I should like to insert for the RECORD a table showing what former volunteers are now doing.

(See table below.)

	1963	Early 1964	Late 1964–65	Total
CONTINUING EDUCATION				
GRADUATE SCHOOL				
Social studies, including area studies	63	208	86	357
Humanities, including journalism and language	18	56	18	92
Technical, including engineering, science, mathematics, architecture, etc	30	87	23	140
Health, recreation, and physical education	8	23	10	41
Education	35	107	41	183
Law	10	30	12	52
Business and management	4	11	5	20
Agriculture and forestry	4	7	4	15
Other fields and not specified	8	31	12	51
Overseas	6	15	5	26
Total, graduate: Number	186	575	216	977
Percent	29	26	24	26
UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION				
Social studies, including area studies	10	106	54	170
Humanities, including journalism and language	2	36	22	60
Technical, including engineering, science, mathematics, architecture, etc	9	53	22	84
Health, recreation, and physical education	2	9	9	20
Education	1	38	15	54
Business and management	0	11	4	15
Agriculture and forestry	4	40	16	60
Other fields and not specified	6	35	23	64
Overseas	0	0	2	2
Total, undergraduate: Number	34	328	167	529
Percent	6	14	19	13
Total, continuing education: Number	220	903	383	1,506
Percent	35	40	43	39
EMPLOYED				
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT				
Peace Corps	58	102	29	189
State Department	4	4	3	11
AID	7	28	9	44
USIA	4	3	0	7
War on poverty (Federal only)	4	14	6	24
All other domestic agencies	29	85	32	146
Congressional staff	2	0	0	2
Total Federal: Number	108	236	79	423
Percent	17	11	9	11
STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT				
State government	7	25	4	36
County government	9	32	12	53
Municipal government	7	24	3	34
Total State and local: Number	23	81	19	123
Percent	4	4	2	4
JOB CORPS CENTERS				
Teachers	0	7	4	11
Administrators and Technicians	1	4	6	11
Not specified	4	10	9	23
Total, Job Corps: Number	5	21	19	45
Percent		1	2	1
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS				
United Nations	3	3	1	7
Foreign governments: Teaching	2	13	1	16
Other	1	6	1	8
International organizations	1	1	0	2
Total, international: Number	7	23	3	33
Percent	1	1	1	1

	1963	Early 1964	Late 1964–65	Total
TEACHING				
Elementary teacher or administrator	23	73	18	114
Secondary teacher or administrator	55	181	29	265
Special education	2	14	7	32
College teacher, administrator or employee (including secretaries, researchers, etc.)	26	47	19	92
Overseas teachers or administrators	6	12	4	22
Peace Corps training sites, teachers and administrators	4	20	15	39
Total, teachers:				
Number	116	347	92	555
Percent	17	15	10	15
NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS				
Health worker	11	49	31	91
Labor union worker	1	2	2	5
Social service worker	18	76	15	109
War on poverty contractor	1	3	3	7
All nonprofit overseas	9	19	6	34
Total, nonprofit:				
Number	40	149	57	246
Percent	6	7	6	7
PROFITMAKING ORGANIZATIONS				
Agriculture and related	3	21	6	30
Business:				
Secretarial and clerical	6	17	3	26
Management	10	32	19	61
Technical	5	44	9	58
Sales and retail	6	20	11	37
Semiskilled	5	37	16	58
Other	10	36	18	64
Communications	4	10	4	18
Self-employed professional	2	11	6	19
All profit organizations overseas	7	20	3	30
Total, profitmaking:				
Number	58	248	95	401
Percent	10	11	11	11
Total, employed:				
Number	357	1,105	364	1,826
Percent	55	50	41	49
OTHER				
Extended or reenrolled	1	93	88	182
Housewife	42	84	34	160
Military	12	20	8	40
Traveling	4	12	16	32
Retired	0	9	3	12
Total, other:				
Number	59	218	149	426
Percent	10	10	16	11
Grand total:				
Number	636	2,226	896	3,758
Percent	100	100	100	100
SUMMARY OF OVERSEAS CAREERS				
Employed by the Peace Corps or other Federal agency with international interests	73	137	41	251
Studying overseas	6	15	7	28
Employed overseas, other than U.S. agency	29	74	16	119
Extended Peace Corps service or traveling	5	105	104	214
Total in overseas careers	113	331	168	612

SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL AWARDS

During the 1964–65 school year, at least 320 former volunteers held scholarships, fellowships, and assistantships worth over $612,400.

	1963	Early 1964	Late 1964–65	Total
WAR ON POVERTY EMPLOYMENT				
Employed by the Office of Economic Opportunity	4	14	6	24
Employed by OEO contractors	6	24	22	52
Total, war on poverty employment	10	38	28	76

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, another area of particular concern to me, as the House well knows, is the use of psychological tests by Government agencies. The Government Operations Committee's special inquiry into this subject heard testimony in June from several agencies, including the Peace Corps. Unlike some of the agencies which appeared before us, the Peace Corps obviously understood, respected, and shared our concern. In preparation for the hearing, the Peace Corps has made a detailed study of its procedures. It had made major changes in many of them designed to insure greater privacy and protection of the individual, including destroying all personality inventory data about an applicant after the selection process has ended. I was also pleased to learn that the Peace Corps strictly limits access to all the personal data it accumulates about an applicant to certain key members of its professional selection staff and that the psychological data are not even available to investigators from other Government agencies.

I notice that two Members from the other side of the aisle have filed separate views about the Peace Corps. There they criticize the committee for limiting itself "almost entirely to discussion with Mr. Shriver. Nongovernmental witnesses were conspicuous by their absence."

I may be mistaken—and if I am I do hope the gentleman will correct me—but I am not aware that they made any request to hear witnesses other than from the executive branch.

Had they, I have no doubt but that the committee would have invited those witnesses to appear.

Moreover, I would like to remind those gentlemen that last year the committee held 5 days of hearings which included testimony from the executive director of CARE and a director of the Catholic Relief Services as well as from two persons who had served as American Ambassadors in countries to which Peace Corps volunteers have been assigned.

Finally, I notice that the separate views complain of "lack of evidence of the overall grassroots impact of the operation."

Permit me to call to their attention the fact that if the full $115 million requested by President Johnson is authorized and appropriated, the Peace Corps proposes to allot approximately $500,000 to such impact studies in countries where the Peace Corps in terms of size or volunteer to population ratio is becoming a major manpower resource.

There are now seven countries in each of which 500 or more volunteers are serving. As the Peace Corps continues to grow, how best to use such a substantial resource will become a major Peace Corps challenge.

The other body in effect eliminated the availability of funds for these studies. The committee wisely did not do so, and if the House accepts its recommendation, the committee will make every effort in conference to eliminate the other body's limitation.

Yesterday's speech by the President again forcefully reminded us of the grave situation the United States confronts in Vietnam. At such a time it is proper that we make every effort to meet the Communist challenge there.

At such a time, it is equally important that we fully support the Peace Corps and its volunteers. They are our army of peace. To hundreds of thousands of people overseas, they are living evidence of America's commitment to service in the cause of peace.

In his speech yesterday the President stated:

> It is an ancient but still terrible irony that while many leaders of men create division in pursuit of grand ambitions, the children of man are really united in the simple elusive desire for a life of fruitful and rewarding toil.

The Peace Corps stands as a living expression of America's recognition of this truth and of our determination to see this desire carried to fruition in the world.

CAREER INFORMATION SERVICE,
PEACE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1965.

The current career plans of 3,758 Peace Corps volunteers who have completed initial service are summarized below. Separate totals and percentages are given for volunteers who completed service in 1963, early 1964 (January through August) and late 1964 (September on) to present.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

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

When this program was first proposed 4 years ago, I was skeptical as to its merits and possibilities. This was a view shared by many. It was not an unreasonable view since the Peace Corps was an untried concept of foreign assistance. I was aware of the shortcomings of our foreign aid program and I feared that this would be equally unproductive. But evidence is increasingly available not alone from those who administer the Peace Corps but from those who have participated in it and from those who have visited the projects in the field that it is one that has gained us friends at a level that many of our other assistance programs cannot or do not reach.

Mr. Chairman, previous speakers have outlined the principal features of this bill, chief among which is an authorization for an appropriation of $115 million.

The initial request was for $125,200,000 but before the committee started its hearings the executive reduced this request to $115 million. The committee decided to recommend and does include in the bill before us an authorization for the entire amount.

The Peace Corps in the fiscal year just concluded spent about $92 million from an appropriation of about $104 million. As the chairman of the committee has pointed out, the Peace Corps has justified in some detail its expenditures for the past fiscal year.

Lest, however, we think everything connected with the Peace Corps is on the basis of complete frugality and barebones expenditure, I wish to include at this point in my remarks a chart from page 11 of the hearings showing that there are 238 employees of the Peace Corps who are paid $12,000 or more per

year. I do this because I think it is important that it be known that this number are compensated at a rate which I think would be considered adequate and generous.

Salary levels of Peace Corps employees

	June 30, 1963	June 30, 1964	Apr. 30, 1965
Departmental:			
$26,000 to $28,500 (statutory)			2
$22,000 to $24,500			11
$20,000 to $21,999	4	5	9
$18,000 to $19,999	9	17	21
$16,000 to $17,999	22	30	18
$14,000 to $15,999	23	17	28
$12,000 to $13,999	25	34	46
Total, departmental	83	103	135
Overseas:			
$22,000 to $24,500			7
$20,000 to $21,999			4
$18,000 to $19,999	6	9	19
$16,000 to $17,999	13	29	12
$14,000 to $15,999	23	30	24
$12,000 to $13,999	21	21	37
Total, overseas	63	89	103
Peace Corps-wide:			
$26,000 to $28,500 (statutory)			2
$22,000 to $24,500			18
$20,000 to $21,999	4	5	13
$18,000 to $19,999	15	26	40
$16,000 to $17,999	35	59	30
$14,000 to $15,999	46	47	52
$12,000 to $13,999	46	55	83
Total, Peace Corps-wide	146	192	238

As has been previously pointed out, the principal feature of this bill is the fact that it does authorize an appropriation of $115 million. In addition to this authorization there are the personnel amendments to which reference has also been made. The amendments provide, an integrated personnel system covering those at home as well as those abroad and assure the employment by the Peace Corps will be limited to 5 years. Thus, the Peace Corps is not a way of life for those seeking a career that is a relatively short time assignment in the service of our country.

Many of us, Mr. Chairman, who have doubts about certain aspects of the various foreign assistance programs into which our country has entered, find that of all these the Peace Corps is among the most successful from my viewpoint and is most acceptable in the host countries. Very few unpleasant or improper incidents have been reported. On the other hand, there are many reports of real constructive work that has earned for our country a deep appreciation by the local people. Further, this work has been done at a level of cost which compares favorably with other aspects of our foreign program.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the committee was convinced that the amount requested was reasonable because we did find the program functioning in a manner that advanced our national interests. It is my recommendation that this legislation providing $115 million authorization for the coming fiscal year be adopted.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill presently before the House. However, in supporting this measure, I should like to express certain reservations which I still have regarding the present Peace Corps program and its proposed expansion.

There is little doubt in my mind that dollar for dollar, the Peace Corps is one of our best buys in foreign policy. And yet, this is one of the very things which causes me to worry—for as the worth of the Peace Corps continues to be recognized, there is the increased danger of its expanding into something of which its original admirers would disapprove.

Take, for example, the words of Mr. Roscoe Drummond in his column of April 25, 1965:

> The Peace Corps isn't what it used to be and is getting less so. It is running down. It is growing old—prematurely * * *. The Peace Corps has made one grave mistake in administrative policy. It has been racing into expansion for its own sake * * *. It has been unwisely setting unattainable goals of more volunteers in more countries in more kinds of activity year after year * * *. In some countries abroad the Peace Corps people are running into each other and running over each other.

Mr. Drummond goes on to say that the Peace Corps cannot continue its rapid expansion "without beating the bushes on every campus, without pleading for volunteers, and without resorting to a hard-sell recruitment which dilutes the very volunteerism of the Peace Corps itself."

I think it is legitimate to ask whether total size is proportional to total effectiveness. For example, if three or four volunteers are assigned to a given community, they naturally find a place within it and learn to participate in its life. However, should a larger number of volunteers be assigned in that same location, they would tend to form their own little American community. And although you have more volunteers in the given location, the saturation into that community's life actually decreases.

The minority has pointed out in the report on H.R. 9026 that "The Peace Corps has achieved a status of permanence." Yet, by the very nature of its goals, the Peace Corps should be busy eliminating itself, not expanding itself. For example, if the Peace Corps enters a country to work within its educational system, it should plan its contribution to that country's educational effort in such a way as to let host nationals assume the Peace Corps role within the educational system as soon as possible. Simply because a volunteer has served well and fruitfully at his post is no reason to fulfill a request that he be replaced by another once his term of service is finished.

In the past, there were mildly strained relations between the Peace Corps and the other agencies concerned with American foreign policy. This was, no doubt, due to the scepticism the differing agencies held about each other. However, as the Peace Corps has proved its worth, the distance between the agencies has lessened as they learn to work together. However, in so doing, there is danger that the Peace Corps will be swallowed by the larger agencies. When the volunteers build libraries, is it the U.S. Information Service which will rush in to staff them? When the volunteers build wells in rural towns, is it USAID that will be shipping the parts and handling the costs? Cooperation is to be lauded—but its dangers are also to be noted. For as the Peace Corps effort begins to coordinate itself with admittedly more political aspects of our foreign policy, it will lose the political neutralism which has contributed so greatly to its success.

I have already said that I believe the Peace Corps to be one of our best buys in foreign diplomacy. However, this does not speak so highly of the Peace Corps as it does disparagingly of our other foreign expenditures. The Peace Corps is to be commended that it has steadily reduced the general administrative costs of its program from 28 percent of all costs in 1963 to 23 percent of all costs in 1965. However, the Peace Corps is still to be reminded that church mission groups would consider such a figure literally astounding. Not one major mission agency in the United States runs such high administrative costs; and yet these agencies must not only make contributions to present operating expenses, but for the education of missionary children, retirement benefits, and so forth. The Peace Corps is to be commended for lowering the average annual cost per volunteer to slightly under $8,000 in 1965 when in 1963 the cost per volunteer was slightly above $9,000. However, it ought likewise be noted that some of the larger mission agencies such as the Sudan interior mission which has over 1,000 American missionaries serving abroad average costs to about $4,000 per missionary—again including such added costs as the education of missionary children, retirement benefits, and so forth.

Another matter which disturbs me somewhat regarding the general Peace Corps operation is its public relations. Perhaps I am bothered because they are too good. One seldom hears a bad word about the Peace Corps. And if one does, it is generally so outlandish as to bring the source of information into disrepute while giving a backslap of praise for the Peace Corps. Two years ago we were told in the Wall Street Journal that the large corporations were literally begging returned volunteers to join their firms. Now we are told in Life magazine that the returned volunteers suffer such shock when they seek to reacculturate into American life that they stand in danger of having to visit the psychiatrist's couch on their way home. Note how both these images of the returned volunteer are contradictory. Note also how the Peace Corps is able to use each image—for in either case the Peace Corps has a hero. In the first instance, the volunteer refuses the material enticements of corrupt American society, and goes on to graduate school or into some form of social work. In the second instance, the volunteer returns home undaunted, realizing that his pending ordeal is but one of the sacrifices he must make for his country.

There is, unfortunately, a vast aura of unthinkable thoughts regarding the Peace Corps. And by doing away with

reason, we do not stand to improve the organization. I have in the past supported the Peace Corps, and I have by and large been satisfied with its performance. It has certainly come a long way from its first days in 1962 when we wondered if it might not be a catastrophic attempt at a 2-year intern program for junior diplomats. Let us hope that it does not rest on past accomplishments and, in so doing, fail in its obligations to the present.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, it is a well-known fact that I strongly endorse the philosophy behind the U.S. Peace Corps. I have stated publicly many times that the one sure way to demonstrate the excellence of the American way of life to the peoples of the world is through a peaceful program of social intercourse between the citizens of our country and the inhabitants of foreign nations.

Presently H.R. 9026 is before the House for consideration. I strongly support this bill to expand the Peace Corps and I am sure that this body will act favorably on it. I do believe, though, that we must expand even further our efforts to get private citizens into other countries for person-to-person contact.

The great natural attraction of the so-called people-to-people concept is obvious to any Christian. The spirit of brotherly love embodied in a man's effort to help another by his own personal time, strength and knowledge surely must be well taken.

However, Peace Corps volunteers are representatives of the Federal Government and, because of this, sometimes are surrounded by an aura of suspicion as U.S. agents when viewed by a foreign country's natives.

Representatives of private groups, on the other hand, would not face such suspicion. It has been brought to my attention many times that in situations where our Peace Corps volunteers are being figuratively stoned by U.S. critics in foreign nations, religious missionaries, and other private citizens are able to carry on their beneficial work without such harassment.

The possibilities for private relations with foreign nations are endless. I am thinking now of the human resources of America's religious groups, labor unions, service clubs, and educational institutions that are virtually untapped for a nonfederally sponsored program such as that now carried on by the Peace Corps.

I firmly believe that such a program would inestimably improve our image among foreign peoples and go a long way toward easing some of the world tensions that the cold war has created.

A step along this same path is the creation of a Freedom Academy to train our public and private emissaries how to help people in other countries to live their lives and govern themselves.

I am pleased to report that a Freedom Academy bill authored by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] and similar to my own bill has now been cleared by the Committee on Un-American Activities. It is my fond hope that this legislation will be before us in the near future to help further this people-to-people concept of foreign relations.

It will be a major step forward in a world peace offensive.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I direct the attention of the Members to the separate views which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and I offered. I am sure the Members have noted that no direct answer has been provided to the constructive criticisms that we have leveled.

I believe we are perfectly consistent and practical to ask for a thorough study of the Peace Corps so that it could be properly improved. As it stands, the information made available to the Members comes primarily from the Peace Corps' own propaganda employees. This is hardly objective information.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe that those of us who support the Peace Corps but are frank enough to acknowledge its imperfections should receive on behalf of the American taxpayers cooperation from the executive branch in taking a thorough look at this agency.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I can think of no vote that gives me greater satisfaction than one which expresses support for continuing and expanding the Peace Corps Act, and I am pleased and proud to have an opportunity today to once more add my unqualified endorsement to the concept of the Peace Corps and to applaud its extraordinary success. At its inception, there were many eyebrows raised at the sheer audacity of such a proposal, and I doubt I am far wrong if I state it is quite likely that a good many of my colleagues who voted in favor of the original authorization did so with less than enthusiasm, and were perhaps, while willing to give the idea a fair trial, a little apprehensive at the risks involved. I am confident any such fears were long ago allayed, and even the most cynical among us can, with good cause, pay tribute to the significant contribution these volunteers have made to the promotion of understanding, friendship and peace throughout the world. All good teams usually have top leadership. So it is with the Peace Corps in the person of Sargent Shriver, its Director. It is good to see here today the generous tributes to his outstanding ability. May this fine work continue to prosper.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio for her generosity in yielding 10 minutes to me. I had asked for 5 minutes and probably will not use that unless I get into some kind of argument.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to some of the remarks of preceding speakers. One referred to the Peace Corps and its skilled workers. I doubt that there are many really skilled workers in the Peace Corps at $75 per month. The poverty program probably pays more than some of them are getting.

Another speaker said the Peace Corps frowns on taking families overseas. If I remember correctly, there was a good deal of publicity, laudatory of the Peace Corps, in connection with one individual who took his family of a wife and seven or eight children over to the Philippines at a high cost to the taxpayers. So I am sure not all of them go overseas without children and that it is not exactly frowned upon.

In its short lifespan the Peace Corps—as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] and I have stated in our minority views—in its short lifespan the Peace Corps has acquired an atmosphere of sanctity; its every target is proper; its training perfect; its office staff functions flawlessly; and the corpsmen in the field, within their personal 2-year hitches, surmount obstacles that would have defied our hardiest pioneers.

The original public relations buildup dramatically describes the volunteers as working for $75 per month under conditions of extreme personal hardship, which is in stark contrast to 238 staff positions with salaries ranging from $12,000 to $28,500 per year, along with politically appointed specialists receiving $75 per day plus travel and per diem expenses.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that this year as in previous years the Foreign Affairs Committee did not have a review and evaluation of this program in depth. I am pleased that the distinguished chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] has assured some of us that next year there will be a thorough review and evaluation, which it badly needs. I have opposed the Peace Corps, and for the reason that there has been no disposition to cut down on other assistance programs, operated by a multiplicity of Government agencies, doing much the same work. I say to you, we could very well save a substantial amount of money in other programs that are duplicating by providing so-called technical assistance and so-called experts to foreign countries. We are about to begin to see in this country the use of something akin to wooden nickels as the result of legislation passed by the House a few days ago. We are head over heels in debt in this country, and it seems to me if the Peace Corps program is to be continued, and I labor under no illusions whatever as to the fate of this bill here today—if the Peace Corps is to be continued, I say to you we ought to cut down on some of the other programs and make at least a pretense of having some consideration for the taxpayers of this country. Despite the billions that have been spent abroad by the Peace Corps and other international outfits, the situation seems to grow worse almost daily.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is nothing I could say here today that would have the effect of slowing down or in any

way changing this program, and, therefore, I bow to the inevitable and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa yields back 5 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9026, a bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act.

Without a doubt, the Peace Corps has proven itself to be the most effective instrument for bringing about understanding between the United States and other nations of the world. It has been the wisest investment in our search for peace. Through its intelligent, dedicated, and hardworking corpsmen in some 45 countries, it has helped to create a new image of our Nation abroad—a change from one of acquisitive, materialistic society of fortune-seeking individualists, to a land of men of good will seeking to help those in need. This has been the impression expressed to me by a countless number of Asians I have met, including the Crown Prince of Japan.

Our Committee on Foreign Affairs, in its deliberations on this bill, has noted that not only have there been no incidents involving Peace Corps personnel of such a nature as to create problems in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy, but instead Peace Corps volunteers during periods of crisis in the Dominican Republic, northern Borneo, and elsewhere have made a conspicuous and significant contribution to the promotion of a better understanding of the American people and of world peace and friendship.

We in Hawaii are proud of our contribution to this wonderful program. I speak not only of Hawaii volunteers whose quality is every bit as fine as those from other States, but I refer also to the Peace Corps training camp in Waipio Valley, near the city of Hilo, on the Island of Hawaii. It is here that the volunteers bound for Asia get their first taste of the life they may lead when they arrive at their assigned station. They live in bamboo huts, and speak only the language of the country to which they have been assigned. They may have to eat roots, fruits, and coconut milk. They learn to plow with the only working water buffalo in the United States. They climb mountains, and trudge through swamps. They learn how to bargain for food, how to exist, in short, in the kind of community in which they may be called upon to serve.

Hawaii, of course, can do much more to contribute to the program of the Peace Corps because of our natural tropical and semitropical settings and our multiracial community. We believe we can add to the continuing effectiveness of the Peace Corps in its mission of bringing better understanding between the United States and the developing nations of the world.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering authorizes $115 million to finance the operation of the Peace Corps during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. The amount represents a reduction from $125.2 million which had originally been asked by the administration. Our Committee on Foreign Affairs has received convincing evidence that increasing the number of volunteers serving overseas by 1,400, to a total of 15,110, during fiscal year 1966 would serve the interests of the United States and make a significant contribution to the advancement of the countries where they would work, and that the expanded operation would be prudently and economically administered. And all these things will be accomplished during the current fiscal year with the requested appropriation, while the total average annual cost per volunteer will be less than the cost for fiscal 1965.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford not to put our stamp of approval on this tremendous worldwide program of good will.

I urge an overwhelming vote in favor of H.R. 9026.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation before the House.

As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has already explained, your committee has given very careful study to this legislation. We are convinced that the authorization proposed for fiscal year 1966, and the related amendments, are fully warranted by the performance of the Peace Corps, and will enhance the effectiveness of that agency's future operations.

At the outset, I want to stress one thing: During the years of its existence, the stigma of mismanagement or improper expenditure of the taxpayer's money has never been attached to the Peace Corps. And we can see why this is so when we look at some of the figures included in the record of the hearings on this legislation.

We find, for example, that the cost of training and maintaining each Peace Corps volunteer has gone down year after year and is today some $1,100 less than it was 3 years ago.

We also find that the ratio of staff to Peace Corps volunteers has dropped. Two years ago, there was 1 staff employee for each 10 volunteers. In the coming fiscal year, there will be 1 for each 13 volunteers. In this one case, Parkinson's law has not worked: to the great satisfaction of our committee and the Congress, the Peace Corps has not produced an ever-growing bureaucracy.

We also find that whenever the Peace Corps had some money left over from their annual appropriations, they have turned it back to the Treasury—a practice which ought to be emulated by other Government agencies. I believe 12 million will be refunded.

The fact that the Peace Corps has been careful in spending money, and has successfully lived up to its fiscal mandate, speaks volumes about the character and the integrity of this organization. We must remember, however, that additional volumes can and should be written about the actual performance of Peace Corps volunteers throughout the world—performance which has brought untold benefits to thousands of people who need help to overcome illiteracy, poverty, disease, and other dire conditions of their existence.

If the Members of the House will look at page 4 of our committee's report on the bill before us—look at the charts on that page—they will see something very interesting about the performance of the Peace Corps: they will see that the Peace Corps has tried to tailor its activities to meet the most urgent needs of the areas in which our volunteers work.

The Members will notice, for instance, that almost two-fifths of all Peace Corps volunteers are working in our sister Republics of Latin America.

They will also notice that in each geographical area, the direction of Peace Corps efforts varies. In Africa, for example, almost 80 percent of volunteer efforts are expended on education. In contrast, in Latin America, more than one-half of Peace Corps activities are directly related to community action. In still other areas, health and agriculture receive particular attention.

I know it is not necessary for me to tell the Congress what the Peace Corps has done to the American image in the free, developing countries of the world. The boys and girls, the men and women who volunteer to serve abroad with the Peace Corps are the embodiment of the finest ideals of our Nation. Their service provides a tangible expression of our Nation's most personal concern for the well-being of all mankind. And this expression has been received with gratitude and enthusiasm by the people of each and every country which had Peace Corps volunteers assigned to it. Our image abroad has been improved, and the objectives which our Nation pursues on the world scene have been made more understandable, and more appreciated, by the selfless service and devotion of these fine young men and women. It is truly a people-to-people program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in the Peace Corps—its mission, its objectives, and its capacity to fulfill both. And for this reason. I shall continue to support this program. I hope and trust that the membership of the House will do likewise.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, having voted for the bills creating and maintaining the Peace Corps, I am pleased to be able to renew my support for the good work being done by that organization.

There is little doubt that Peace Corps volunteers are doing valuable, constructive work in the 45 countries in which they are now serving. As of March 31 of this year there were 8,644 Peace Corps volunteers and trainees either in or on their way to field assignments.

The performance of Peace Corps workers in their very difficult and dangerous role in the Dominican crisis illustrates how effective young idealists really can be under the most trying of circumstances.

While the self-satisfaction which they gain must be considerable, Peace Corps volunteers receive meager pay. Furthermore, they often suffer considerable physical hardships which may result in substantial personal expenses.

In recognition of this, the bill provides for additional medical and dental treat-

ment, as well as a more equitable basis for the tax treatment of Peace Corps pay.

The additional authorization to finance the expanding operation of the Peace Corps which is provided for in this bill can be used to commendable advantage. The Peace Corps has shown responsible concern for preventing the organization from becoming top-heavy with administrative personnel as evidenced by the changing ratio of staff to fieldworkers. During the first year of its operation, there was one staff member for every four volunteers. During fiscal year 1965 the staff-volunteer ratio had shrunk to 1 to 12. Increasingly better management has reduced the annual cost per volunteer from $9,074 in fiscal year 1963 to $7,950 in fiscal year 1965.

Two dozen countries in which the Peace Corps is not now operating have requested volunteers, and all of the nations which now have volunteers want more. Clearly, the need for the unique and devoted services of Peace Corps volunteers is not diminishing. In Latin America, in Africa, in Asia, thousands of underprivileged people are leading relatively unproductive lives because, due to their lack of education and training, they are unable to forge a better future for themselves. The Peace Corps has proved that it is able to do the job, and I think it ought to be given the means to take on added responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, I wholly support the Peace Corps program and the bill before us today.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Chairman, approximately 4 years and 10 months ago, on September 22, 1961, the President of the United States signed legislation to establish the Peace Corps as a permanent body. The fundamental soundness of this idea can be ascertained by the overwhelming support this legislation received by the Congress when the matter was presented to it for enactment into law.

During this period of uncertain conditions throughout the world, we have been confronted by many expressions of gratitude of the countries where these Peace Corp volunteers served. The cry and response from these countries is, "send us more of these Peace Corps volunteers." This response is a far cry from the many "Yankee Go Home" signs which some radicals display in various areas of the world.

Today, we are all aware that the program has become a success, it is no longer an experiment in assisting the many countries which have welcomed these volunteers. The successful record speaks for itself and the people of the United States can be proud of this success.

The Peace Corps has received a splendid response for the many volunteers it presently has serving in various capacities throughout the world. Our young people, yes, and many in their senior years have been working as social workers, surveyors, farmers, teachers, auto mechanics, home economists, nurses, doctors, fishermen, engineers, carpenters and in many other fields.

The many volunteers, spread over the territories of over 40 countries come from every walk of life, representing every race, every color, every creed.

We can be proud of the fact that our Peace Corps personnel are acting as Americans and the ambassadors of good will in every area of the world. They go beyond the boundaries of projects which were assigned to them to be performed in the areas to which they were sent. They engage in voluntary activities and in community projects to demonstrate that voluntary action of the citizens is a vital part of American free society. This they wish to impart to the people of the countries in which they serve so nobly.

It is my honest belief that the Peace Corps has been a real bargain in terms of the returns for the dollars we have invested in this program, a bargain in terms of our fight against the encroachment of communism, and a bargain in our traditional concern for people less unfortunate than ourselves.

Can we make a better investment than in helping human beings to find a better way of life which, in turn, makes it more meaningful to an individual?

The program was made truly a people-to-people activity and all credit should go to the caliber of the dedicated Americans who wish to see that this program continues its high level of support to the countries which have requested them.

I am pleased and proud to have the opportunity to express my support of this concept of the Peace Corps and no other measure before this House deserves more recognition than the one we are presently discussing.

There is no doubt that the American people are willing to support and finance a program which has been accepted as a success. The accomplishments have been impressive and it seems clear to me that no obstacle should be placed to curtail the success of this Peace Corps program.

I rise in support of the present bill and hope that no effort will be made to reduce the funds which are authorized in this legislation. For, as long as the foreign governments request this assistance and welcome the members of the Peace Corps we should do all that we can to continue this program at its present level, and possibly make a moderate expansion of it.

The idea was a modest beginning with many skeptics prophesying its demise, but the events of the past indicate that this Peace Corps movement was one of our better efforts in meeting people and helping them to attain a better way of life.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time and I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of that Act, is amended by striking out "1965" and substituting "1966".

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to Peace Corps volunteers, is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (c) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C.), a volunteer shall be deemed to be paid and to receive each amount of a readjustment allowance to which he is entitled after December 31, 1964, when such amount is transferred from funds made available under this Act to the fund from which such readjustment allowance is payable."

(b) In subsection (e):

(1) In the first sentence, strike out "and such health examinations and immunization preparatory to their service," and substitute therefor "applicants for enrollment shall receive such health examinations, immunization, and dental care preparatory to their service, and former volunteers shall receive such health examinations within six months after termination of their service,".

(2) In the second sentence, strike out ", examinations, and immunization" and strike out "for volunteers".

(c) In the first proviso of subsection (g), strike out "one" and substitute therefor "two" and strike out "in the aggregate".

(d) In subsection (h), immediately after "(5) U.S.C. 73b–5)," insert "the Act of December 23, 1944, chapter 716, section 1, as amended (31 U.S.C. 492a),".

SEC. 3. In section 6(3) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the provision of health care to the spouses and minor children of volunteer leaders, immediately after "accompanying them" insert ", and a married volunteer's child if born during the volunteer's service,".

SEC. 4. Section 7 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to Peace Corps employees, is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out subsections (a) and (b).

(b) Redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (a) and in the subsection as redesignated:

(1) In the introductory phrase:

(A) Insert "(1)" immediately before "For the purpose of".

(B) Strike out "—" immediately after "may".

(2) In paragraph (1) strike out "(1)".

(3) In paragraph (2):

(A) Amend the first sentence to read as follows: "The President may utilize such authority contained in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, relating to Foreign Service Reserve officers, Foreign Service Staff officers and employees, alien clerks and employees, and other United States Government officers and employees apart from Foreign Service officers as he deems necessary to carry out functions under this Act; except that (A) no Foreign Service Reserve or Staff appointment or assignment under this paragraph shall be for a period of more than five years unless the Director of the Peace Corps, under special circumstances, personally approves an extension of not more than five years on an individual basis; and (B) no person whose Foreign Service Reserve or Staff appointment or assignment under this paragraph has been terminated shall be reappointed or reassigned under this paragraph before the expiration of a period of time equal to his preceding tour of duty or until the expiration of one year, whichever is the shorter."

(B) Strike out in the second sentence thereof "the Foreign Service Act of 1946" and insert in lieu thereof "that Act".

(C) In the first proviso in the second sentence thereof strike out "of" immediately after "the period of the appointment" and insert in lieu thereof "or".

(D) Insert immediately after "may prescribe" in the second proviso thereof ": *Provided further,* That under such regulations

as the President may prescribe persons who are to perform duties of a more routine nature than are generally performed by Foreign Service Staff officers and employees of class 10 may be appointed to an unenumerated class of Foreign Service Staff officers and employees ranking below class 10 and be paid basic compensation at rates lower than those of class 10."

(4) In paragraph (3):

(A) Strike "specify" and insert in lieu thereof: "The President may specify what additional compensation authorized by section 207 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 118h), and".

(B) Strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(a)".

(C) Strike out "that Act" and insert in lieu thereof "those Acts".

(c) Redesignate subsection (d) as subsection (b) and in that subsection as redesignated:

(1) Immediately after "or assigned" insert "for the purpose of performing functions under this Act outside the United States".

(2) Strike out "subsection (c)(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "subsection (a)(2)".

(d) Redesignate subsection (e) as subsection (c) and in the second sentence of that subsection as redesignated strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(a)".

SEC. 5. (a) Section 4 of this Act shall not become effective until the first day of the fourth pay period which begins after the date this Act becomes law.

(b) Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, each person employed under authorities repealed by section 4(a) of this Act immediately prior to the effective date of that section shall effective on that date be appointed a Foreign Service Reserve officer or Foreign Service staff officer or employee under the authority of section 7(a)(2) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, and appointed or assigned to an appropriate class thereof; except that—

(1) no person who holds a career or career-conditional appointment immediately prior to the effective date of section 4(a) of this Act shall, without his consent, be so appointed until three years after such effective date; and

(2) each person so appointed who, immediately prior to the effective date of section 4(a) of this Act, held a career or career-conditional appointment at grade 8 or below of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive an appointment for the duration of operations under the Peace Corps Act, as amended.

Each person appointed under this subsection shall receive basic compensation at the rate of his class determined by the President to be appropriate, but the rate of basic compensation received by such person immediately prior to the effective date of his appointment under this subsection shall not be reduced by the provisions of this paragraph.

SEC. 6. In section 10(a)(3) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to acceptance, employment, and transfer of gifts, immediately after "and transfer such" insert "money or".

SEC. 7. In the second sentence of section 15(c) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to training of employees, strike out "Such training shall not be considered employment or holding of office under section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U.S.C. 62), and any" and substitute therefor "Any".

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point, and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments, the Committee will rise, under the rule.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, 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. 9026) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 473, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2054) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes, and for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—is the gentleman asking to amend the Senate bill to conform to the House bill?

Mr. MORGAN. No; to substitute the House bill for the Senate bill.

Mr. GROSS. Does that mean there will be no conference on the bill?

Mr. MORGAN. There will be a conference.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2054

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of that Act, is amended by striking out "1965" and substituting "1966", and by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "of which not to exceed $500,000 shall be available for carrying out research".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4(a) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which provides for the appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, is amended by striking out "and a Deputy Director of the Peace Corps" immediately after a "Director of the Peace Corps' and substituting therefor ", a Deputy Director of the Peace Corps and two Associate Directors of the Peace Corps"; and by adding at the end of section 4(a) the following sentence: "The Director shall hold no other Federal office of equivalent rank."

(b) Section 16 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the appointment of persons serving under prior law, is amended by adding immediately after the end thereof a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) Any person serving as Associate Director of the Peace Corps for Program Development and Operations or Associate Director of the Peace Corps for Peace Corps Volunteers on the date this subsection becomes law may serve as one of the two Associate Directors of the Peace Corps for whose appointment provision is made in section 4(a) of this Act until the end of the first session of the Eighty-ninth Congress, or until the President shall commission him or his successor as such an Associate Director of the Peace Corps, or until his nomination as such an Associate Director is rejected by the Senate, whichever sooner occurs."

(c) Section 303(e) of the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964, which provides for the application of level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by section 302 of that Act to certain offices and positions, is amended by striking out paragraphs (71) and (72) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraph (71):

"(71) Associate Directors of the Peace Corps (2)."

SEC. 3. Section 5 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to Peace Corps volunteers, is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (e):

(1) In the first sentence, strike out "and such health examinations and immunization preparatory to their service," and substitute therefor "applicants for enrollment who have accepted an invitation to begin a period of training under section 8(a) of the Act shall receive such health examinations, immunization, and dental care preparatory to their service, and former volunteers shall receive such health examinations within six months after termination of their service,".

(2) In the second sentence, strike out ", examinations, and immunization" and strike out "for volunteers".

(b) In the first proviso of subsection (g), strike out "one" and substitute therefor "two" and strike out "in the aggregate".

(c) In subsection (h), immediately after "(5 U.S.C. 73b–5)," insert "the Act of December 23, 1944, chapter 716, section 1, as amended (31 U.S.C. 492a),".

SEC. 4. In section 6(3) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the provision of health care to the spouses and minor children of volunteer leaders, immediately after "accompanying them" insert ", and a married volunteer's child if born during the volunteer's service,".

SEC. 5. Section 7 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to Peace Corps employees, is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out subsections (a) and (b).

(b) Redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (a) and in the subsection as redesignated:

(1) In the introductory phrase:

(A) Insert "(1)" immediately before "For the purpose of".

(B) Strike out "—" immediately after "may".

(2) In paragraph (1), strike out "(1)".

(3) In paragraph (2):

(A) Strike out the first sentence thereof and substitute therefor "The President may utilize such authority contained in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, relating to Foreign Service Reserve officers, Foreign Service Staff officers and employees, alien clerks and employees, and other United States Government officers and employees apart from Foreign Service officers as he deems necessary to carry out functions under this Act: *Provided, however,* That all Foreign Service Reserve or Staff appointments or

assignments shall be limited or temporary and not exceed five years in duration unless the appointee or assignee held a career or career-conditional appointment at grade eight or below of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.), under former section 7(a) of this Act immediately prior to the effective date of the repeal of that section: *Provided further,* That a person who serves as a Foreign Service Reserve or Staff officer or employee under this paragraph may not be reappointed or reassigned under this paragraph until the expiration of a period of time equal to his preceding tour of duty."

(B) Strike out in the second sentence thereof "the Foreign Service Act of 1946" and insert in lieu thereof "that Act".

(C) In the first proviso in the second sentence thereof strike out "of" immediately after "the period of the appointment" and insert in lieu thereof "or".

(D) Insert immediately after "may prescribe" in the second proviso thereof ": *Provided further,* That under such regulations as the President may prescribe persons who are to perform duties of a more routine nature than are generally performed by Foreign Service Staff officers and employees of class 10 may be appointed to an unenumerated class of Foreign Service Staff officers and employees ranking below class 10 and be paid basic compensation at rates lower than those of class 10."

(4) In paragraph (3):

(A) Strike out "specify" and insert in lieu thereof: "The President may specify what additional compensation authorized by section 207 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 118h), and".

(B) Strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(a)".

(C) Strike out "that Act" and insert in lieu thereof "those Acts".

(c) Redesignate subsection (d) as subsection (b) and in that subsection as redesignated:

(1) Immediately after "or assigned" insert "for the purpose of performing functions under this Act outside of the United States".

(2) Strike out "subsection (c)(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "subsection (a)(2)".

(d) Redesignate subsection (e) as subsection (c) and in the second sentence of that subsection as redesignated strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(a)".

SEC. 6. (a) Section 5 of this Act shall not become effective until the first day of the fourth pay period which begins after the date this Act becomes law.

(b) Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, each person employed under authorities repealed by section 5(a) of this Act immediately prior to the effective date of that section shall effective on that date be appointed a Foreign Service Reserve officer or Foreign Service Staff officer or employee under the authority of section 7(a)(2) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, and appointed or assigned to an appropriate class thereof: *Provided, however,* That no person who holds a career or career-conditional appointment immediately prior to the effective date of that section shall, without his consent, be so appointed until three years after the effective date of that section. Each officer or employee so appointed shall receive basic compensation at the rate of his class determined to be appropriate by the President, except that the rate of basic compensation received by any officer or employee immediately prior to the effective date of his Foreign Service Reserve or Staff appointment shall not be reduced by the provisions of this section.

SEC. 7. In section 10(a)(3) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to acceptance, employment, and transfer of gifts, immediately after "and transfer such" insert "money or".

SEC. 8. In section 13(a) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the employment of experts and consultants, strike out "$75" and substitute therefor "$100".

SEC. 9. In the second sentence of section 15(c) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to training of employees, strike out "Such training shall not be considered employment or holding of office under section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U.S.C. 62), and any" and substitute therefor "Any".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORGAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORGAN: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill (S. 2054) and insert the following:

"That section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of that Act, is amended by striking out '1965' and substituting '1966'.

"SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to Peace Corps volunteers, is amended as follows:

"(a) Subsection (c) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C.), a volunteer shall be deemed to be paid and to receive each amount of a readjustment allowance to which he is entitled after December 31, 1964, when such amount is transferred from funds made available under this Act to the fund from which such readjustment allowance is payable.'

"(b) In subsection (e):

"(1) In the first sentence, strike out 'and such health examinations and immunization preparatory to their service,' and substitute therefor 'applicants for enrollment shall receive such health examinations, immunization, and dental care preparatory to their service, and former volunteers shall receive such health examinations within six months after termination of their service,'.

"(2) In the second sentence, strike out ', examinations, and immunization' and strike out 'for volunteers'.

"(c) In the first proviso of subsection (g), strike out 'one' and substitute therefor 'two' and strike out 'in the aggregate'.

"(d) In subsection (h), immediately after '(5) U.S.C. 73b–5),' insert 'the Act of December 23, 1944, chapter 716, section 1, as amended (31 U.S.C. 492a),'.

"SEC. 3. In section 6(3) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the provision of health care to the spouses and minor children of volunteer leaders, immediately after 'accompanying them' insert ', and a married volunteer's child if born during the volunteer's service,'.

"SEC. 4. Section 7 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to Peace Corps employees, is amended as follows:

"(a) Strike out subsections (a) and (b).

"(b) Redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (a) and in the subsection as redesignated:

"(1) In the introductory phrase:

"(A) Insert '(1)' immediately before 'For the purpose of'.

"(B) Strike out '—' immediately after 'may'.

"(2) In paragraph (1) strike out '(1)'.

"(3) In paragraph (2):

"(A) Amend the first sentence to read as follows: 'The President may utilize such authority contained in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, relating to Foreign Service Reserve officers, Foreign Service Staff officers and employees, alien clerks and employees, and other United States Government officers and employees apart from Foreign Service officers as he deems necessary to carry out functions under this Act; except that (A) no Foreign Service Reserve or Staff appointment or assignment under this paragraph shall be for a period of more than five years unless the Director of the Peace Corps, under special circumstances, personally approves an extension of not more than five years on an individual basis; and (B) no person whose Foreign Service Reserve or Staff appointment or assignment under this paragraph has been terminated shall be reappointed or reassigned under this paragraph before the expiration of a period of time equal to his preceding tour of duty or until the expiration of one year, whichever is the shorter.'

"(B) Strike out in the second sentence thereof 'the Foreign Service Act of 1946' and insert in lieu thereof 'that Act'.

"(C) In the first proviso in the second sentence thereof strike out 'of' immediately after 'the period of the appointment' and insert in lieu thereof 'or'.

"(D) Insert immediately after 'may prescribe' in the second proviso thereof ': *Provided further,* That under such regulations as the President may prescribe persons who are to perform duties of a more routine nature than are generally performed by Foreign Service Staff officers and employees of class 10 may be appointed to an unenumerated class of Foreign Service Staff officers and employees ranking below class 10 and be paid basic compensation at rates lower than those of class 10.'

"(4) In paragraph (3):

"(A) Strike out 'specify' and insert in lieu thereof: 'The President may specify what additional compensation authorized by section 207 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 118h), and '.

"(B) Strike out '(c)' and insert in lieu thereof '(a)'.

"(C) Strike out 'that Act' and insert in lieu thereof 'those Acts'.

"(c) Redesignate subsection (d) as subsection (b) and in that subsection as redesignated:

"(1) Immediately after 'or assigned' insert 'for the purpose of performing functions under this Act outside the United States.'

"(2) Strike out 'subsection (c)(2)' and insert in lieu thereof 'subsection (a)(2)'.

"(d) Redesignate subsection (e) as subsection (c) and in the second sentence of that subsection as redesignated strike out '(c)' and insert in lieu thereof '(a)'.

"SEC. 5. (a) Section 4 of this Act shall not become effective until the first day of the fourth pay period which begins after the date this Act becomes law.

"(b) Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, each person employed under authorities repealed by section 4(a) of this Act immediately prior to the effective date of that section shall effective on that date be appointed a Foreign Service Reserve officer or Foreign Service staff officer or employee under the authority of section 7(a)(2) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, and appointed or assigned to an appropriate class thereof; except that—

"(1) no person who holds a career or career-conditional appointment immediately prior to the effective date of section 4(a) of this Act shall, without his consent, be so appointed until three years after such effective date; and

"(2) each person so appointed who, immediately prior to the effective date of section 4(a) of this Act, held a career or career-conditional appointment at grade 8 or below of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive an appointment for the duration of operations under the Peace Corps Act, as amended.

Each person appointed under this subsection shall receive basic compensation at the rate of his class determined by the President to

be appropriate, but the rate of basic compensation received by such person immediately prior to the effective date of his appointment under this subsection shall not be reduced by the provisions of this paragraph.

"SEC. 6. In section 10(a)(3) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to acceptance, employment, and transfer of gifts, immediately after 'and transfer such' insert 'money or'.

"SEC. 7. In the second sentence of section 15(c) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to training of employees, strike out 'Such training shall not be considered employment or holding of office under section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U.S.C. 62), and any' and substitute therefor 'Any'."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similiar House bill (H.R. 9026) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MORGAN. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8310) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes.

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

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. 8310, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8310, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965.

H.R. 8310 is an important bill for the several million Americans who are the victims of physical or mental disability. It is an important bill for State and Federal Governments in their efforts to provide better rehabilitation programs for their disabled citizens. It is an important bill for the hundreds of voluntary organizations which conduct programs to aid the disabled. I should like to point out also that this bill, as well as the program of vocational rehabilitation generally, has traditionally been supported with enthusiasm on a nonpartisan basis in the Congress. Our colleagues on the other side have been much interested in this legislation and we have had unanimity of opinion in the committee that this is a good bill.

H.R. 8310 reflects the committee's conviction of the steps that should be taken to further improve this valuable Federal-State program. It has been 11 years since any major legislative changes have been made in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

The public program vocational rehabilitation is our major governmental effort—both federally and in the States—to do something constructive about the problems of disability. There are about 3½ million disabled men and women today who need the services of this program. Each year about 300,000 new cases come into the picture.

During this fiscal year the Federal-State program will rehabilitate and replace in employment about 135,000 disabled people. While this represents the largest number ever rehabilitated in 1 year, it still falls far short of the 300,000 who should be rehabilitated each year.

Because we and the States have permitted this program to operate far below its potential, we face the backlog of about 3½ million people which I just mentioned.

We need to do everything we can to bring this situation under control. H.R. 8310 is designed to do that.

The President has set a goal of rehabilitating 200,000 disabled people annually as soon as possible. If H.R. 8310 is enacted this year, we should reach the President's goal in about 3 years.

Serious disability is one of the causes of poverty among our people. It halts employment and wages, it depletes savings, and it often destroys families.

We will, therefore, be mounting another specialized attack on poverty with which the Committee on Education and Labor is specifically concerned when we support H.R. 8310.

At the same time we will be producing thousands of new taxpayers, because most of these disabled people, placed on the payroll and taken off the relief rolls, will be supporting themselves and our public institutions through their earnings and their taxes.

At a time when we need skilled manpower, the vocational rehabilitation program continues to produce thousands of skilled and semiskilled workers every year. In this program there is great emphasis on job training to help disabled people compete successfully in the job market. When they are rehabilitated, many of them go into professions, skilled trades, technical fields, and other employment, where they contribute as much to our labor force as the nondisabled.

Since 1954, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration also has conducted programs in research and demonstration, and for the training of more professional workers in the field.

The research and demonstration program has produced much new knowledge, just as research has advanced the Nation's efforts in so many other fields. This research program is one of the reasons why today it is possible to rehabilitate and return to work large numbers of disabled people who formerly were considered to be hopeless in terms of work.

Mr. Chairman, this is a comprehensive piece of legislation. It is the culmination of 11 years of experience and growth in this public program. It reflects extended study by the Committee on Education and Labor and the very careful deliberations of the executive branch, national voluntary organizations, professional groups and others.

The committee has received endorsement of such legislation from organized labor, professional organizations, specialist groups, voluntary service groups, and a large number of public-spirited and well-informed citizens.

I trust the House will act promptly and favorably upon this bill today, for the disabled people to whom it is directed are the constituents of every Member of this body.

In reporting H.R. 8310, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965, the Committee on Education and Labor took a careful look at this program of vocational rehabilitation for disabled people. I should like my colleagues in the House to know of some of the outstanding achievements that this public program has made during the last several years. I do this partly because the Congress should be well informed on this subject and partly because I believe it is convincing evidence that we may safely expand the legislative authority we give to the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, knowing that the agency will administer these new programs as soundly and wisely as they have carried out previous programs.

When the present law was passed in 1954, the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation was rehabilitating into employment less than 56,000 handicapped people annually. In the fiscal year just ended, this program has rehabilitated well over 130,000 handicapped people.

While this increase in numbers was taking place, the rehabilitation program also was increasing the quality of service and was rehabilitating a much larger proportion of severely handicapped people who particularly need this specialized service.

If H.R. 8310 is enacted, it will be possible to do what the President asked—to rehabilitate at least 200,000 disabled

people a year as promptly as possible—and this will be done in the next 3 years or less.

One of the interesting parts of this growth in services to the handicapped is the sharp increase in the number of mentally retarded youths and adults who have been trained and placed in jobs. It was only a few years ago that less than 500 mentally retarded people were being rehabilitated by our public program in the entire United States. By 1960 the figure had risen to nearly 3,000. In 1964 more than 7,200 mentally retarded young people and adults received a variety of services, were prepared for jobs and placed in useful employment.

I point out this record of expanded service for the retarded because H.R. 8310 is the last remaining piece of major legislation proposed initially by President Kennedy to combat the problems of retardation in the United States. With the continued support of President Johnson for this special field, and his strong support for the total rehabilitation program, we can proceed with the complete national effort for the mentally retarded if this bill is enacted into law.

The vocational rehabilitation program has been directly and deeply involved in the problem of poverty for 45 years. Three-fourths of the disabled people accepted for services are unemployed at the time and the remainder are in marginal jobs or are threatened with loss of their jobs because of their disabilities.

Among those rehabilitated last year, nearly 20 percent had been receiving public assistance or some other form of public support. An even larger proportion were dependent on their families, friends or charitable sources.

The training program has substantially increased the supply of personnel in rehabilitation. A larger number of physicians specializing in rehabilitation are coming into this field today.

In the training of more rehabilitation counselors, the increase is even more remarkable: 10 years ago, only 12 rehabilitation counselors were completing their college training each year. Today nearly 500 new counselors are coming out of our colleges each year.

In the other professional fields involved—speech pathology and audiology, physical therapy, occupational therapy, and certain others—the training program is helping to produce the supply of trained staff that this country must have to restore more of our disabled men and women.

The financing of the Federal-State program, which is the basic program of services to disabled people under section 2 of the act, would be changed to use a somewhat different formula for allotting Federal funds among the States.

Allotments would be based on a formula reflecting each State's population and its per capital income. The amount of the total funds authorized for allotments among the States is specified in the bill and these amounts would be the actual sums available for each year's allotment. For fiscal 1966 allotments would be made on the basis of $300 million; for 1967, $350 million, and for 1968, $400 million. Let me add that these are allotment amounts; the appropriations required would be substantially less for each year. The authority for such appropriations is limited to 3 years, at which time the Congress will have an opportunity to review the progress made and decide whether such authority should be continued or changed.

The Federal share in the support of this basic program of services would be increased by the bill, to place this program in a more comparable position with other federally aided programs which today are engaged in various efforts in the fields of specialized training.

At present the Federal share, under a variable matching formula, ranges between 50 and 70 percent. H.R. 8310 would establish a uniform Federal share of 75 percent for all States beginning with fiscal year 1967. The bill also provides for reducing payments to any State in which expenditures of State funds fall below expenditures in fiscal year 1965.

This is a measure designed to make sure that States maintain the level of support during the transitional year and that there will be no substitution of Federal funds for State funds.

Another important feature which is introduced is that the States would be authorized to accept severely disabled persons, for whom the outlook for employment is obscure, provide services to them for a period up to 6 months, and then determine whether or not they can be expected to be employable if a rehabilitation program is completed. In the case of mentally retarded persons, this special provision would authorize such services for as long as 18 months.

This will help greatly in the programs' efforts to restore to employment a much larger number of seriously disabled men and women who usually are not accepted under present law because their employment outlook is very difficult to determine at the outset.

The bill would authorize a program of grants to assist in meeting costs of construction of rehabilitation facilities and workshops, under a new section of the act. The present law authorizes only a very limited effort in this field; it is confined to alterations, expansion and equipment, without any authority for new construction.

The bill would authorize projects to construct rehabilitation centers, primarily those of a vocational nature, so that this program will augment and reinforce the construction done under the present Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act, which is primarily concerned with medical types of facilities. The bill also will provide similar construction authority to aid in building more workshops and expanding present ones.

Provisions are included to safeguard the Federal Government's interest and to recapture the Federal share of any such project which ceases to function as a rehabilitation facility or workshop within 20 years after its establishment.

To help carry out this provision and for other purposes, the bill would also establish a National Policy and Performance Council. The Council would develop and recommend to the Secretary the criteria and standards to be observed in approving grants for training services projects.

The bill authorizes grants to assist the States in conducting a 2-year program of statewide planning in rehabilitation.

This will be a valuable inventory of what the States have in the way of rehabilitation resources and will provide a clear picture of future needs. This planning will be conducted in the context of developing, in each State, a specific plan to have available by 1975 the programs, institutions and other facilities needed to rehabilitate all disabled people who need services.

H.R. 8310 would permit Federal matching of local public funds to expand rehabilitation services in local communities.

The bill would authorize a 3-year National Commission on Architectural Barriers to Rehabilitation of the Handicapped. This is a major effort to eliminate many of the structural design features inside and outside of buildings which make it impossible for handicapped people in wheelchairs, on braces and crutches, et cetera, to use these buildings.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, the author of the bill [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8310 is a very important bill for millions of Americans who are crippled by physical or mental disability.

In my opinion, this bill will go far to restore thousands of disabled Americans to health. Before I discuss this bill, I would like to commend the very able gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education for her labors not only in this Congress but in every Congress in which she has served in behalf of the handicapped. On this bill, as on so many others, her work has been outstanding.

In addition, I would also like to thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] for his hard work in behalf of vocational rehabilitation. He has worked consistently to keep vocational rehabilitation nonpartisan.

Also, I desire to commend my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] who served with me on the subcommittee in 86th and 87th Congresses under the able chairmanship of a former Member of this Congress, Carl Elliott, whose labors contributed immeasurably to the development of the legislation under consideration today.

Much has been said in this House about the need for alleviating poverty and while we may not always agree on the best methods of ridding this Nation of poverty, we do, I am sure, agree upon the necessity for action in this area.

I am happy to state that this bill will certainly be an effective means to fight poverty. The thrust of this bill is intended to rehabilitate many thousands of persons annually and transform them into vital contributing members of our society. In this way we will be simultaneously pruning relief rolls while we

are producing new taxpayers. I am happy to say this bill has strong support on both sides of the aisle as it has always had since the program was initially established in 1920.

H.R. 8310 is the first change in the program since 1954 and it comes as a result of a demonstrated need for more extensive services in the area.

As President Johnson stated in his health message earlier this year, we are rehabilitating about 120,000 persons a year when we should be rehabilitating 200,000 or more.

There is urgent need for the kind of legislation proposed in H.R. 8310. The bill lays the foundation for the next great steps forward which our country needs to take for its disabled men and women. The proposals in this bill are built upon and improve what is now being done in the vocational rehabilitation programs throughout the country. This legislation has the ultimate objective of creating better opportunities for the disabled people of this Nation to be trained to work and live actively and usefully as fully participating citizens of our communities and our country.

Before I describe the several features of the bill, I want to speak about the meaning of this program of vocational rehabilitation. In our society, constructive work of some kind is essential to mental and often to physical health. Without question it is fundamental to economic security, and to a sense of accomplishment, of standing in the eyes of our associates, and of participation in our democracy. We have discovered to our sorrow that without it, many young people—both the ablebodied and the handicapped alike—become discontented and frustrated. They take out this frustration on the community where they live in dozens of destructive and often criminal ways.

In this country today there are approximately 3 million youths and adults with physical or mental handicaps which seriously interfere with their opportunity and ability to get a job and perform useful work—but who, with the combination of services, called vocational rehabilitation, could work. Most can be placed in full-time competitive employment. Many need to perfect their skills in the sheltered environment of a workshop for an extended period before entering the labor market. Another group will need part-time work arrangements, often in special workshops. Some may only be able to work a few hours a day, such as the older handicapped worker or the victims of cerebral palsy, the severely retarded, or the stroke patient. Here the individualized job finding and placement services are especially important. On an annual basis, about 300,000 disabled persons come into this picture each year—an annual increment which far exceeds the number being rehabilitated each year. And this contributes steadily to the backlog of 3 million which I mentioned.

The Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation is making gradual progress toward meeting this need, but the rate of progress remains far too slow. Last year this public program rehabilitated nearly 120,000 disabled people. This year we expect the figure to exceed 130,000.

If this bill is enacted and supported with the funds needed to carry it out fully, a level of 200,000 disabled persons can be restored to usefulness annually within the next 5 years, and perhaps sooner. At that point, taking into account the work done in this field by voluntary agencies, the number of disabled people being rehabilitated into employment each year will about equal the number of new cases appearing each year. Then it will be possible to direct our attention to steps to reduce the tremendous backlog.

The Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation is a partnership which goes back to 1920. From a modest beginning, the work has grown steadily and soundly over the years. Not only the volume of work, but its quality, its breadth of reach and its leadership within the States have shown excellent progress. Every State, as well as the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, operates a program of vocational rehabilitation. In 36 of the States there also are separate agencies which provide vocational rehabilitation services to blind persons only. With a State, rehabilitation counselors work from offices spread across the State. They serve disabled men and women at the request of public welfare agencies, private physicians, hospitals, school systems, the old age and survivors' insurance system, labor organizations, workmen's compensation and many others. Many disabled people come directly to the State rehabilitation agency, or are brought there by their families.

The services provided include medical, surgical, and hospital services, where these are needed to reduce or eliminate the disability. Education and training in preparation for a job are provided—using technical and trade schools, universities, correspondence courses, on-the-job training, and other training resources, as needed individually. Placement in a job and followup to assure successful employment, constitute the final stage in the service program. Other specialized services are provided as needed, such as artificial limbs, braces, hearing aids, and other prosthetic and orthotic devices. Rehabilitation centers, workshops, and special facilities in the community or elsewhere are used in rehabilitating and placing people in jobs.

Since 1954 the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has administered certain other highly important programs. One of these is a system of grants in support of research and demonstration projects, aimed at the twin goals of securing new scientific and program knowledge and making the benefits of this new knowledge more widely available to State agencies, rehabilitation centers and other phases of rehabilitation work in this country. Since 1954 about 900 research and demonstration projects have received financial support. The work being done covers many fields of investigation and application. Cooperating are scores of universities, scientific and technical institutes, State rehabilitation agencies, voluntary organizations, and others. From this 10 years of experience, basic concepts have emerged for an intramural research program which is a part of this bill and which I will discuss more fully later.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has also conducted for the last 10 years a program of support to expand the number of professional workers being trained for careers in rehabilitation. This training program was one of the most fortunate events of the past decade, in terms of its contribution to building the trained staff that is absolutely essential to program growth. The training program covers the fields of physicians in rehabilitation, physical psychologists, social workers, speech pathologists and audiologists, nurses in rehabilitation, prosthetics and orthotics specialists, and certain other specialized groups who serve blind persons, deaf persons, the mentally retarded, and others. Part of the training grant program has been directed to multidisciplinary training in order that the several specialties in rehabilitation may learn to function at their highest effectiveness as a team.

The State vocational rehabilitation agencies also carry out the program of determination of disability on behalf of the old age and survivors insurance system of the Social Security Administration. Under this program, enacted in its original form in 1954, persons under social security coverage who become disabled may be eligible for disability benefits provided the disability meets the requirements of the law and they are otherwise eligible. For 10 years the State rehabilitation agencies in 47 of the States have made this determination on behalf of OASDI. The law also requires that all applicants for such disability benefits must be considered by the State vocational rehabilitation agency to see if they might be potentially capable of rehabilitation and return to work.

In the operation of that part of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act—the Hill-Burton program—which provides financial assistance to help build rehabilitation facilities, the Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service are jointly responsible for approving applications.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration administers another law which has proven very valuable over the years. This is the Randolph-Sheppard Act, under which blind persons receive certain preferences in the operation of vending stands on Federal property. This law, in operation since 1936, has made it possible for thousands of blind persons to have successful employment and lives of activity and dignity. This bill provides for a relatively minor change in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to permit further improvement in the management of stands under the Randolph-Sheppard Act.

The ability of this program to provide both services and work opportunities for disabled people has increased greatly since 1920, both in terms of the potentiality of the individual and his adaptability to the labor market. It was not until 1943 that medical rehabilitation

was accepted as an essential part of the total vocational rehabilitation needs. In 1954 only an occasional victim of mental illness and mental retardation was thought of as a suitable candidate for vocational rehabilitation, although consideration of these disabilities was highlighted in the 1943 amendments. Last year, however, the program rehabilitated more than 7,000 mentally retarded individuals and 14,000 victims of mental illness. The proposals in the bill we are considering today hold great promise for substantially increasing this effort in both these categories. The interest of the late President Kennedy and President Johnson in people with these problems has meant heightened interest and efforts to find solutions which will benefit these groups.

Each day our medical leaders learn how to deal more effectively with the scourge of the highway—paraplegia and quadriplegia caused by accidents—but thousands of the youngsters suffering from these most severe disabilities are not rehabilitated fully today. They are wasting away in back rooms or in nursing homes because of lack of sufficient financial support in the States, inadequate or no facilities, or lack of faith in the spirit of the individual to respond to rehabilitation services or training. This waste of young people must not be continued. We can and must do more to cut down on the causes of these crippling conditions and rehabilitate those who have suffered these severely disabling experiences.

The vocational rehabilitation effort has been an antipoverty program since its inception. Last year more than 20,000 of those rehabilitated came from some form of public assistance or other publicly supported welfare. The momentum to prevent dependency due to physical and mental disabilities for those of our citizens who want to work is here. Let us increase that momentum and make absolutely sure that the handicapped can, in truth, be part of the Great Society.

In his health message, President Johnson promised "a new life for the disabled." The gates to that new life can be widened by enactment of H.R. 8310.

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

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with the gentleman from New Jersey in expressing appreciation for the very able consideration of this bill by the members of the subcommittee and the members of the full committee, but I think they will all agree with me that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] is entitled to special consideration in the introduction of this bill and to our profound appreciation for the able manner in which he worked in the subcommittee out of which came the recommendations of the full committee with respect to the bill that is now before the House. We also commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mrs. GREEN, in her outstanding leadership. This is a very far-reaching bill, one of the most historic bills of the entire period of our Nation's history in the field of vocational rehabilitation. The people of the district of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], can feel highly honored that he is representing them in the Halls of Congress in such an able, constructive, courageous, and forward-looking manner.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Speaker for his kind and gracious remarks. I appreciate everything you have said and I indeed feel highly elated.

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

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I want to congratulate the gentleman on this very wonderful piece of legislation, and say how much I have enjoyed working in the subcommittee on this most important matter which I think, if we would look into it, will develop that it affects not only those in every State of the Union, but which can have a lasting effect on the future of our country.

I give my wholehearted support to H.R. 8310, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments of 1965.

Few bills come before this body which afford a Member so much gratification in return for his support as does the measure now before us. Those of us who have been fortunate to have been born with a whole, perfect body, and who have successfully escaped the misfortune of a crippling disease or accident, cannot, I think, begin to understand and fully appreciate what these benefits mean to those who are not so fortunate. The continuing expansion and improvement of services and facilities for rehabilitation of disabled persons is a true living memorial to those who have given strength and meaning to the original plan conceived almost 50 years ago, and the wonderful programs which emanated therefrom.

I have no doubt a good many Members will speak today in support of this legislation, and such remarks will probably cover one or all of the major provisions of the bill—and the provisions which merit the term "major" are as multiple as they are significant.

While discussing the report on the bill with a member of my staff, my attention was particularly called to the provision designed, as stated in the report, "to initiate a concerted effort to remove architectural barriers to the rehabilitation of the handicapped." This staff member related that some years ago, following minor foot surgery, she had occasion to be confined to a wheelchair for a short period of time, and then graduated to crutches before resuming her normal, uninhibited locomotive habits. It was explained to me that with very few exceptions, it is virtually impossible for a person in a wheelchair to maneuver into an office building, a restaurant, and of course, without considerable assistance, a public conveyance is totally impossible. If one is on crutches, the task becomes merely "almost impossible." I invite all of you to look around and assess the situation in your own minds as you go through your daily routine for the next few days.

Most assuredly, with the tremendous strides we are now able to make in the rehabilitation of disabled individuals, the removal of architectural barriers would represent a giant step forward in our efforts to assist the disabled in their efforts to achieve complete integration in community life.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that enables each of us to follow the very best instincts of human beings for others among us not so fortunate. It is a practical and fiscally sound measure also. Let us hope its passage will be almost unanimous.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], who was the ranking minority member of the subcommittee serving under the leadership of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8310. I believe this is good legislation for one reason, and that it is that we are making some changes in it which will enable States to better meet their responsiblities. By changes, we mean more liberal participation on the part of the Federal Government.

This has become necessary because we have passed other legislation in recent years, last year particularly, which increased the Federal share so high in those programs that the State matching money seems to be going to them, rather than for vocational rehabilitation. Especially in some of the larger States where this is true there is a tremendous work in rehabilitation left to do. For that reason I think it is necessary to make changes encompassed in this bill to improve the legislation.

This bill would make a number of improvements in the administration of vocational rehabilitation, and would provide for expanded services to reach greater numbers of disabled persons. It would extend the range of the program to reach mentally handicapped persons and those incapacitated by catastrophic illnesses such as stroke. It provides for assistance in the construction of new workshops and rehabilitation facilities, and in the operation of new facilities. It permits increased flexiblity in State administration of the programs, and it provides for a greater emphasis on training of personnel, research, and experimentation.

The bulk of this program is the assistance authorized by section 2 of the act for the regular State vocational rehabilitation services. The act now contains an open-ended authorization, and the funds are allocated to the States on the basis of the actual appropriations, with the process being very complicated. The distribution formula, moreover, is so weighted toward per capita income that the program has not flourished in some of the larger States. The bill simplifies all this. It contains specific authorizations, cuts down the weight given per capita income in State allocations, and prorates allotments when appropriations are less than the authorizations. It provides, however, that no State may receive less than its current Federal allocation, and in order to achieve this

effect the authorizations have to be very much greater than the amounts that will be needed to be appropriated. Accordingly, the authorizations for section 2 are $300 million, $350 million, and $400 million for 3 fiscal years. By contrast, the pending appropriation request for section 2 is $121 million; with enactment of this bill a supplemental request of $49 million is anticipated, or a total for the year of $170 million as opposed to the $300 million authorized to be appropriated.

The Federal share of the total program under section 2 currently varies from 50 to 70 percent; the bill makes this uniform at 75 percent in all States. For the construction of new facilities the matching is 50–50, and for experimental programs the Federal share is 90 percent—on the theory that a lesser share would make it impossible to compete for State funds with other Federal programs such as manpower development and training.

I want to make one note of warning, however. When the Federal Government participates to the extent of 90 percent in some parts of the bill, the sense of responsibility on the State and local level I hope will not be reduced. One of the impressive things about vocational rehabilitation is the fact that locally and statewide there is a great pride in the work that is being done. The fact that 135,000 people last year were rehabilitated under this program, that more than 83 percent of those rehabilitated are employed in outside employment, indicates the great success of it. When an individual in a community has been rehabilitated and his neighbors and friends and other individuals in the community notice he becomes a self-sustaining individual in that community, a taxpaying individual rather than one who drains on the resources of the State, there is great pride on the part of all that this can be done.

So, as I have worked with rehabilitation groups in my district and worked with those in the State of Minnesota, I can tell you firsthand of the great pride in the work that is being done at this level and the willingness to work, improve, and accept responsibility.

I am pleased that this bill will enable those who work in vocational rehabilitation to reach even further. They will be able to give help to people who might on the surface not appear to be employable through rehabilitation but the handicapped will be able to have a period of time where they could receive these services to determine whether they are employable, because one of the things about people who are rehabilitated is that many times they attain much greater accomplishments than ever was expected of them.

The vocational rehabilitation program is a humanitarian program that has had the active support of members from both parties for many years. It is also an economically sound public service program. For every Federal dollar spent on the vocational rehabilitation of a disabled person there is returned to the Federal Treasury approximately $5 in income tax returns. In addition, rehabilitated persons are paying State and local taxes. We should keep in mind, also, that great numbers of the disabled who are rehabilitated by this program come from low- or middle-income families. Without vocational rehabilitation which prepares them for employment and places them in suitable work, a great number of these disabled youth and adults would have to be supported by assistance programs for the rest of their lives. Vocational rehabilitation is a program that prevents dependency. It is a program that removes people from relief rolls, or substantially reduces the extent of their need for public support. It is an original and effective antipoverty program. I have heard no criticism of this program except that it does not reach all who need it. Also, that its most active advocates may be overly optimistic about the ability of the program to make an appreciable dent on poverty and dependency. To such critics I would say first that no one is satisfied that all is being done that can or should be done to help disabled people who could benefit from vocational rehabilitation services.

Since 1954, during Republican and Democratic administrations alike, the Congress has made available increasingly larger amounts of Federal funds for vocational rehabilitation and the State legislatures have also supported these programs with ever-increasing amounts of non-Federal funds being devoted to vocational rehabilitation purposes. The growth in numbers of people served and numbers rehabilitated each year is remarkable.

1964 data compared to 1955 under sec. 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act

	1955	1964	Percent increase
Total expenditures	$38,629,322	$133,259,334	245
Federal funds	23,811,724	82,194,537	245
State funds	14,817,598	51,064,797	245
Number of people rehabilitated	57,981	119,708	106
Number of people served	157,618	399,852	156

But much more needs to be done if the numbers rehabilitated are to match the numbers who are added each year to the backlog of those who need but are not receiving services.

So I believe we should watch now and be able to test in this program of vocational rehabilitation whether it is possible for the Federal Government to assume too great a share. I am willing to take this approach, to pay in some cases 90 percent Federal money, because of the way the program is basically set up; and that is, the Federal Government does not dictate to the State and local communities how they are going to run their programs. And there are always ample opportunities for responsibility to be exercised at the State level, and if a private group has a rehabilitation program this must receive the approval of the State agency.

There is need to continue to increase the financial resources that are channeled into vocational rehabilitation activities. Several provisions in this bill will accomplish this objective. Voluntary groups will be encouraged to raise and devote added resources to rehabilitation activities through the special project grants in section 4 of the bill. Similarly, voluntary groups will be interested in the provisions for the construction of new workshops and vocational rehabilitation facilities. Many national, State and local groups will be motivated to redouble their efforts by the prospect of Federal sharing in the costs of developing new or expanded resources for special disability groups such as the blind, retarded, the deaf, and people who are handicapped because of strokes, cancer, or heart conditions.

Section 15 of the bill would authorize aid for local rehabilitation services and should stimulate the use of local public funds, for expanded services for disabled people in their own communities.

In 1965 as I have said there were more than 135,000 people restored to work and more meaningful participation in community life, another record-breaking year. This number can continue to grow each year so long as the American people, acting through the Congress, the State legislatures and locally, are willing to make added resources available. In addition, it will be necessary for the supply of trained personnel to be increased to man the services needed. This means training more counselors, more workshop managers, more physical and occupational therapists, more doctors, nurses, and other professional and technical personnel. We must also support the basic and applied research through which new knowledge and practices can be found and shared with rehabilitation practitioners throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8310 is a long step toward these objectives.

Here we have a system of local, State and Federal cooperation in a Federal program that has worked well. We do not see the instances of political controversy that we have seen in the Economic Opportunity Act, the so-called war on poverty. As far as poverty is concerned, we should be rehabilitating these people, just as rehabilitating is what is needed for the physically or mentally handicapped. In the poverty effort that has been done in a little less than a year under the Office of Economic Opportunity, I think it is deplorable when we see the chaos that has been going on in the economic opportunity program that we do not see at all in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Act is in many respects a model for Federal legislation. This bill, in my judgment, will make possible substantial improvements in our national effort to rehabilitate handicapped persons so that they may lead productive lives. The bill now before us is the product of very careful work by the subcommittee headed by the gentlewoman from Oregon. It has had proper committee consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but contrast this program, and this legislation, with the unfortunate pattern that has been established by the Johnson administration: A pattern of bypassing State responsibility, of dealing directly with private groups from Washington

without regard to either State or local governmental approval.

The so-called war on poverty and the bill we passed last week to expand it is a perfect example. Even the token and unsatisfactory negative power of the Governor's veto was virtually eliminated, leaving no vestige of State responsibility or authority in the far-flung and far-fetched operations of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The war on poverty is one of the biggest examples of chaos in the history of the Federal Government precisely because it ignores the successful experience of cooperative programs such as vocational rehabilitation. All of us, on both sides of the aisle, who have observed and supported the successful programs of vocational rehabilitation in our own States and throughout the Nation, undoubtedly are relieved that this legislation has not received the familiar treatment.

I point out to you what I did in debate on the so-called war on poverty bill, that here is a Federal program that works in a way that one should, and if we would make the changes in the Economic Opportunity Act which will enable it to operate in the same way as the vocational rehabilitation program, I think within a year the bickering and partisanship that we have seen in this last year would cease and be eliminated and we would see Republicans and Democrats rising in support of a bill then which would be doing the kind of good for the people in poverty that vocational rehabilitation does for the handicapped. I am pleased to have been able to work on this legislation while I have been a member of the Committee on Education and Labor in prior years as well as this year and to bring to fruition a bill that I think is one of the most important as far as what it will do for human beings in the way of human kindness as anything that will come out of our committee.

I too want to commend the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] for the work she has done to bring this about. All my colleagues have witnessed the courage, hard work, thorough study, fairness, and compassion that the gentlewoman has shown in the past and I will say this work is further evidence.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. I have had a rather unusual experience in vocational rehabilitation. I served 9½ years as a medical referee for 28 counties in southwest Missouri. At the same time I was one of the senior surgical consultants. So that I was in the peculiar position sometimes of hiring myself to pass judgment on actually doing reconstructive surgery on some of these people who needed to be rehabilitated from a physical point of view. Of course, the genius of this program is that it is controlled locally and by States, as the gentleman has so well stated.

Second, it involves not only physical rehabilitation but educational and mental rehabilitation and many other types of readaptation to society.

I am very proud to be a lifetime member of the National Rehabilitation Association. In addition to associating myself with your statement and the work you have done in this broadened concept, that has been brought out by the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and our ranking member on that subcommittee—yourself—to say nothing of the members of the committee as a whole, I want to point out there is nothing quite as thrilling as seeing someone taken off the welfare rolls, perhaps—or if it is a matter of mental unsoundness or epileptic rehabilitation or educational construction—to see these people adapt themselves into society and earn a living and become taxpayers themselves.

They become the greatest proponents of the program. In fact, much of the progress comes from those who have been rehabilitated, in the broad sense of the term.

I hope we can keep the program going, because of the good it does to restore the moral fiber of human beings in all the States, territories, and commonwealths. I hope it can be expanded and kept on a matching fund basis because, in my opinion, this, too, is part of the genius.

I am glad to see some liberalization in the old definition that one must be able to be reconstituted to a successful and gainful occupation; and not necessarily or as a requirement, be totally and completely and permanently disabled. Liberalizations along these lines have long been needed, as the gentleman from Minnesota has so beautifully explained, in these rare changes of program. It is something to be strongly prosecuted; and to see the Federal-State relationship bear such fruit. I believe in the program evolved here. It will be even more beneficial to all mankind.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I might add, in closing, that when one sees an individual change from a sense of hopelessness to pride in his ability one realizes that within the spirit of man it is necessary for him to believe he is needed and has worth. We seek to change an individual from considering himself to be worthless to considering himself to be of value to society, recognized by his fellow man. We can take pride that there is an opportunity under this legislation for additional people to feel they are worth something by enabling them to do something worthwhile.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished and able gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], the chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

May I also express my deep thanks to the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle for their long and arduous work on this legislation. I was very pleased when all of the problems were resolved and the bill could be reported by the subcommittee on a unanimous basis and also from the full committee by a unanimous vote. My thanks also to the tireless and devoted help given by the members of the staff of the subcommittee.

I should also like to take this moment to express my thanks to the people in the department downtown, without whom we would not have been able to work out the legislation which we present to the House today. They were of inestimable help, not only during this session of Congress but also in preceding years, as we have tried to improve the vocational rehabilitation program which, in my judgment, can accurately be called the first war on poverty.

I would especially pay my respects to Dr. Mary Switzer, who is recognized across the Nation as an expert in this field. Both she and Russell Dean have been of so much help to all of us.

I also have been very grateful to those people who are on the firing lines, to those people who are out in the field doing the work which is made increasingly possible because of the legislation. I am sure Mr. Whitten and Mr. John Harmon and others come in this category.

Mr. Chairman, in hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education, Mr. William K. Page, president-elect of the Association of Rehabilitation Centers, stated very succinctly the problem to which we are turning our attention today. He said:

> The fight against the human and economic loss caused by disability in this Nation is a matter of national concern. No nation can afford this waste in misery nor can long endure the loss of retrievable human resources.

The manpower loss this Nation suffers because of disability is staggering. According to the Welfare Administration, approximately 600,000 blind or seriously disabled individuals are presently receiving monthly assistance grants through the Federal-State public welfare program. In addition, it is estimated that 250,000 Americans each year become disabled to such an extent that they are eligible for services under the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program.

According to the National Society for the Prevention of Blindness, approximately 40,000 individuals become blind each year; and a substantially higher number sustain severe visual impairments, so that they require vocational rehabilitation.

These handicapped persons are individuals whose worth must be recognized and who must be assisted to either enter or reenter the competitive labor market and become productive citizens both for their own good and for the benefit of society. As a nation, in this complex and competitive age, especially at a time of heightened world tensions, we require productive and worthwhile contributions from all our citizens. Moreover, as moral persons, we cannot sit by and allow individuals, who might be helped, to lead unproductive lives. Vocational rehabilitation is one of those rare programs which combines humanitarian and other social goals.

Almost half a century ago the Federal Government and the States entered into

what was to become an enduring partnership in a program of service to the disabled. This partnership has grown in strength over the years since the enactment of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920. Since its beginning in 1921, the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program has returned over 1½ million disabled persons to more productive self-sufficient positions in society. In fiscal year 1963 alone, nearly 370,000 persons were served by the various State vocational rehabilitation agencies, and an all-time high of over 110,000 men and women with physical or mental handicaps were helped to obtain successful employment after they had been provided with rehabilitation services. These people are employed in every segment of America's productivity—in large and small industrial firms, on the farms, in retail stores and offices, in the professions, in their own small businesses, in many service occupations, and in the important task of homemaker. Many disabled older people in the white-collar group have entered or reentered occupations in which there are shortages of competent professional and technical people, such as teaching, nursing, social and welfare work, the clergy and laboratory technicians and assistants.

Of the 110,000 individuals who were assisted in 1963 to gain employment, three-quarters had no earnings at all when they were first accepted for services. They were living in tax-supported institutions or with family or friends receiving public assistance, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, or disability payments. Thus, rehabilitation services have transformed all of these people from dependents on the public to independent, economically productive members of society. As such, the $1,200 average cost of rehabilitating a disabled person is little to pay. It is repaid many times over for society by the new capabilities of the rehabiliated.

I have always thought if we considered these kinds of services in the same way which we consider reclamation projects and dams on a cost-benefit ratio, that indeed the Congress of the American people would be far more liberal. So it is important not only from the humanitarian viewpoint—helping these persons to achieve self-respect as they shed their dependence on family or on public funds through their ability to support themselves—but it is also important from a very coldly economic point of view. This is indicated by the fact that the money expended for public assistance to 75,000 individuals on relief who were rehabilitated in 1964 totaled almost $18 million a year, while the cost of their rehabilitation—ordinarily a one-time outlay—was also $18 million.

The vocational rehabilitation program has proved its worth. Before us now are proposals for its extension and improvement; proposals which will help this Nation meet the goal enunciated by President Johnson when he recommended to Congress a stepped-up vocational rehabilitation program to "overcome this costly waste of human resources." He said the rehabilitation goal "should be at least 200,000 a year."

H.R. 8310 contains all of the major amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act proposed in the administration's bill, H.R. 6476, and in addition includes committee amendments which respond to the testimony presented and the evidence gathered during the subcommittee hearings on the bill.

The principal subcommittee amendment, and I believe the most significant feature of the entire bill, provides for more favorable Federal financing of the Federal-State program of rehabilitation services provided under section 2 of the bill. Mr. E. B. Whitten, director of the National Rehabilitation Association, was the first witness to call the matter to the subcommittee's attention. He said:

> We need an improved structure for financing vocational rehabilitation in the States. The mean Federal share under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act is 60 percent with individual State shares varying from 50 percent in the State with highest per capita income to 70 percent in those with lowest per capita incomes. It is becoming increasingly difficult for State rehabilitation agencies to maintain the rate of growth expected of them under this financial arrangement. Very few States are utilizing all of the Federal money allocated to them under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. One of the principal reasons is the increased competition for funds at the State level. The problem of vocational rehabilitation agencies has been complicated by the new grant-in-aid programs in the manpower field established during the last few years with higher Federal shares than are available under vocational rehabilitation legislation. These include the manpower development and training program, programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, and rehabilitative services under the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments. It is our firm conviction that the contribution of vocational rehabilitation to the general welfare of the Nation and its specific contributions to the relief of unemployment and the alleviation of poverty are great enough that the Federal Government would want to see that they are as liberally financed as the new programs.

He added:

> We propose that the Federal share of the basic program under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act be 75 percent in all of the States.

Mr. Chairman, almost every witness who testified on the bill supported this position. And hundreds of letters from persons in the field of vocational rehabilitation were received by the subcommittee urging such an amendment.

In considering this proposal it was necessary to review the achievements of the past. In so doing I became convinced that this is one of the best antipoverty programs that we have ever had in this country. It was the original antipoverty program and has been perhaps the most successful.

Mary Switzer, the very outstanding Commissioner of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration whose leadership has contributed so much to the rehabilitation field, stated during the subcommittee hearings. She said:

> I do believe firmly in the kind of work that has been done by the rehabilitation agencies through the years, in their approach to this through a client-oriented goal for each individual. I do not think you can solve the personal problems of poverty any other way. I am absolutely convinced that the rehabilitation philosophy, and the way that we have built the atmosphere that you create when you work with people in our centers, and in our facilitites, is really the most effective way that I have seen to make a dent in this poverty problem.

Last week the House doubled the amounts available for the war on poverty programs in which there is in title II a Federal share of 90 percent. If we can provide such for programs that are as yet not fully tried and tested, we certainly ought to be at least as generous in the nationwide program that has so beautifully proved its worth.

H.R. 8310 proposes to substitute for the existing variable Federal share which ranges between 50 and 70 percent for the section 2 program, a standard Federal share of 75 percent, applicable in all the States. This would go into effect in fiscal year 1967. For this present fiscal year each State's Federal share will be increased to a point midway between the State's 1965 share and 75 percent. In connection with the increase of the Federal share the exceedingly complex allocation formula which gave unnecessary weight to the per capita income factor has been greatly simplified. The provision insures that no State will be entitled to less than its 1965 allotment while at the same time insures that each State will maintain its own State effort.

Under section 3 of the existing act a program of grants to the States for projects for the improvement and extension of rehabilitation services is authorized. The matching rate was 75 percent and the funds were distributed on a formula with only one factor—population. Subcommittee amendments to this section contained in H.R. 8310 will:

First, revise the formula to make it the same as the section 2 formula;

Second, increase the Federal share to 90 percent for the first 3 years of a project and 75 percent for the last 2.

Third, revise the objective of the section so that the grants will be used for the development of new methods and techniques for providing vocational rehabilitation services for handicapped individuals, or for the development of new, specially designed services for groups of handicapped individuals having disabilities which are catastrophic or particularly severe.

The bill will permit the extension of rehabilitation services to greater numbers of disabled, particularly severely disabled persons, through a deletion of the economic need requirement now prerequisite for certain rehabilitation services and also through a liberalization of the definiton of rehabilitation services to permit the use of Federal funds for rehabilitation services to determine rehabilitative potential.

To assist in the construction and operation of new rehabilitation workshops and facilities, a new program of construction grants and initial staffing grants is being proposed. Approved projects from

public and nonprofit private rehabilitation organizations will be eligible for grants to cover 50 percent of construction costs.

Grants will also be made to pay part of the costs of initial staffing of the newly constructed workshops. The grants will cover a 51-month period, starting in initial months at 75 percent of the cost of initial staffing and gradually reduce to 30 percent of such costs in the later months of the period. In another section, a 5-year program of grants is authorized to pay 90 percent, not 75 percent as presented in the administration bill, of the cost of providing training services to handicapped persons in nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities. As introduced, only workshops were eligible for these training grants. This has been expanded by the subcommittee to allow grants to be made to rehabilitation facilities. A 5-year program of grants to pay part of the costs of projects to analyze, improve, and increase professional services and to provide for technical assistance in existing workshops is also authorized.

In conjunction with these new programs for workshops and rehabilitation facilities, an advisory group is established, a National Policy and Performance Council to provide assistance in the administration of the new programs.

To initiate a concerted effort to remove architectural barriers to the rehabilitation of the handicapped there is proposed the establishment of a National Commission on Architectural Barriers to Rehabilitation of the Handicapped.

Under a new section 15 provision is made to permit Federal financial participation—under sections 2 and 3 of the act—inactivities which are financed with local public funds made available to the States to make vocational rehabilitation services more widely available to residents of local jurisdictions. For this purpose, the existing State plan requirements for statewideness would be waived.

As part of the on-going program of special project grants under section 4 of the act the bill authorizes, for a limited period of time, grants to pay part of the cost of projects to expand vocational rehabilitation programs with the objective of increasing the number of handicapped persons vocationally rehabilitated and a 2-year program of grants to States to assist in planning for the development of comprehensive vocational rehabilitation programs in each State.

Heretofore the Vocational Rehabilitation Agency has provided assistance through fellowships, training grants, and so forth, for persons preparing to enter the field of vocational rehabilitation. Such assistance was limited to a 2-year period for each individual. Under this bill the assistance may be extended for a period of 4 years.

Another amendment will permit greater flexilibity in the administration of the vocational rehabilitation programs at the State level. In addition to authority to place administration in State organization units as is already authorized—the States are given still another choice, that is to place administration in a State agency which includes at least two other major organizational units, each of which administers one or more of the major education, welfare, or labor programs of the State.

Other amendments will result in reader services and interpreter services being supplied to blind and deaf clients.

More or less technical amendments strike out the word "physically" every time it appears in the act; strike out "remunerative" each time it appears and substitute "gainful" and increase the per diem allowances paid members of advisory groups.

Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent bill which demands the attention of Congress. It is a bill with strong popular support. Just this week I have received over 50 telegrams in support of H.R. 8310, in addition to the many letters I have received this year endorsing the 1965 amendments to the act. I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point a number of the telegrams which are representative of the views and comments of persons in the vocational rehabilitation field.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say again, for it cannot be reiterated enough, that vocational rehabilitation—economically, socially, and morally—is vital to our Nation. Through it we can restore the sense of self-worth and self-confidence that can be found in an independently strong and productive life. Through it, also, we can enable thousands of presently idle citizens to become significant contributors to our national manpower needs. For these reasons, I am proud today to urge most strongly the overwhelming support of this bill.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
July 29, 1965.

EDITH GREEN,
Special Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The vote today on H.R. 8310 will be one of the most significant in the history of vocational rehabilitation. Best wishes.

EUGENE J. TAYLOR,
Associate Editor, New York Times.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
July 29, 1965.

EDITH GREEN,
Special Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

I am delighted H.R. 8310 is to come before the House today. Its passage will be a milestone in leading to our objective of providing rehabilitation services for all disabled Americans.

My congratulations.

HOWARD A. RUSK.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 27, 1965.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

As the Nation's oldest and largest group of sheltered workshops, Goodwill Industries of America, Inc., wishes to endorse H.R. 8310, now before the House of Representatives and urge its prompt consideration and approval. We wish to commend you and your committee for your untiring efforts in the development of this much-needed legislation. It will make possible a major advance in vocational rehabilitation services to thousands of handicapped and disabled persons.

P. J. TREVETHAN,
Executive Vice President, Goodwill Industries of America, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 27, 1965.

Mrs. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The National Rehabilitation Association appreciates the dedicated work of your committee in reporting H.R. 8310, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendment of 1965. This bill is strongly supported by the National Rehabilitation Association. It will make possible a better life for hundreds of thousands of disabled Americans during the next few years.

E. B. WHITTEN,
Director of National Rehabilitation Association.

PASADENA, CALIF.,
July 28, 1965.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
Subcommittee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The California Conference of Workshops for the Handicap strongly supports the vocational rehabilitation amendments to Public Law 565 as means of returning increased numbers of handicapped persons to work and to fuller lives. Of the 800-plus workshops in our country, 130 are in California. Most are private, voluntary facilities and all are not profit. This legislation will enable these workshops to combine their funds and efforts with those of public agencies in expanding the scope and depth of vocational rehabilitation services. It will provide for improved and broadened workshop program of work evaluation, work adjustment, and work training which are of particular benefit to persons handicapped as workers. Favorable action on the vocational rehabilitation amendment is urged.

Dr. DOROTHY CANTRELL PERKINS,
President, California Conference of Workshops for the Handicapped.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 27, 1965.

Mrs. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The National Association of Sheltered Work Shops and Home Bound Programs strongly supports H.R. 8310, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965. This association is most appreciative of the work done by your committee in the interests of many thousands of disabled Americans. We are confident that the implementation of these amendments will enable the sheltered workshops to better meet the needs of the disabled throughout the country.

ANTONIO C. SUAZO,
Executive Director, National Association of Sheltered Workshops & Home Bound Programs, Inc.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.,
July 27, 1965.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

We in the Illinois vocational rehabilitation program are grateful for your support of H.R. 8310 and deeply appreciate your effort to move the bill to present stage. Heartfelt thanks to you and your colleagues.

ALFRED SLICER,
Director, Illinois Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
July 29, 1965.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, Special Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

We urge your support of the amendments suggested by the National Rehabilitation Association in H.R. 8310.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Coast Counties Chapter of National Rehabilitation Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
July 28, 1965.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The National Association for Retarded Children congratulates you and your committee on bringing to the floor an excellent bill, H.R. 8310, which extends the proven benefits of rehabilitation services to more mentally retarded and other seriously handicapped youth and adults in all States.

LUTHER W. STRINGHAM,
Executive Director, National Association for Retarded Children, New York City.

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and I wish to congratulate the gentlewoman from Oregon, the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, for the excellent hearings which she has conducted. I also wish to congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] for his splendid work on the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the proposals in H.R. 8310 which are before the House today represent the culmination of many months of study and consideration of ways to improve and augment the work of vocational rehabilitation programs in this country. I favor the bill and hope that the House will approve it unanimously. I want to congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] on his bill and to pay tribute to the excellent hearings which the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] conducted on this subject. The committee's report notes that President Johnson's recommendations, and the bills introduced by Mrs. GREEN, Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. PEPPER, received almost unanimous endorsement from the many organizations that testified before the subcommittee or submitted statements commenting on the proposed amendments.

The history of this long-established Federal-State grant-in-aid program shows that it has grown steadily and gradually from its beginning in 1920. The main outlines of the program, as it is administered today, were laid down in the amendments of 1954, and no substantial changes have been made since. For this reason, one of the primary objectives of the hearings and committee study was to develop the basis for new financing provisions which would deal with present-day realities of fiscal relations between the States. We were concerned, also, with the fact that growth of the program in many areas was being adversely affected by the competition that the State rehabilitation programs faced in obtaining non-Federal funds to match available Federal resources. Many of the newer Federal antipoverty and retraining unemployed programs have been attracting State resources that otherwise would be channeled, at least in part, into these needed rehabilitation services for the handicapped. The new proposals provide for increased Federal financing of the basic support program and incentive funds for new efforts that States undertake in the establishment of programs for the severely disabled and for people who present unusually difficult problems in rehabilitation, such as the deaf-blind, the retarded who are also blind or have cerebral palsy.

Other amendments were devised to increase the development and expansion of voluntary efforts such as those undertaken by Goodwill, the Jewish vocational services, community chests, and other sponsors of workshops, and special services for particular groups of handicapped—the mentally ill, those who have suffered heart disease, strokes, and cancer, to name but a few.

A series of amendments affecting workshops and rehabilitation facilities was developed because of the important role that such institutions play in the evaluation and training of disabled people, some of whom need to spend considerable time in a planned environment with counseling, prevocational testing, work tryouts, and other services before they are ready for placement in jobs in the community. The amendments provide for the construction of new facilities and workshops including planning; the development of programs to improve operations in existing workshops and to expand training services in selected workshops; the appointment of a National Policy and Performance Council to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on policy and criteria for making grants for training services projects; and the provision of technical experts to help workshops improve their operations.

To encourage localities that are anxious to move ahead with expanded or new services for their own residents, the act authorizes local jurisdictions to donate funds to State agencies—including funds contributed by private groups—and have such funds matched with Federal funds. This will make it possible, for example, for many localities to step up their local services to handicapped youth still in school. As previous speakers have noted, the bill contains other important amendments that will improve the effectiveness of these services to disabled people.

The vocational rehabilitation program in Indiana is responding to the new nationwide drive to rehabilitate and return to work the disabled and other hard-core unemployed and underemployed citizens. I hope that we shall be able to take full advantage of these new amendments.

In 1966 Indiana estimates show that there will be an increase in State funds from $500,000 in 1965 to $690,000 for 1966. As funds permit, the general vocational rehabilitation agency plans to establish additional field offices making vocational rehabilitation services more readily available. Due to the increased emphasis on the establishment of and the use of rehabilitation facilities and workshops, a specialist will be added to the agency staff to oversee all activities involving facilities. Increased emphasis will be placed on staff training programs.

Services to special disability groups have been highlighted. Twenty-four hard-core deaf clients were trained, 18 of whom were placed in employment. A cooperative program has been developed with the Vigo County Metropolitan School District which has a combined school-work program with local industries in the placement of mental retardates. Some 130 school dropouts were referred by the school to this program.

Under a similar project with the Indianapolis City Schools some 80 mentally retarded pupils, 16 years of age or older, received half-day program at school and half-day work experience at the Crossroads Rehabilitation Center. In addition to these two special programs, serving the mentally retarded, the agency is working closely with the division of special education to identify areas of need and interest in providing services to disabled youth.

The selective service rejectee program is the responsibility of the Indiana State Board of Health which will refer interested rejectees to the local vocational rehabilitation offices for help. The northern Indiana offices have received about 100 referrals from the Chicago area screening office.

Although there is no formal agreement, the vocational rehabilitation agency works with the department of correction on public offenders who are disabled.

The agency estimates that 75 to 80 percent of the persons accepted for vocational rehabilitation services could be considered as impoverished. The agency has been able to obtain some training for clients under the Manpower Development and Training Act redevelopment program. About 100 referrals from the community action program have been transferred to local vocational rehabilitation offices and some of the cases are still in various stages of service.

With funds recently made available under the Laird amendment, the Evansville Association for the Blind has expanded its workshop to provide evalution services. This workshop serves other disabilities as well as the blind and currently there are 75 vocational rehabilitation clients receiving evaluation and training in work situations.

The general agency is exploring with the AFL–CIO the possibility of employing a representative from labor to work on placement of vocational rehabilitation clients. This would help in public relations, job opportunities through apprenticeship and general information to labor groups about vocational rehabilitation.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I have actively encouraged and supported the expansion of the vocational rehabilitation program ever since it has been my privilege to serve in the Congress. I am familiar with the cooperative nature of the work done by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and the programs in the States in rehabilitating disabled people. The Kentucky Bureau of Rehabilitation Services aided by the Federal legislation has accomplished outstanding results in the past decade in rehabilitating disabled people, and will be able to do more if this legislation passes.

By 1964 the Kentucky program had grown in such a way as to be serving about 7,000 people each year, and completing the rehabilitation of more than 3,000 in this same period. In 1954 Kentucky was ranked 50th among the States in the number rehabilitated in relation to population; in 1959 it was ranked 31st; and by 1964 it had risen to 13th with 96 rehabilitants per 100,000 persons in the State.

This progress reflects the close cooperation between the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration responsible for administering Public Law 83–565 and our State and voluntary agencies that work with disabled people, including the hospitals, workshops, and centers where people are treated, and the universities where research and training of rehabilitation staff are done.

For the Nation as a whole, this dynamic partnership between the Federal Government and the States resulted in 1964 in restoring nearly 120,000 people to productive work and to more independent status as human beings. While these achievements are impressive, it is essential, in my judgment, that the program reach even higher goals as soon as possible—rehabilitating at least 200,000 people by 1967. To accomplish this, the President sent recommendations to the Congress looking toward the immediate improvement and expansion of the vocational rehabilitation program.

The gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. EDITH GREEN], and my other colleagues, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], introduced legislation early in the 89th Congress to carry out the President's proposals. Under the able chairmanship of Mrs. GREEN, the special Subcommittee on Education held hearings both in Washington and communities in other parts of the country. In these hearings and the committee discussions, there was unanimous agreement that this program was outstanding, both in administration and in accomplishments under the national leadership of Miss Mary Switzer. It was agreed that the mission of the program should be considerably expanded, and the Federal investment increased through changes to make the Federal matching rates more comparable to those in the newer Federal-State grant-in-aid programs with similar objectives of retraining and returning people to employment.

Other speakers probably will dwell upon the details of the bill so I shall confine my remarks to the objectives of the legislation, and some references as to how this will enable our program in Kentucky to provide better opportunities for disabled people to enter more fully into active participation in community life.

The principal provisions as I understand are designed—

First. To liberalize Federal financing of the basic Federal-State programs.

Second. To encourage States to begin new programs, to innovate new services with special emphasis on help for severely disabled people.

Third. To permit the extension of rehabilitation services to greater numbers through special grants to States and other nonprofit voluntary agencies.

Fourth. To enhance the quantity and quality of services to disabled people through improvement workshops and facilities where disabled people are evaluated, and trained, and where many of them work for extended periods of time.

Fifth. To begin an all-out effort to remove remaining architectural barriers to the employment of the handicapped.

Sixth. To make other needed improvements in the program, including the establishment of an intramural research program and data processing service in the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration.

As the Members know, we have enacted the antipoverty programs, as well as new vocational education and Manpower Development Training Act legislation in the past several years, all calculated to help retrain and redirect unemployed and underemployed people to more productive employment. The Appalachia and other area redevelopment programs are concentrating upon distressed areas where basic economic activity needs stimulating so that more jobs will become available. Both the Johnson and the Kennedy administration have spearheaded improved community health services, including special services for the retarded and the mentally ill; the Congress is completing action on the memorable health insurance and social security amendments.

These efforts to bring better health, education, rehabilitation and social services to our people depend upon the vitality of the community agencies through which the services reach the consumer. And this requires greater cooperation between State and Federal agencies on the one hand, and, on the other, between States agencies in any one State or local jurisdiction. I am glad to say that we are seeing in Kentucky many outstanding results of such joint ventures in vocational rehabilitation.

The cooperative relationships and coordination which the Kentucky Bureau of Rehabilitation Services has with other State agencies and organizations throughout the State are significant factors in this achievement. Prompt referral and proper supportive services necessary for successful rehabilitation are provided best through close working relationships.

One of the significant liaisons has been the establishment of rehabilitation units in four State mental hospitals. These rehabilitation units provide comprehensive rehabilitation services to the mentally ill. In 1964 alone the State was able to rehabilitate 1,200 mentally ill persons. This was at the rate of over 38 per 100,000 persons while the average for the country was only a little over 7 per 100,000.

The increasing number of young people being rehabilitated by the State vocational rehabilitation agencies may be directly attributed to the cooperative programs being sponsored by the vocational rehabilitation agencies with special education and the public school systems. The vocational rehabilitation agencies provide vocational evaluation, work and personal adjustment, counseling and guidance, training and job placement. The schools provide academic and related instructions, recreational and social activities. This joint effort has done much to help bridge the gap between school and the world of work.

Kentucky is one of the States making great strides in this type of venture. In 1964, 373, or 13 percent, of the total number of clients rehabilitated—2,975—had not yet reached 20 years of age. The counties in which cooperative programs are now operating are Rockcastle, Harlan, Floyd, Bourbon, Bell, and Jefferson.

In addition, the Kentucky Bureau of Rehabilitation Services has established vocational rehabilitation facility units at the two State hospitals and schools for the mentally retarded in Frankfort and in Dawson Springs. These programs bring about a closer working relationship among professional people who are concerned with helping handicapped youth to develop desirable job attitudes and work habits in order to achieve the ultimate goal of earning their living and successfully adjusting to community life.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has made a research and demonstration grant to help create a network of rehabilitation services for disabled people in the Appalachian Mountain area. The project will be carried out jointly by Appalachian Regional Hospitals, Inc., headquartered at Lexington, Ky., and the Kentucky Bureau of Rehabilitation Services. It will cover 39 eastern Kentucky counties in which an intensive program of medical and vocational rehabilitation will be aimed primarily at preparing disabled individuals to become active again, learn a job, and find employment.

The Kentucky Bureau of Rehabilitation Services, with its staff of rehabilitation counselors working from 12 field offices throughout the State, will provide direct community contact and the involvement of a wide range of service organizations, along with provision of nonhospital rehabilitation services for the disabled persons served in the project. The bureau's Harlan office will be the focal point for this collaborative work.

Two projects are underway to provide rehabilitation services for disabled public assistance clients in Johnson, Lawrence, Martin, Harlan, and Bell Counties. The projects are cooperative undertakings of the Kentucky Bureau of Rehabilitation Services and the division of public assistance with the general purpose of developing improved methods and techniques to enable more disabled applicants and recipients of public assistance to earn their livelihood as the result of vocational rehabilitation services.

Perhaps most important of all in the Kentucky bureau's ability to serve the disabled of the State has been Mr. Ben Coffman, the State director. His able leadership and competent staff have grown rapidly and surely to meet the need for an increased and more comprehensive program. Through this leadership and continued statewide support, the Kentucky Bureau of Rehabilitation Services will be able to provide rehabilitation services to all who need them.

In summary, the financing and program amendments that are in H.R. 8310 are long overdue and will free States like Kentucky from artificial barriers that create inequities in the amount of funds that States like Kentucky can earn with State and local funds.

The prompt passage of this bill with its new financing formula and improved Federal matching will help Kentucky and other State vocational rehabilitation programs to bring more and better services of the kind I have described to the disabled segment of our unemployed and underemployed population.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I will be glad to yield to a member of the subcommittee from Maryland.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman particularly with respect to the great work which was done by the committee, particularly the fact that it was such a bipartisan effort. Also I wish to congratulate and thank her on behalf of all my citizens of Maryland as well as the rest of the citizens of this Nation for her great leadership in this field.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity to speak to the House in support of H.R. 8310, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965. The amendments in this bill are based upon recommendations originally made by President Johnson and offered in bills introduced by Mrs. EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, and other colleagues including Mr. CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida. Mr. JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, also introduced a bill to improve and extend the vocational rehabilitation program with which he has become familiar in the process of dealing with appropriation requests for State and Federal vocational rehabilitation programs. I introduced a bill, H.R. 7373, to improve the program by removing from the Federal law the requirement that economic need be considered in the provision of certain vocational rehabilitation services.

Under the able chairmanship of Mrs. EDITH GREEN, the Special Subcommittee on Education held hearings in Washington and in the field. In addition to hearing the extensive testimony presented by many national organizations and individuals who came before the subcommittee, the subcommittee took testimony and made visits to facilities serving handicapped people in several communities in Illinois and Maryland. The visit to Chicago included observation of training activities in several workshops for the blind, and courses on prosthetics and orthotics at which doctors and other personnel were being trained to deal with different types of prostheses for people with orthopedic difficulties.

In a special visit to some of Maryland's vocational rehabilitation facilities I had an opportunity to see how the public program in my State operates, how it utilizes hospitals, workshops, and other community resources in working with disabled people.

Mr. Kenneth Barnes, assistant superintendent of education and director of vocational rehabilitation, was my host for this trip. It included observation of work with clients at the district office in Hyattsville, and pioneering activities of a special vocational rehabilitation facility at the State mental hospital at Crownsville. In Baltimore we visited an office serving a metropolitan area and observed the training of handicapped in a workshop sponsored by the Maryland League for Crippled Children. Because of the emphasis many witnesses had put upon the need for improved evaluation of the vocational potential of disabled people, we were especially interested in going to the physical medicine and rehabilitation evaluation unit at the University of Maryland Hospital. A visit with Dr. Sensenbach, superintendent of education for Maryland, completed our tour in this area.

The vocational rehabilitation programs vary from State to State depending upon the State's needs, resources, and leadership. The nature and the number of vocational rehabilitation services offered to Maryland clients are determined basically by available funds. The counseling function and medical evaluation are essential characteristics of every program and placement in satisfactory employment must always take place before the rehabilitation process is considered complete.

In addition to these basic services, the Maryland agency provides vocational training, physical restoration, maintenance, prosthetic appliances, and transportation when needed. All resources that are available to the client to assist in his program are made use of under the supervision of the counselor assigned to him. In 1964 the agency worked with nearly 11,000 people, of whom almost 6,700 received some service. In this same period nearly 2,000 disabled people were fully rehabilitated and in jobs. An additional 7,600 disability determination cases were handled for the bureau of old age and survivors insurance.

Mr. Barnes and Mr. Sensenbach have listed the following as major highlights of the Maryland program during this past year. They are representative of the work being done by other public agencies and illustrate the scope of the vocational rehabilitation activities undertaken in this program.

Counselors were assigned on a visiting basis to every major hospital and institution. More intensive service was rendered to mental and tuberculosis patients.

Special programs for disabled high school students were carried on in two of the largest political subdivisions. All other high schools of the State were served by counselors with general caseloads.

Work for the blind was expanded in the areas of industrial training and placement, vending stands, and home services.

Adult evaluation clinics, prosthetic clinics, and cardiac evaluation clinics were staffed to the extent possible.

Public health clinics in all major disability fields were contacted periodically, both for referral sources and for certain types of treatment for clients.

Liaison was maintained with numerous research and demonstration projects being conducted in cooperation with the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. One project in group counseling was conducted by the staff of the Agency.

A joint conference of supervisory personnel from public welfare and vocational rehabilitation was held to develop plans for more intensive work in this field.

In order to determine the economic soundness of Maryland's vocational rehabilitation program, a comprehensive survey is made each year of all the cases rehabilitated three years previously. A study of the 1,491 disabled persons rehabilitated in 1961 has just been completed with these results:

The total cost of the program in 1961 was $1,049,520.

The number of clients served in 1961 was 5,925—this includes the 1,491 rehabilitants.

The total earnings of the 1,491 in the 3-year period was $5,668,086.00.

The rehabilitated clients earned in 3 years 9½ times the cost of their rehabilitation. They earned 5½ times the total cost of the program in 1961. It is estimated that in 3 years the 1,491 paid in taxes $791,347.00, or $197,233.00 more than the cost of their rehabilitation.

In addition to the economic values there are social values also.

To the individual: independence, not dependence; normal living, not mere existence; opportunity and happiness, not resignation and helplessness.

To the State: The strength and stability provided by citizens who are socially and economically secure.

The bill reported by the committee builds upon the recommendations of the President and the suggestions that developed from the hearings and committee discussion of the issues raised. The amendments, in my opinion, will provide the physically and mentally handicapped people of the country with an improved and expanded program that will give them greater opportunities to

be restored to full functioning as active participants in the life of the community.

The major amendments provide for—First. More liberal Federal financing of the basic State-Federal program. Second. Development of new programs of rehabilitation services, especially for people suffering from severe or catastrophic disabilities.

Third. Expansion of services to greater numbers of disabled in those States where substantially greater numbers can be served.

Fourth. Comprehensive State planning with a view to serving all disabled people by 1975.

Fifth. Construction of workshops and facilities, and programs for the improvement of existing workshops and training services in workshops.

Sixth. A concerted effort to reduce architectural barriers to the rehabilitation of handicapped.

Seventh. The establishment of an intramural research program and data processing program in the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration.

These and other amendments in the bill will enable the vocational rehabilitation programs to make considerable progress toward reaching by 1967 President Johnson's goal of rehabilitating 200,000 annually.

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join the gentlewoman from Oregon in her support of this bill. I would have hoped that it could have been financed out of funds for the poverty program, because I think this is a much more worthwhile program than the poverty program. I note, too, there is authority for the hiring of so-called experts and consultants. I hope that this authority will be used sparingly, for this sort of authorization has resulted in considerable abuse in other agencies and departments of the Government. I hope it will not be abused in this case.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I will be delighted to yield to my friend and very able colleague from Connecticut, who was a longtime member of the subcommittee and made so many great contributions on that committee.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon for her kind comments. It has always been a pleasure to work with her, and I am sure that all of us are grateful for her leadership and vision.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of this bill. It represents the culmination of many years of effort, in which I have been proud to participate, and in which I have been proud to follow the leadership of our colleague from Oregon.

The many reasons for the adoptions of this legislation have been advanced by its principal sponsors and I wish only to utilize this time to urge its adoption and to congratulate the committee for its work. This legislation represents much needed extension and expansion of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, whose contributions are familiar to all of us and worthy of our continued support and enthusiasm.

We cannot take pride in our national goals unless we implement provisions which will take care of those who, for many and varied reasons, are unable to compete with their fellows. This is not to say that they cannot—if given help, and it is for this reason that we should support the bill before us today.

Again, I am proud to support this legislation and to urge its passage.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the views of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and others who have so eloquently expressed themselves in support of H.R. 8310.

I have mixed emotions about some of the so-called rehabilitation programs we have passed in this Congress since I have been here, although I have supported most of them. I am fearful that some of them may turn out to be more harmful than helpful in that individual initiative and incentive may well be seriously impaired.

However, as someone has said, the U.S. Vocational Rehabilitation Administration "is a monument to the growth of an idea." Here has been an example of our Federal system at its best—the Federal Government and the States and localities working together as a team in an enduring partnership to make life more meaningful and more abundant for the disabled persons of this Nation by rehabilitating them for proper employment and other avenues of citizenship responsibility.

Truly this partnership has increased in strength over the years as vocational rehabilitation has demonstrated not only our Nation's humanitarian outlook but its hopes and desires and goals on behalf of all our disabled, including especially the physically and mentally handicapped.

I have always supported programs of this kind beginning with my first legislative experience in the North Carolina General Assembly. I have been happy to support programs of this kind since I came to the Congress in 1953. It is the kind of program which can truly help people to help themselves. I support the purpose of H.R. 8301, known as Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965 to provide the physically and mentally disabled persons of this Nation an improved and expanded program of services designed to provide them greater opportunities for more actively and fully participating in the life of our country.

This is a program which creates initiative and provides incentive for many who may otherwise be helpless. It is the kind of humanitarian and self-help approach which the people of this country have always supported. They always will.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice to those in support of H.R. 8310, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965.

The first vocational rehabilitation act was passed in 1920. It was substantially amended in 1943 and, again, in 1954. The program carried on under this legislation has always had bipartisan support. The 1943 amendments were proposed by a Democratic administration and supported by the Republican Party. The 1954 act was proposed by a Republican administration and supported by the Democrats. Incidentally, it is under the 1954 legislation that the research and demonstration programs and the programs for training rehabilitation personnel have been developed. The period since 1954 has also seen the most rapid and significant growth of the State-Federal program of vocational rehabilitation. The bill now before us was proposed by the current Democratic administration, improved and liberalized in the House Committee on Education and Labor, and reported to the House unanimously.

Summarizing briefly, the bill before us increases the Federal share of the cost of vocational rehabilitation services in the States to put the Federal share of this program closer in line with other welfare, manpower, and poverty programs that have been established recently; broadens the definition of vocational rehabilitation services to include the provision of services for an extended period during which time rehabilitation potential is being determined; initiates programs for the construction and staffing of workshops; provides improvement and technical assistance grants for workshops to enable them to more effectively serve severely handicapped people; and established a National Commission on Architectural Barriers. There are also quite a number of technical amendments, all of which are designed to facilitate the development of services under the legislation.

This program is administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, which is a small but highly efficient unit of the Department. In the States, the program is administered by State boards of vocational education or education, with the exception of a few States that established independent departments of vocational rehabilitation. Rehabilitation for the blind is administered separately in 38 of the States, usually in departments of public welfare.

Vocational rehabilitation is a tested program. It has always been administered soundly and economically. Appropriations Committees of this Congress have been particularly laudatory of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and the States with respect to how they have conducted this program. The

number of persons being rehabilitated annually has risen steadily over the years. During the last complete fiscal year, rehabilitation was completed for over 120,000 individuals. Under the bill before us, the number of rehabilitations is expected to increase to over 200,000 per year. In practically all cases, these individuals are dependent upon someone else for support when they come to the vocational rehabilitation agencies for help. They become wage earners and taxpayers as a result of vocational rehabilitation services. The contribution they make to society in terms of production and taxes paid far exceeds the amount spent upon them. This is good business anyway one looks at it.

While all parts of this bill are important, I want to stress the importance of two sections. Section 6 sets up a National Commission on Architectural Barriers to the rehabilitation of the handicapped. In my judgment, the establishment of this Commission offers great hope for bettering the lot of handicapped people throughout our Nation. It is distressing how many barriers we thoughtlessly place in the way of handicapped individuals and older people. We know for instance that many public buildings are not accessible to the handicapped. In many cities, street curbs prevent their passage from block to block. Huge housing developments may arise without any regard to the fact that a substantial part of the population of the United States is handicapped. Private industry is equally as thoughtless as the public in this regard. The Commission established under this legislation is expected to identify the problem and formulate a concrete plan for overcoming these barriers. It may be that laws will be needed in some instances, in the main, however, the need is to educate the public to the fact that it is important to everyone that these barriers be eliminated. Ordinarily, it does not cost more to provide facilities that will accommodate the handicapped. It is just necessary that somebody think about it at the right time.

Particularly commendable, we think, are the efforts being made by some of our colleges and universities to make their facilities available to students in wheelchairs. The University of Missouri and the University of Illinois are two leaders in this respect. We hope many others will follow suit.

I also want to emphasize the importance of the section expanding the definition of rehabilitation services to include the determination of rehabilitation potential. At the present time, it is necessary for the State rehabilitation agency to make at least a tentative determination that an individual will be employable before services are begun. This is a totally unrealistic approach to rehabilitation. It has been demonstrated again and again that once given the opportunity to rehabilitate themselves, many handicapped individuals amaze everyone with what they can do. This amendment is not designed to let the bars down so rehabilitation services can be provided for anyone regardless of the circumstances. Its purpose is clearcut; rehabilitation agencies are expected to take individuals whether there is any hope whatsoever of any degree of employability and provide them services until there can be a full and complete determination of the individual's potential for rehabilitation. This much we owe to every handicapped citizen.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by saying that I am indeed proud to support this legislation. I do not believe Congress makes any better investment of funds than what it spends on the rehabilitation of its handicapped citizens.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the gentlelady from Oregon, the subcommittee and the full committee, for bringing this bill to the floor. I notice that the subcommittee mentioned the mentally retarded. I would like to ask the gentlelady from Oregon whether the mentally ill are also included?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes.

Mr. STAGGERS. And what about the disabled older workers?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes. Services are provided for the physically and mentally disabled, many of whom might be classified as disabled older workers. I hope that more provision will be made for older handicapped persons.

Mr. STAGGERS. What about the mentally and physically handicapped whom we find in chronic disease hospitals or in penal or correctional institutions? Would they be covered in any way?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes, they are. In addition there is another piece of legislation that was passed by this House in the field of correctional rehabilitation. It was passed within the last 2 months. It is a bill which provides for a 3-year study of training and personnel needs in the field of correctional rehabilitation. The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration does provide support in this area such as the grant for a juvenile home, I believe in the State of Georgia, where they are exploring ways to help the young public offenders so that they will not become wards of society in later years. The program is concerned with this problem and advances are being made.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentlelady. Again, I should like to say that the committee has done a great job in a humanitarian field.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 8310, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965, which is being sponsored by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

I am glad to speak in behalf of prompt passage of this bill and have introduced an identical measure in support of this worthy piece of legislation.

The proposed amendments are timely. I am convinced that they will help State and community rehabilitation agencies to do a better job in behalf of physically and mentally handicapped people. Our programs in New Jersey also will benefit from passage of this bill.

I am informed that the proposed new Federal-State matching ratio—75 to 25 percent—in the bill will have significant implications for the disabled in New Jersey. Between 1965 and 1968 it is expected that New Jersey's population will increase by about 6 percent. At present it is estimated that there are about 96,000 disabled in New Jersey who could benefit from vocational rehabilitation services. Another estimated 12,000 each year will come to need rehabilitation because of accidents or disease.

With the present budget and staff, the State rehabilitation commission served about 15,000 in 1964, and rehabilitated 2,890 with 8,900 continuing to receive services. More favorable Federal financing of the services given through the State-Federal program, such as is projected in H.R. 8310, would help the commission to bring services to many more of our disabled each year.

The Commission has informed me that the existing Federal legislation provides for incentive financing of certain types of projects which extend and improve programs. The new proposals in this bill would reorient this program but continue to encourage State agencies to begin new services, especially for people who are severely disabled. Under the present authority New Jersey has innovated many new services. Under one project it employed a workshop coordinator who helped the State agency to utilize more effectively the services of workshops. Through another it placed rehabilitation counselors in each of four mental health hospitals. A special effort was made under another of these extension projects to improve services for the deaf and hard of hearing, primarily through offering intensive services in job finding and placement, especially for students at the New Jersey School for the Deaf. Other projects have concentrated upon developing job opportunities for the severely disabled and young people who are mentally retarded. The amendments which will encourage this kind of extension of services will help our New Jersey agencies to broaden their coverage of the disabled who can be helped to prepare for and obtain employment.

Other special efforts are being made, in cooperation with the public assistance office, to work with disabled public assistance recipients. There is a team unit in each of three county welfare offices dealing with these cases which are very difficult because of the time and effort needed to motivate some of them to want and to use rehabilitation services.

New Jersey agencies will benefit from the proposed amendments dealing with comprehensive statewide planning and expansion of services. Both the New Jersey State Commission for the Blind and the New Jersey Rehabilitation Commission have plans for expansion that probably can be undertaken or helped considerably under these new authorities. Similarly, the several amendments in H.R. 8310 which deal with construc-

tion of new workshops and facilities and improvement of existing workshops will be especially useful in New Jersey in the immediate future.

The Governor's Committee on Lifetime Disability anticipates the establishment of 21 workshops throughout the State, on an area basis, to meet the need for training and work opportunities. At the present time there are 17 rehabilitation or sheltered workshops. Many sections of the State are without adequate workshop facilities and some of the shops are short of staff and equipment and cannot develop the kind of programs which are required. The proposed amendments could have a great impact upon the growth and improvement of workshop facilities in New Jersey.

The New Jersey State Commission for the Blind is looking forward to an expansion in the vending stand program, and hopes to expand by 50 percent the services to blind clients at the Commission's Rehabilitation Training Center where they receive adjustment training, mobility training, prevocational tryout, home economics and other specialized training. A large percentage of these clients have disabilities in addition to blindness, and there is need to develop specialized programs for them. The new authorities and more favorable Federal financing can make a significant difference in the number of people helped and the program development that can be undertaken for this multiple handicapped group.

New Jersey's Gov. Richard J. Hughes and the State legislature support the vocational rehabilitation programs in New Jersey and have always provided additional funds within the limits of State ability. The rehabilitation agencies report that other public agencies and private groups have given the program excellent cooperation both in referring cases and in obtaining additional resources to complement and supplement what can be done through the public programs.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I want to endorse wholeheartedly the provisions in H.R. 8310 through which our public and voluntary agencies can be helped to do more for the physically and mentally handicapped so that they may take their rightful place in the economic and social life of the community.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate and commend my very distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] for sponsoring this legislation, as well as the distinguished gentlelady from Oregon, the chairman of the subcommittee, and her entire committee for reporting out this bill.

This bill joins a whole series of other impressive bills that have been reported out by the House Education and Labor Committee, all of them designed to give greater meaning to our democracy by improving and increasing the opportunities for people so that they may walk through life with dignity. I am proud to be a member of that committee. Members on both sides of the aisle have worked very hard.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen go through this Congress an antipoverty bill, a bill designed to provide Federal aid to the children of poverty-stricken parents, an adult education bill, a minimum wage bill, a bill to provide aid to higher education, the manpower retraining and development bill, the vocational training bill, and now, Mr. Chairman, the vocational rehabilitation bill.

Mr. Chairman, all of these measures have been designed to do one thing, give people the opportunity to help themselves.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation now spends in excess of $44 billion a year on all forms of public assistance. This represents a staggering sum.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the concept which we have been developing in our committee—and this bill before us today epitomizes that concept—is to help people help themselves by training so they can be taken off the public dole, so they can walk the streets with dignity, so they can be proud of being Americans and help themselves and take care of themselves.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation will go a long way in that direction.

My own State of Illinois spends more than $1 billion a year on all forms of public assistance such as aid to the aged, aid to the blind, aid to the handicapped, general public welfare programs, and all of these programs that we have passed through this House—and many of them on a bipartisan basis with the help of the minority of this Congress—as they begin taking shape, as they start developing, the result is that we are going to see more and more people who for a long time have relied upon public assistance programs, become full-fledged, self-supporting, proud, dignified citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any nation that has ever embarked upon as exciting career as we have in this direction. I do not know of any nation in the history of the world that has tried to do so much to restore human dignity to its people.

Mr. Chairman, we certainly owe the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] and the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] a great deal of commendation for bringing this legislation to us.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be able to support this legislation today and I am sure all Americans will be proud of the conduct and the behavior of this Congress.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few minutes to discuss the major change in financing vocational rehabilitation under H.R. 8310 under the present section of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the formula for allotting funds is, as the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] pointed out during hearings on the bill, extremely complex. What this bill proposes to do is simplify the complex formula under which section 2 funds are disbursed to the States.

Under present law, the States and the Federal Government share in expenditures made under a State plan. An allotment percentage for each State is calculated on the basis of the per capita income of the State. The total amount made available to a State is computed by multiplying the population of the State by the square of the State's allotment percentage. Within this allotment, the Federal Government reimburses a certain percentage of the State's expenditure. The variable Federal share ranging from 70 to 90 percent is determined by the per capita income of the State.

Under the provisions of H.R. 8310 the financing will be made infinitely simpler. The committee's proposal is that only two factors be taken into consideration, population and per capita income. The squaring of the per capita income is eliminated.

This bill raises Federal contribution to State programs to 75 percent in a two-step process. At present, the Federal share of State programs varies from 50 to 70 percent. Written into the bill is a provision that no State receive less than its 1965 allotment.

H.R. 8310 authorizes $300 million for fiscal year 1965, $350 million in fiscal 1967, and $400 million for fiscal year 1968 for State vocational rehabilitation programs.

Included in the bill is a provision authorizing $80 million in fiscal 1966, $104 million in fiscal 1967 and $117 in fiscal 1968 for research and demonstration projects.

The bill also authorizes $21 million over the next 3 fiscal years for project grants to the States to aid them in starting new projects in order to improve and extend rehabilitation services provided under section 3 of the present act.

The bill also authorizes a new grant program for construction and the initial staffing of workshops and rehabilitation facilities established either by State agencies or private rehabilitation groups who are approved by the States. The amount of money authorized for these grants is $1.5 million in fiscal 1966; $7 million in fiscal 1967 and $9 million in fiscal 1968.

Mr. Chairman, these are the major changes in the bill in terms of financing vocational rehabilitation. As has been brought out in the testimony before the special subcommittee on education, miracles have been wrought in this field. Yet, more remains to be done and with your help more will be done.

By voting today for this bill you are investing in America's future. Every dollar spent to rehabilitate physically and mentally handicapped Americans is returned many times to the Treasury in the form of increased taxes.

I am happy and proud that this bill has received such strong support from so many Members on both sides of the aisle. It is a tribute to our political system that we can differ on some things but in other areas all Members of Congress stand shoulder to shoulder. This is one area where we can agree that we have a good program, which with your help can be made more effective.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of one of the most meaningful and well-thought-out pieces of special educational legislation to come before this Congress this year.

It is true that other measures will have more massive impact upon the educational systems of this Nation, or will be more widely publicized. However, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965 represent one of the most significant and, potentially, one of the most far-reaching efforts at improvements in the field of special education.

This bill would be meritorious even if it only expanded our 45-year-old program of restoring the disabled to gainful employment to the 200,000 persons per year level requested earlier this year by President Johnson. However this bill goes far beyond that point, to break new ground and provide for major improvements and expansion of the vocational rehabilitation program.

Under the terms of this measure, Federal financing of the program will be liberalized; new programs will be encouraged to include many of those seriously disabled persons not now included in the program; construction and operation of new workshops and related facilities will be aided and encouraged; the facilities for training of persons entering the vocational rehabilitation field and centralized research and data processing will be made more readily available.

As one with a longtime interest in, and personal knowledge of, the operation of vocational workshops I am especially pleased to make note of the provisions in this bill that will expand and improve the operations of these workshops.

The bill provides five new programs that should enable the workshop concept to break through present difficulties.

These new programs provide for: First, grants for improved training programs in workshops; second, grants for the construction and staffing of workshops; third, grants to improve the level and quality of services in existing workshops; fourth, the use of outside experts in improvement of workshop operations, and fifth, the establishment of a body that will set standards for their operation.

Among these programs is one that will provide for experimentation in the use of residential workshops. Another especially significant feature is the provision for assistance in staffing these facilities, which will help to break the bottleneck now encountered as a result of a shortage of trained and qualified personnel.

I also think it especially noteworthy that the bill compares the vocational rehabilitation program closely with the manpower development and training program that has been so successful in retraining persons who have been underemployed or unemployed.

The provision that trainees may receive stipends while undergoing training will do much to assist disabled persons who otherwise could not afford to take part in the program, and to encourage them to leave the welfare rolls.

Another breakthrough provides for rehabilitation on the basis of handicap rather than on that of need, widening the range in which such services can be offered. I believe that one of the greatest benefits of this type of program is that it recognizes all persons as potentially contributing members of our society.

Mr. Chairman, because of the many benefits I have outlined, and because of the others inherent in this bill, I urge my colleagues to support and pass H.R. 8310, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I welcome the chance to express my support for H.R. 8310, to expand and improve our vocational rehabilitation program.

We have an outstanding program under this general legislation in Oklahoma, and it has helped tremendously to strengthen our citizenship and build a better economy.

The enlargement of the program is soundly justified by the record of achievement in the past, and this bill should be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that this important legislation is before the House today and I wish the Members to know that I am strongly in support of H.R. 8310.

This legislation affects disabled people in every congressional district in the United States. It is an unfortunate fact of life that disability strikes at all ages, in all income groups, in all geographical sectors. It affects the rich and the poor, but it has its worst impact among those who live in poverty, for studies have shown that disabling conditions are more frequent among those who are the poorest.

I expressed my concern for the need for new legislation in this field early this year. Along with the distinguished chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, and others, I introduced the administration bill, H.R. 6971. The bill before the House today, H.R. 8310, reflects the administration bill, plus several amendments to broaden and strengthen this legislation.

For several years, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, I have reviewed the plans and progress of the vocational rehabilitation program. One result of this is that I have become quite aware of the present-day inadequacies of the 1954 legislation under which the program operates. Great progress has been made in those 11 years, as we have seen in our annual reviews in connection with appropriations.

However, it is time to give this important national effort for handicapped people a better legislative base, one that is more in keeping with the many changes that have occurred in the last few years. The Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation is a remarkable demonstration of a successful venture between the Federal Government and the States. For 45 years this program has steadily improved in effectiveness, to the point where, during fiscal year 1965, more than 130,000 disabled men and women received a variety of rehabilitation services and were placed in useful employment.

This is, without question, one of the most constructive uses we could make of the tax dollar. Thousands of these men and women had been dependent upon public welfare programs because they were disabled and unable to work. Today, instead of being dependent, they are working the same as their nonhandicapped friends and instead of requiring public funds, they are paying taxes which help support every governmental activity in our cities, States, and national life.

Under the remarkable leadership of the Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation, Miss Mary E. Switzer, there has been developed an outstanding program of research and training which complements and supports the service program of the States as well as the hundreds of voluntary organizations serving the disabled throughout the United States. From this research program we are securing new knowledge and new methods which make it possible to rehabilitate disabled people who had no hope of restoration until recent years. In many instances the task of putting these new procedures to work is speeded up by demonstration grants to community groups and State agencies.

In my own State of Rhode Island the rehabilitation of disabled people has been enhanced by several such demonstration projects. These have given imaginative new ideas to the community and have bolstered the entire community effort for the handicapped youths and adults of my own State.

For example, the Rhode Island School of Design at present is working on a plan to expose their students in technical and industrial design to the needs of rehabilitation programs for better equipment. What is urgently needed here are inventive minds to seek better prosthetic appliances, specialized assistive devices, and other mechanical aids for handicapped people. By turning the minds of these promising students to this special field, there is an excellent chance that improved devices will be developed, and at the same time some of these future leaders in our industrial life will gain an understanding of disability and rehabilitation that they could not have secured in any other way.

I believe this legislation will induce many States to play a lot more responsible role in meeting the needs of their own disabled people. This is one of the very proper functions of the Federal Government, as far as I am concerned—to point out national needs, to provide financial and other encouragements to the States to meet these needs, and to invite their wholehearted cooperation in discharging the obligations of government at all levels.

Frankly, I have been disappointed at the level of State support for vocational rehabilitation in my own State of Rhode Island. We have the same proportion of seriously disabled people, in relation to our population, as any other State. Yet for several years, Rhode Island has not produced the State funds needed to take full advantage of the Federal funds available for vocational rehabilitation.

In the fiscal year just ended, Rhode Island's failure to provide an additional

$178,000 in State funds meant that the State lost more than $270,000 in Federal funds. In other words, close to a half million dollars of funds for this important program were lost to the disabled citizens of Rhode Island last year.

For the present fiscal year 1966, the situation is even worse. Despite my urging, it appears that my own State will have only about $517,000 appropriated for vocational rehabilitation, where the amount should be $642,000 in State funds to take full advantage of the Federal funds under present law. As a result, Rhode Island again will lose money—this time amounting to about $188,000.

With the passage of the legislation before us today—and I personally feel quite confident that the Congress will enact this important bill—the loss of Federal funds for vocational rehabilitation in Rhode Island will be even greater. I am told that, with the limited State funds available, Rhode Island will lose around $325,000 in Federal grant funds this year under this new law.

Knowing the widespread and urgent need for this kind of special assistance among our disabled people in Rhode Island, I find this an intolerable situation and I fervently hope that the State of Rhode Island will assume its full responsibility for fully measuring up to the needs of its own citizens and demonstrating this responsibility by the funds it appropriates.

I do not think there should be special penalties attached to being a disabled person in Rhode Island or any other State. I believe that the disabled people of Rhode Island should have every opportunity to overcome their handicaps, become active, interested citizens again, and be employed at useful jobs like all our other adult citizens.

I believe that handicapped children and youth should be able to approach their adult years, and the responsibilities of the working world with confidence in their State government and their Federal Government as instruments for providing the special services they need to be good and useful citizens.

I believe the State of Rhode Island should become an active partner with the many fine voluntary agencies and institutions we have in that State for serving the handicapped.

I think the State of Rhode Island should appropriate enough funds to enable it to serve effectively as a service-giving rehabilitation resource and at the same time to give substance to State leadership in bringing together voluntary groups, the Federal Government and everyone else who can help fashion better lives for seriously disabled young people and adults. Therefore, I hope that, among the many other benefits of this legislation, it will serve to stimulate a sense of responsibility in Rhode Island for the welfare of its handicapped citizens. The improved Federal financing, the introduction of new programs to meet special needs—all these should be a powerful incentive for all States—and I hope my own State of Rhode Island will be among the leaders in this important work within a few years.

To do less than this is to practice the falsest kind of shortsighted economy. Over and over again, the vocational rehabilitation program has shown that these disabled men and women, once they are rehabilitated and returned to employment, pay far more in taxes than it costs to rehabilitate them. Detailed studies have shown, for example, that for every Federal dollar spent to rehabilitate a disabled person in this program about $5 is returned to the Federal Treasury in taxes paid by the disabled person as a worker. Much the same dollar benefits accrue to State governments, so that State treasuries benefit from this program. We are considering, then, a field of work which combines sound economics with the finest aspirations we can have for our fellow man. We serve a high humanitarian cause when we rehabilitate disabled people, for self-support and independence are the essence of personal dignity.

H.R. 8310 would establish a new and simplified system of financing the program of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services. This simplification is long overdue. It will, in addition, provide additional Federal funds which will greatly stimulate the growth of the total program and make it possible to rehabilitate many more thousands of handicapped people during the next 3 years.

The bill will authorize a new program of construction to increase the number of rehabilitation centers, workshops, and special facilities serving the handicapped. We have an urgent need for more centers and workshops in this country, and to expand and improve the ones we already have. This bill will meet this vital need and will assist community and State groups which operate such facilities by also offering assistance with initial staffing and initial equipment.

The proposals for workshop improvement in this bill are certain to have a far-reaching effect on what we do for severely handicapped people in the United States. Experience has shown the need for more workshops and for improvement in the professional and operational aspects of the workshop function. The disabled men and women who need services in workshops represent some of our most difficult rehabilitation problems, particularly as they relate to restoring people eventually to employment. This comprehensive national approach to workshops will enable voluntary agencies and State agencies to approach this task more efficiently and more broadly during the next 10 years.

H.R. 8310 will add two other provisions to the law which will greatly strengthen the work of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. One of these is the establishment of an intramural research program, to complement the extramural research grant program which has been carried out for the past 10 years. It will be possible for the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration to actively collaborate with other scientists on certain selected projects where collaborative effort is essential to success, to initiate investigations in certain fields where the grant process is not the most effective or efficient approach to a problem.

Of equal importance is the provision to establish a National Data Service in Rehabilitation, using modern automated data systems to collect, store, analyze, retrieve and disseminate research information, and a great variety of other data essential to rehabilitation programs in the United States.

The bill includes many other important features—a system of grants to expand vocational rehabilitation services, a 2-year program of statewide planning in each State, the establishment of a 3-year National Commission on Architectural Barriers to the Handicapped and several other technical amendments which will improve the operation of both the public program and the cooperating voluntary programs.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 8310. I hope that every Member will see in this bill a new hope for the future for thousands of his constituents who today are the victims of disability. I should like to see the House express its concern for these disabled men and women by voting unanimously for the passage of this bill.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8310, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK DANIELS, of New Jersey, are based upon recommendations made by President Johnson. They were designed to expand and modernize this established Federal-State program through which States and localities are helped to bring vocational rehabilitation services to their physically and mentally disabled residents. After extensive hearings in Washington and several communities in different parts of the country, the subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of Mrs. EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, reported out a bill which incorporated many suggestions that came from national and local organizations familiar with the work of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the State agencies and the many private organizations and agencies working in behalf of disabled young people and adults.

The program began in 1920 as a simple effort to place handicapped people in available jobs. Major amendments in 1943 and 1954 provided authority for the cooperative Federal-State program as it operates today. Since 1954, under the able leadership of Miss Mary Switzer, the size and scope of the program have grown significantly. Fifty-seven thousand people were rehabilitated in 1954.

By 1965 this number had grown to more than 130,000 men and women rehabilitated and placed in useful employment. Federal and State funds made available for this program have grown gradually as the State and local agencies have developed public support for their activities, and as trained personnel have become available to man the varied services that are involved in restoring disabled people to maximum physical and mental capacity, in training them and placing them in remunerative work that is suitable to their abilities and capacities.

President Johnson decided to enhance the mission and the effectiveness of this established antipoverty program, and to recommend that the Congress give it tools to work with so that rehabilitations could reach and exceed 200,000 each year. To accomplish this, various amendments to the program are outlined in the bill. Some of the main provisions of the bill are designed:

First, to simplify the allotment formula for distribution of funds on a population and per capita income basis, and to increase Federal matching to a flat 75 percent by 1967 and subsequent years;

Second, to provide incentive financing for development of new services, especially with respect to projects serving the disabled with particularly severe disabilities—such as people who are both deaf and blind;

Third, to assist in the construction and operation of new rehabilitation workshops and facilities;

Fourth, to provide improved training programs for people in existing and new workshops and facilities;

Fifth, to begin a concerted effort to remove architectural barriers to the rehabilitation of handicapped people;

Sixth, to encourage statewide planning so that by 1975 States will have so developed their programs and planned services as to reach all disabled who can benefit from vocational rehabilitation services.

Mr. Chairman, these reforms are long overdue. This program is one of the most humanitarian and economically valuable social efforts that has been brought before the House this year. Handicapped people who are rehabilitated are taxpayers and do not remain tax consumers on public assistance or other forms of public relief. No one has estimated the dollars they return to State and local treasuries in taxes paid, but conservative figures show that for every single Federal dollar spent for rehabilitation, they return $5 to the Treasury in Federal income taxes.

Mr. Chairman, earlier in this Congress I introduced and the Congress enacted legislation to establish a National Technical Institute for the Deaf, where some of our deaf young people will receive technical training and preparation for remunerative employment. Many of these young people will be clients of the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program which will prepare them to take full advantage of this technical preparation, and which will help them to find the employment that their training will have fitted them for.

I have also introduced legislation—H.R. 8092—that would benefit the disabled with respect to extraordinary costs of transportation they must incur in getting to and from work. I hope that the Congress will be giving consideration to this and other legislation which will encourage this courageous segment of our population, the handicapped, to find and keep jobs despite the disabilities that they have had to overcome.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION; ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 2. (a) Sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act are amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANTS; PURPOSES FOR WHICH AVAILABLE

"SECTION 1. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants as provided in this Act for the purpose of assisting States in rehabilitating handicapped individuals so that they may prepare for and engage in gainful employment to the extent of their capabilities, thereby increasing not only their social and economic well-being but also the productive capacity of the Nation.

"(b)(1) For the purpose of making grants to States under section 2 to assist them in meeting the costs of vocational rehabilitation services, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the sum of $300,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $350,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $400,000,000.

"(2) For the purpose of making grants under section 3, relating to grants to States to assist them in meeting the costs of projects for innovation of vocational rehabilitation services, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the sum of $5,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $7,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $9,000,000.

"(3) For the purpose of making grants (A) under section 4(a)(1) for research, demonstrations, training, and traineeships; (B) under clause (2)(A) of section 4(a) for planning, preparing for, and initiating special programs to expand State vocational rehabilitation services; and (C) under clause (2)(B) of section 4(a) to meet the cost of planning for the development of a comprehensive vocational rehabilitation program in each State, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the sum of $80,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $104,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $117,000,000.

"(4) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and each of the succeeding fiscal years, only such sums may be appropriated for the purposes described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"GRANTS TO STATES FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES

"SEC. 2. (a) For each fiscal year each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount bearing the same ratio to the amount authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1) of section 1(b) for meeting the cost of vocational rehabilitation services, as the product of (1) the population of the State and (2) its allotment percentage (as defined in section 11(h)) bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States. The allotment to any State under the preceding sentence which is less than the amount such State was entitled to receive under subsection (b) of this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments of each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

"(b) For each fiscal year the Secretary shall pay to each State an amount equal to the Federal share (determined as provided in section 11(i)) of the cost of vocational rehabilitation services under the plan for such State approved under section 5, including expenditures for the administration of the State plan, except that the total of such payments to such State for such fiscal year may not exceed its allotment under subsection (a) for such year, and except that the amount otherwise payable to such State for such year under this section shall be reduced by the amount (if any) by which expenditures from non-Federal sources (except for expenditures with respect to which the State is entitled to payments under section 3) during such year under such State's plan are less than such expenditures under such plan for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965.

"GRANTS TO STATES FOR INNOVATION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES

"SEC. 3. (a)(1) From the sums available for any fiscal year for grants to States to assist them in meeting the costs described in paragraph (2) of this subsection, each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount bearing the same ratio to such sums as the product of (A) the population of the State and (B) its allotment percentage (as defined in section 11(h)) bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States. The allotment to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than $5,000 (or such other amount as may be specified as a minimum allotment in the Act appropriating such sums for such year) shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

"(2) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall pay to such State a portion of the cost of approved projects for vocational rehabilitation services (including their administration) under the State plan which (A) provide for the development of methods or techniques, which are new in the State, for providing vocational rehabilitation services for handicapped individuals, or (B) are specially designed for development of, or provision for, new or expanded vocational rehabilitation services for groups of handicapped individuals having disabilities which are catastrophic or particularly severe. The Secretary shall approve any project for purposes of this section only if the plan of such State approved under section 5 includes such project or is modified to include it.

"(b) Payments under this section with respect to any project may be made for a period of not to exceed five years beginning with the commencement of the first fiscal year for which any payment is made with respect to such project from an allotment under this section. To the extent permitted by the State's allotment under this section, such payments with respect to any project shall be equal to 90 per centum of the cost of such project for the first three years and 75 per centum of the cost of such project for the next two years, except that, at the request of the State, such payments may be less than such percentage of the cost of such project.

"(c) No payment may be made from an allotment under this section with respect to any cost with respect to which any payment is made under section 2."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be in effect for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1965, except that payments may be made from a State's allotment under section 3 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for any project approved under such section before July 1, 1965. Such payments may be made for the period for which such project was approved and at the rate provided for in such section at the time of such approval.

CONSTRUCTION OF REHABILITATION FACILITIES; WORKSHOP IMPROVEMENT; EXPERIMENTAL PROJECTS; REMOVAL OF ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS

SEC. 3. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act is further amended by redesignating section 13 as section 17, and by inserting after section 12 the following new sections:

"GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF REHABILITATION FACILITIES AND WORKSHOPS

"SEC. 13. (a) Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1965, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to assist in meeting the costs of construction of public or other nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities. Such grants may be made only for projects for which applications are approved by the Secretary under this section.

"(b) To be approved, an application for a grant for a construction project under this section must—

"(1) contain or be supported by reasonable assurances that (A) for a period of not less than ten years after completion of construction of the project it will be used as a public or other nonprofit workshop or rehabilitation facility, (B) sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of construction of the project, and (C) sufficient funds will be available, when construction of the project is completed, for its effective use as a workshop or rehabilitation facility, as the case may be;

"(2) be accompanied or supplemented by plans and specifications which comply with regulations of the Secretary relating to minimum standards of construction and equipment, and with regulations of the Secretary of Labor relating to safety standards for workshops and rehabilitation facilities;

"(3) be approved, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, by the appropriate State agency designated as provided in section 5(a)(1);

"(4) contain or be supported by reasonable assurance that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on any construction aided by payments pursuant to any grant under this section will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5); and the Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(c) The amount of a grant under this section with respect to any construction project in any State shall be equal to 50 per centum of the cost of such project.

"(d) Upon approval of any application for a grant for a construction project under this section, the Secretary shall reserve, from any appropriation available therefor, the amount of such grant determined under subsection (c); the amount so reserved may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as the Secretary may determine. In case an amendment to an approved application is approved or the estimated cost of a project is revised upward, any additional payment with respect thereto may be made from the applicable allotment of the State for the fiscal year in which such amendment or revision is approved.

"(e) If, within twenty years after completion of any construction project for which funds have been paid under this section, the workshop or rehabilitation facility shall cease to be a public or other nonprofit workshop or rehabilitation facility, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the workshop or facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such workshop or facility is situated) of the workshop or facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such workshop or facility.

"(f) The Secretary is also authorized to make grants to assist in the initial staffing of any workshop or rehabilitation facility constructed after the date of enactment of this section (whether or not such construction was financed with the aid of a grant under this section) by covering part of the costs (determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary) of compensation of professional or technical personnel of such workshop or facility during the period beginning with the commencement of the operation of such workshop or facility and ending with the close of four years and three months after the month in which such operation commenced. Such grants with respect to any workshop or facility may not exceed 75 per centum of such costs for the period ending with the close of the fifteenth month following the month in which such operation commenced, 60 per centum of such costs for the first year thereafter, 45 per centum of such costs for the second year thereafter, and 30 per centum of such costs for the third year thereafter.

"(g) The Secretary is also authorized to make grants (1) to the State agency or agencies designated as provided in section 5(a)(1) to assist in meeting the cost of determining the State's needs for workshops and rehabilitation facilities and (2) upon application approved by the appropriate State agency so designated for such State, to public or other nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations to assist them in meeting the costs of planning workshops and rehabilitation facilities and the services to be provided thereby.

"(h) Payment of grants under subsection (f) or (g) may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

"(i) There is authorized to be appropriated for carrying out this section $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years only such sums may be appropriated for carrying out this section as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. Sums so appropriated shall remain available for payment with respect to construction projects approved or initial staffing grants made under this section prior to July 1, 1970.

"(j) For purposes of this section—

"(1) 'construction' includes construction of new buildings, acquisition of existing buildings, and expansion, remodeling, alteration, and renovation of existing buildings, and initial equipment of such new, newly acquired, expanded, remodeled, altered, or renovated buildings;

"(2) the 'cost' of construction includes the cost of architects' fees and acquisition of land in connection with construction, but does not include the cost of offsite improvements;

"(3) a project for construction of a workshop may include such construction as may be necessary to provide residential accommodations for use in connection with the rehabilitation of mentally retarded individuals or such other categories of handicapped individuals as the Secretary may designate.

"WORKSHOP IMPROVEMENT

"Grants for projects for training services

"SEC. 14. (a)(1) The Secretary is authorized, during the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1971, to make grants to States and public and other nonprofit organizations and agencies to pay 90 per centum of the cost of projects for providing training services to handicapped individuals in public or other nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities.

"(2)(A) Training services, for purposes of this subsection, shall include training in occupational skills; related services, including work evaluation, work testing, provision of occupational tools and equipment required by the individual to engage in such training, and job tryouts; and payment of weekly allowances to individuals receiving such training and related services.

"(B) Such allowances may not be paid to any individual for any period in excess of two years, and such allowances for any week shall not exceed $25 plus $10 for each of the individual's dependents, or $65, whichever is less. In determining the amount of such allowance for any individual, consideration shall be given to the individual's need for such an allowance, including any expenses reasonably attributable to receipt of training services, the extent to which such an allowance will help assure entry into and satisfactory completion of training, and such other factors, specified by the Secretary, as will promote such individual's fitness to engage in a remunerative occupation.

"(3) The Secretary may make a grant for a project pursuant to this subsection only on his determination that (A) the purpose of such project is to prepare handicapped individuals for a remunerative occupation, (B) the individuals to receive training services under such project will include only individuals who have been determined to be suitable for and in need of such training services by the State agency or agencies designated as provided in section 5(a)(1) of the State in which the workshop or rehabilitation facility is located, (C) the full range of training services will be made available to each such individual, to the extent of his need for such services, and (D) the project, including the participating workshop or rehabilitation facility and the training services provided, meet such other requirements as he may prescribe for carrying out the purposes of this subsection.

"(4) Payments under this subsection may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as he finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

"Workshop improvement grants

"(b)(1) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to workshops during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years to pay part of the cost of projects to analyze, improve, and increase their professional services to the handicapped, their business management, or any other part of their operations affecting their capacity to provide employment and services for the handicapped.

"(2) No part of any grant made pursuant to this subsection may be used to pay costs of acquiring, constructing, expanding, remodeling, or altering any building.

"(3) Payments under this subsection may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as he finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

"Technical assistance to workshops

"(c)(1) The Secretary is authorized, directly or by contract with State vocational

rehabilitation agencies or experts or consultants or groups thereof, to provide technical assistance to workshops.

"(2) Any such experts or consultants shall, while serving pursuant to such contracts, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"National Policy and Performance Council

"(d) (1) There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Policy and Performance Council, consisting of twelve members, not otherwise in the employ of the United States, appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. The Secretary shall from time to time appoint one of the members to serve as Chairman. The appointed members shall be selected from among leaders in the vocational rehabilitation or workshop fields, State or local government, and business and from among representatives of related professions, labor leaders, and the general public. Each appointed member shall hold office for a term of four years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that, of the twelve members first appointed, three shall hold office for a term of three years, three shall hold office for a term of two years, and three shall hold office for a term of one year, as designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment. None of such twelve members shall be eligible for reappointment until a year has elapsed after the end of his preceding term.

"(2) The Council shall (A) advise the Secretary with respect to the policies and criteria to be used by him in determining whether or not to make grants under subsection (a); (B) make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to workshop improvement and the extent to which this section is effective in accomplishing this purpose; and (C) perform such other services with respect to workshops as the Secretary may request.

"(3) The Secretary shall make available to the Council such technical, administrative, and other assistance as it may require to carry out its functions.

"(4) Appointed members of the Council, while attending meetings or conferences thereof or otherwise serving on business of the Council, shall be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(e) The Secretary shall make no grant under this section to any workshop or rehabilitation facility which does not comply with safety standards which the Secretary of Labor shall prescribe by regulation.

"(f) There is authorized to be appropriated for making grants under subsection (a) and subsection (b) of this section $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $14,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years only such sums may be appropriated for making grants under subsection (a) and subsection (b) of this section as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"WAIVER OF STATEWIDENESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LOCALLY FINANCED ACTIVITY

"SEC. 15. In the case of any activity which, in the judgment of the Secretary, is likely to assist in promoting the vocational rehabilitation of substantially larger numbers of handicapped individuals or the vocational rehabilitation of individuals with particular types of disabilities in a State or States, the Secretary may waive compliance, with respect to vocational rehabilitation services furnished as part of such activity, with the requirement of section 5(a)(3) that the plan be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State to the extent and for such period as may be provided in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, but only if the non-Federal share of the cost of such vocational rehabilitation services is met from funds made available by a political subdivision of the State (including, to the extent permitted by such regulations, funds contributed to such subdivision by a private agency, organization, or individual).

"NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS TO REHABILITATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

"SEC. 16. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Commission on Architectural Barriers to Rehabilitation of the Handicapped, consisting of the Secretary, or his designee, who shall be Chairman, and not more than fifteen members appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. The fifteen appointed members shall be representative of the general public, and of private professional groups having an interest in and able to contribute to the solution of architectural problems which impede the rehabilitation of the handicapped.

"(b) The Commission shall (1) determine how and to what extent architectural barriers impede access to or use of facilities in buildings of all types by the handicapped; (2) determine what is being done, especially by public and other nonprofit agencies and groups having an interest in and a capacity to deal with the problem, to eliminate such barriers from existing buildings and to prevent their incorporation into buildings constructed in the future; and (3) prepare plans and proposals for such further action as may be necessary to achieve the goal of ready access to and full use of facilities in buildings of all types by the handicapped, including proposals for bringing together in a cooperative effort, agencies, organizations, and groups already working toward that goal or whose cooperation is essential to effective and comprehensive action.

"(c) The Commission is authorized to appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants, and to establish such committees, as may be useful in carrying out its functions, to make studies, and to contract for studies or demonstrations to assist it in performing its functions. The Secretary shall make available to the Commission such technical, administrative, and other assistance as it may require to carry out its functions.

"(d) Appointed members of the Commission and special advisory and technical experts and consultants appointed pursuant to subsection (c) shall, while attending meetings or conferences thereof or otherwise serving on business of the Commission, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(e) The Commission shall, prior to January 1, 1968, submit a final report of its activities, together with its recommendations for further carrying out the purposes of this section, to the Secretary for transmission by him together with his recommendations to the President and then to the Congress. The Commission shall also prepare such interim reports as the Secretary may request.

"(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $250,000 for carrying out the purposes of this section."

SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING TO EXPAND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES

SEC. 4. (a)(1) Section 4(a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 34(a)) is amended by striking out "(1)" where it first appears therein and inserting it immediately after "the Secretary shall make grants".

(2) Clause (2) of section 4(a) of such Act is amended to read: "(2)(A) to States and public and other nonprofit organizations and agencies for paying part of the cost of planning, preparing for, and initiating special programs to expand vocational rehabilitation services in those States where, in the judgment of the Secretary, such action holds promise of yielding a substantial increase in the number of persons vocationally rehabilitated, except that sums appropriated for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1970, shall not be available for grants under this clause, and sums appropriated for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1970, for grants under this clause shall remain available for such grants until the close of June 30, 1971, and (B) to States (but not to exceed $100,000 for any State for any fiscal year) to meet the cost of planning for the development of a comprehensive vocational rehabilitation program in each State, with a view to achieving the orderly development of vocational rehabilitation services in the State (including vocational rehabilitation services provided by private nonprofit agencies), and making vocational rehabilitation services available to all handicapped individuals in the State by July 1, 1975, except that sums appropriated for any fiscal year beginning prior to July 1, 1965, or ending after June 30, 1967, shall not be available for grants under this clause, and sums appropriated for the period beginning July 1, 1965, and ending June 30, 1967, for grants under this clause shall remain available for such grants until the close of June 30, 1968."

(3) Paragraph (2) of section 4(d) of such Act is amended by inserting "(other than subsection (a)(2))" after "under this section" where it first appears therein, and by striking out "under this section" where it next appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "thereunder".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1965.

RAISING OF LIMITATIONS ON TRAINING

SEC. 5. (a) Section 4(a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 34(a)) is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof: "Grants for training and traineeships under clause (1) of this subsection may include training and traineeships in physical medicine and rehabilitation, physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech pathology and audiology, rehabilitation nursing, rehabilitation social work, prosthetics and orthotics, rehabilitation psychology, rehabilitation counseling, recreation for the ill and handicapped, and other specialized fields contributing to vocational rehabilitation. No grant shall be made under clause (1) or clause (2) of this subsection for furnishing to an individual any one course of study extending for a period in excess of four years".

(b) Section 7(a)(3) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 37 (a)(3)) is amended by striking out

all that follows "any one course of study" and inserting in lieu thereof "for a period in excess of four years, and such training, instruction, fellowships, and traineeships may be in the fields of physical medicine and rehabilitation, physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech pathology and audiology, rehabilitation nursing, rehabilitation social work, prosthetics and orthotics, rehabilitation psychology, rehabilitation counseling, recreation for the ill and handicapped, and other specialized fields contributing to vocational rehabilitation; and".

DELETION OF ECONOMIC NEED AS REQUIREMENT FOR SERVICES

SEC. 6. (a) Section 11(a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 41) is amended by striking out "in the case of any such individual found to require financial assistance with respect thereto,".

(b) Paragraph (6) of section 11(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "(except where necessary in connection with determinations of eligibility or nature or scope of services)".

RESEARCH AND INFORMATION

SEC. 7. (a) Effective July 1, 1965, section 7(a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 37(a)) is amended by deleting paragraph (1); by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively; and by striking out, in the paragraph herein redesignated as paragraph (3), "as to the studies, investigations, demonstrations, and reports referred to in paragraph (1) and other matters".

(b) Effective July 1, 1965, section 7 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 37) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The Secretary is authorized, directly or by contract—

"(1) to conduct research, studies, investigations, and demonstrations, and to make reports, with respect to abilities, aptitudes, and capacities of handicapped individuals, development of their potentialities, and their utilization in gainful and suitable employment; and

"(2) to plan, establish, and operate an information service, to make available to agencies, organizations, and other groups and persons concerned with vocational rehabilitation, information on rehabilitation resources useful for various kinds of disability and on research and the results thereof and on other matters which may be helpful in promoting the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals and their greater utilization in gainful and suitable employment.

There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this subsection."

FLEXIBILITY IN STATE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 8. (a) Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 35(a)) is amended by striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1)(A) designate a State agency as the sole State agency to administer the plan, or to supervise its administration in a political subdivision of the State by a sole local agency of such political subdivision, except that where under the State's law the State blind commission, or other agency which provides assistance or services to the adult blind, is authorized to provide them vocational rehabilitation services, such commission or agency may be designated as the sole State agency to administer the part of the plan under which vocational rehabilitation services are provided for the blind (or to supervise the administration of such part in a political subdivision of the State by a sole local agency of such political subdivision) and a separate State agency may be designated as the sole State agency with respect to the rest of the State plan;

"(B) provide that the State agency so designated to administer or supervise the administration of the State plan, or (if there are two State agencies designated under subparagraph (A)) so much of the State plan as does not relate to services for the blind, shall be (i) a State agency primarily concerned with vocational rehabilitation, or vocational and other rehabilitation, of disabled individuals, (ii) the State agency administering or supervising the administration of education or vocational education in the State, or (iii) a State agency which includes at least two other major organizational units each of which administers one or more of the major public education, public health, public welfare, or labor programs of the State;

"(2) provide, except in the case of agencies described in paragraph (1)(B)(i)—

"(A) that the State agency designated pursuant to paragraph (1) (or each State agency if two are so designated) shall include a vocational rehabilitation bureau, division, or other organizational unit which (i) is primarily concerned with vocational rehabilitation, or vocational and other rehabilitation, of disabled individuals, and is responsible for the vocational rehabilitation program of such State agency, (ii) has a full-time director, and (iii) has a staff employed on such rehabilitation work of such organizational unit all or substantially all of whom are employed full time on such work; and

"(B)(i) that such unit shall be located at an organizational level and shall have an organizational status within such State agency comparable to that of other major organizational units of such agency or (ii) in the case of an agency described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii), either that such unit shall be so located and have such status or that the director of such unit shall be the executive officer of such State agency; except that, in the case of a State which has designated only one State agency pursuant to paragraph (1), such State may, if it so desires, assign responsibility for the part of the plan under which vocational rehabilitation services are provided for the blind to one organizational unit of such agency and assign responsibility for the rest of the plan to another organizational unit of such agency, with the provisions of this paragraph (2) applying separately to each of such units."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall become effective July 1, 1967, except that, in the case of any State, such amendments shall be effective on such earlier date (on or after the date of enactment of this Act) as such State has in effect an approved plan meeting the requirements of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act as amended by subsection (a).

SPECIAL SERVICES FOR THE BLIND AND THE DEAF

SEC. 9. So much of subsection (a) of section 11 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 41(a)) as precedes paragraph (1) is amended by inserting after the second semicolon "provision, in the case of handicapped individuals, of reader services for such individuals who are blind and of interpreter services in the case of such individuals who are deaf;".

SERVICES TO DETERMINE REHABILITATION POTENTIAL OF RECIPIENT

SEC. 10. (a) Subsection (b) of section 11 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 41(b)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof: "; except that nothing in the preceding provisions of this subsection or in subsection (a) shall be construed to exclude from 'vocational rehabilitation services' any goods or services provided to an individual who is under a physical or mental disability which constitutes a substantial handicap to employment, during the period, not in excess of eighteen months in the case of any individual who is mentally retarded or has a disability designated for this purpose by the Secretary, or six months in the case of an individual with any other disability, determined (in accordance with regulations of the Secretary) to be necessary for, and which are provided for the purpose of, ascertaining whether it may reasonably be expected that such individual will be rendered fit to engage in a remunerative occupation through the provision of goods and services described in subsection (a), but only if the goods or services provided to him during such period would constitute 'vocational rehabilitation services' if his disability were of such a nature that he would be a 'handicapped individual' under such preceding provisions of this subsection".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply in the case of expenditures made after June 30, 1965, under a State plan approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

MANAGEMENT SERVICES AND SUPERVISION OF BUSINESS ENTERPRISES OF THE HANDICAPPED

SEC. 11. Effective July 1, 1966, section 11(a)(7) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 41(a)(7)) as amended to read as follows:

"(7) in the case of any type of small business operated by the severely handicapped the operation of which can be improved by management services and supervision provided by the State agency, the provision of such services and supervision, alone or together with the acquisition by the State agency of vending stands or other equipment and initial stocks and supplies; and".

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 12. (a) Section 4(d)(3) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 34(d)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Appointed members of the Council, while attending meetings or conferences thereof or otherwise serving on business of the Council or at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently."

(b)(1) The last sentence of section 4(a), the second sentence of section 5(d)(1), the first sentence of section 4(d)(2), section 5(a)(4), the paragraphs of section 7(a) redesignated (by section 7 of this Act) as paragraphs (1) and (3), the portion of section 11(a) preceding paragraph (1), paragraph (8) of section 11(a), section 11(b), and so much of section 11(c) as precedes paragraph (1), of such Act, are each amended by striking out "physically handicapped individuals" and inserting in lieu thereof "handicapped individuals".

(2) The third sentence of section 4(d)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "physically handicapped" and inserting in lieu thereof "handicapped".

(3) Section 8 of such Act is amended by striking out "Physically Handicapped" and inserting in lieu thereof "Handicapped" and by striking out "handicapped individuals" and inserting in lieu thereof "individuals".

(c) Section 11(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "severely handicapped individuals" and inserting in lieu thereof "the severely handicapped".

(d) Subsections (a), (b), and (d) of section 11 of such Act are amended by striking out "remunerative" and inserting in lieu thereof "gainful".

FEDERAL SHARE

SEC. 13. (a) Effective for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, section 11(1) of the

Vocational Rehabilitation Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The term 'Federal share' for any State shall be equal to its Federal share as determined hereunder for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, plus one-half the difference between such share and 75 per centum."

(b) Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1966, such section 11(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The term 'Federal share' means 75 per centum."

Mr. DANIELS (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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments? If not, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, 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. 8310) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 486, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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 REMARKS

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

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING U.S. GOVERNOR TO AGREE TO AMENDMENTS TO THE ARTICLES OF AGREEMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, AND THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 494, Rept. No. 698) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

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 (S. 1742) to authorize the United States Governor to agree to amendments to the articles of agreements of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, 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.

AMENDING TITLES 10 AND 37, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 495, Rept. No. 699) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

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. 7843) to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize the survivors of a member of the Armed Forces who dies while on active duty to be paid for his unused accrued leave. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, 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.

VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, last month I traveled to South Vietnam as a member of a Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee on a factfinding tour. Upon returning from that country I made the following observation concerning teach-ins and demonstrations in this country against our policy in South Vietnam:

The Vietcong, North Vietnam, and Red China are able to capitalize propaganda-wise on such activities. They create doubt in the minds of many that America will stay. They are detrimental to an eventual peaceful solution. They have the effect of encouraging the Communists and directly contribute to the prolongation of the war. American boys are dying in South Vietnam. Many more will lose their lives in the next few months. Even if I disagreed with the policy of the United States, I would find some other way to influence my Government's policy rather than have the stain of American blood on my hands. This is a harsh conclusion, but it is true.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, one of the Nation's top newspapers, has articulated this problem in a very forceful and outstanding manner in an editorial on June 29, 1965. It is even more timely today than when written and I commend it to the Members without further comment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert this editorial of June 29, 1965, from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat in the daily RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH ON VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress are proud of the leadership demonstrated by our President yesterday when he conducted his White House press conference.

The President demonstrated his great desire to maintain peace throughout the world. He pointed out that we have learned many bitter lessons during the first half of this century. These experiences have caused us to be involved in great conflicts with other nations who do not understand our representative form of government.

President Johnson recognizes the ambitiousness of the Communist nations, and he is taking definite steps to see that we maintain a strong nation so that we can be independent in the future.

Every effort was made by the President to see that the peace of the world is maintained. He instructed Ambassador Goldberg to present a letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations requesting that the United Nations employ all of its resources, energies, and immense prestige to find ways to halt aggression and bring about peace in Vietnam.

America has always been a peace-loving nation, and President Johnson yesterday reemphasized our desire to maintain peace throughout the world. It is my hope we can accomplish this objective.

SCURRILOUS POSTHUMOUS ATTACK BY DREW PEARSON

Mr. WAGGONNER. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, on July 12 of this year, I took the floor to defend our colleague, the late T. A. Thompson, of Louisiana, against the scurrilous, posthumous attack by Drew Pearson.

Among the responses I received, was a letter from the vice president of Hercules Powder Co., Mr. J. R. L. Johnson, Jr., which establishes once again that Pearson and the truth are strangers, that he has no compunction against lying if it suits his ugly purpose.

Mr. Johnson's letter further establishes this well-known point and I insert it now with his permission for all to see.

HERCULES POWDER CO.,
Wilmington, Del., July 15, 1965.

Hon. JOE D. WAGGONNER, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WAGGONNER: Thank you for including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 12, 1965, your remarks concerning Drew Pearson's article entitled "Chemical Companies Versus Water Bill."

Hercules Powder Co. has a plant at Lake Charles, La., which is located in the Seventh District. I know of no water pollution problem at that location and, so far as I can determine, no one from this company has ever talked to the late T. Ashton Thompson concerning problems of water pollution or his position on proposed water pollution legislation.

Hercules has been concerned with water pollution problems for many years and has spent substantial sums of money studying and eliminating these problems at its various plant locations. This company has also followed proposals in the Senate and in the House dealing with this problem. We feel that some legislation is needed but from our study of Senator MUSKIE's proposal and the revisions proposed to S. 4 by the House Public Works Committee, we feel that the modified bill suggested by the House version is superior and should be the one adopted if any Federal legislation is considered to be needed at this time.

We appreciate very much your setting the record straight on Drew Pearson's article.

Very truly yours,
J. R. L. JOHNSON, Jr.,
Vice President.

CHAIRMAN PATMAN CONTINUES THE BATTLE FOR REASONABLE INTEREST RATES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge no man has done more to advocate the cause of reasonable interest rates for the American people than the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN.

Chairman PATMAN reiterates his views on tight money in the August issue of the American Legion magazine in a debate with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK]. The title of the article is "Should We Have Lower Interest Rates and More Credit Available?" Chairman PATMAN takes the "yes" position, while the gentleman from Tennessee takes the typical Republican "no" position. In other words, Chairman PATMAN advocates a credit policy that would expand the Nation's economy, while the gentleman from Tennessee advocates a policy that would shut out most Americans in their drive for a better way of life.

In the Legion article Mr. PATMAN points out that there is no reason why a homeowner should have to pay for a house and then pay a second time to cover the interest payments. This is sound, well-founded, and logical reasoning; and if our Nation follows a pattern of reasonable interest rates such as those suggested by Chairman PATMAN, we can look forward to prolonged prosperity.

But, unfortunately, there has been an alarming swing to high interest rates and a tight money policy. The former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Walter W. Heller, warned in a recent speech:

Economic gains probably will slow down during the rest of the year and in 1966 and these developments could dampen economic spirits and lead to a high level stall * * * not a recesssion but a marked slowdown with a rise in unemployment, falling profit margins, and a cutback in plans for capital expansion.

There is one guaranteed way to make certain that Mr. Heller's prediction becomes a fact, and that is to follow the advice set forth by the gentleman from Tennessee and the rest of the Republicans who advocate a policy of making it hard for Americans to purchase the necessities of life.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the RECORD a copy of the American Legion article discussing interest rates:

SHOULD WE HAVE LOWER INTEREST RATES AND MORE CREDIT AVAILABLE?

The question that is posed is like asking whether a man who has been without adequate nourishment needs food.

The American Legion took sides on the question when its founders wrote the preamble to its constitution, which sets forth -) purposes. No. 6 reads: "To combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses."

The Federal Reserve System has changed from its well-conceived creation in 1913 to an absolute autocracy of the classes against the masses in 1965. It is now controlled by private bankers. The President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Congress do not fix our volume of money and interest rates. This is done by the Federal Reserve autocracy, which proclaims that it is independent—independent of the executive and congressional arms of the Government, yes—but not independent of the money powers in New York.

If the Fed for the past two decades had worked in the interest of the American public as hard as it has for private banking interests, our interest-bearing national debt, heading toward $325 billion, would be at least $50 billion less today—it might even have been cut in half. Our carrying charges on that debt, which run pretty close to a billion dollars a month, or $250 million a week, or around $35 million a day, would be halved if we were merely to revert to the pre-Eisenhower interest rates of the Roosevelt-Truman days.

Instead, the Fed has caused man-made recessions or depressions every 3 or 4 years by raising interest rates arbitrarily, tightening money capriciously, thereby robbing the masses and enriching the classes.

Think of the schools and hospitals that could be built, the area redevelopment in city and countryside, the idle factory wheels that could be turning and the jobs that could ensue if the excess $6 billion annual carrying charge we're paying on the national debt were turned into the productive economy of America.

There are many reasons why we should have lower interest rates. I think it's a disgrace that when we buy a house or build a school on long-term credit, we actually pay at least twice for them. High interest charges on our mortgages are responsible. And isn't it rather silly for all the folks in town to pay once for the building of the schoolhouse, and once again to the bankers in interest for merely renting money for its construction?

Americans are paying extortionate interest rates which will aggregate over $75 billion in interest charges during 1965. This means that the consumer is paying far too much for the privilege of owning an automobile, a washing machine, or a split level.

Legionnaires, keep a sharp eye on the autocracy of the Federal Reserve System and those who control it. It must have its power thwarted for the good of nearly 200 million Americans whose pockets are being picked.

WRIGHT PATMAN.

Thirty years ago a buyer virtually had to pay cash for a car or a house, for it was almost impossible to borrow money at any price. Today, almost everything is bought on credit because the American people have saved their money and deposited it in banks where it can be used by others while it's there.

In other words, because the citizens of this country have produced for their families and saved for their security, and because our banking system has become so capable in providing that these savings do not just sit there but are used constantly and securely for even more production and thus even more savings, we have created a truly great society.

The key word is savings. When you and I save money, we put it in the bank. If someone else wants to use it, you do not lend these savings free. Nobody is going to risk his money for less than he can make in a safe investment. That is why Federal restrictions on interest are difficult, at best, and dangerous.

Because money is basically like any other commodity, to make it cheap we have to produce a great deal of it. In the 1940's we were producing for war and consuming little at home. We had laws limiting wages, interest rates, and prices. Later, we expanded production of consumer goods while not increasing the supply of money. The pressure eased and laws on prices, wages, and finally interest rates were repealed. If Washington had chosen to keep a ceiling on interest, the Government could have done so only by dramatically adding to the supply of money and forcing prices of goods up.

In effect, we were required to impose price controls because there was more money available than there were goods on which to spend it. Obviously, in a free economy, prices would rise in such a situation until the excess cash was sopped up. The result would have penalized the poorer people who had no savings and limited incomes. Thus, the law was passed imposing ceilings on wages and prices.

Higher prices literally destroy the savings of people. Those on fixed incomes such as social security or pensions are hurt first. If the condition worsens, they soon find they

cannot afford even basic necessities. Widows, whose husbands had bought insurance once considered adequate, have difficulty meeting bills. For these reasons our Government decided we could not afford the self delusion of laws setting arbitrarily low interest ceilings. Rather, the people through their State governments attacked excessive charges with usury laws.

In conclusion, if we want to manage one sector of the economy, such as the cost of money, then we must manage the rest through wage and price controls. Thus, the opportunity for all to earn and to save is reduced. If we refuse the alternative of wage and price controls, then we allow and even encourage massive price increases. Here, too, the opportunity for those less fortunate to live decently is reduced. The price of wishful thinking on interest rates is too high. Our freedom is too dear to lose through lack of self discipline and individual responsibility.

BILL BROCK.

THE 1ST CAVALRY DIVISION (AIRMOBILE) FROM FORT BENNING, GA.

Mr. CALLAWAY. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, today all other news is overshadowed by the sobering reports from Vietnam. The war has taken on new proportions and this Nation must, as always, rise to meet the situation. For this job, the job upon which may well rest the future of the free world, the President has called upon the 1st Cavalry Division—Airmobile—from Fort Benning, Ga. The newly formed 1st Cavalry is a merger of two of this country's finest outfits: the experimental 11th Air Assault, and the famous 2d Division—"second to none."

The people of my district are proud to have provided the home for these units and the proving ground for the air mobile concept. We are proud to have known their fine commander, General Kinnard.

The 1st Air Cavalry has been called to Vietnam because it is trained to handle the job there. The job that they do will require the support of American courage and American strength. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this Nation and its people will pledge every resource to aid these boys in their efforts to defeat communism in southeast Asia.

CONCERN WITH AID PROGRAM TO SEND COLLEGE GRADUATES TO VIETNAM AS INTERNS

Mr. ADAIR. 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. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on June 29 of this year I rose to inform this body of my concern with an AID program which proposed to send some 20 college graduate students to Vietnam as interns.

At that time I said that I was most concerned about the safety of these young men. AID, I noted, was vague about this aspect of the matter but reportedly had said that the Vietcong usually do not attack AID people. I contrasted this alleged statement with a statement by President Johnson to the effect that AID workers were prime targets of the Communist terrorists.

Now I have been saddened to learn that one of these young men, Theodore M. Smith, of the University of California, has been seriously wounded by a terrorist bomb while serving in the "intern" program in South Vietnam.

In my original remarks I indicated that better uses of AID funds could be found than the financing of a highly dangerous and poorly conceived program such as this. I hoped that AID would drop the program forthwith before any young men could be sent to Vietnam under its sponsorship. Unfortunately, my hopes were not realized.

I am sorry that this has happened. My protest was not heeded and these students were sent. The Agency for International Development should recall the remaining students immediately. We are at war and everyone knows it. It is high time to stop this amateurish and ad hoc approach to the war in Vietnam and let our best professionals get this job done.

Now, for those of you who missed this item in the Washington Post of Tuesday, I will read the item that appeared:

BOMB WOUNDS U.S. STUDENT

SAIGON, July 26.—An American student from the University of California was seriously wounded by a terrorist bomb last Thursday, a U.S. spokesman announced today.

He said the student was Theodore M. Smith, 24, of Fullerton, Calif., 1 of 19 students sent to Vietnam by the State Department in June to familiarize themselves with U.S. aid operations.

Smith was injured in a blast at the home of the U.S. AID mission representative for Lamdong Province, about 100 miles northeast of Saigon, where he was staying. No one else was injured.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ST GERMAIN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday afternoon at the time rollcall 208 was taken I was in conference in my office with officials of the Urban Renewal Administration and the mayor of the city of Providence on important business having to do with the operations of that city.

Mr. Speaker, I miscalculated on my timing and was not present for the vote on the motion to recommit H.R. 77. Had I been present my vote would have been against recommittal.

PICTURES RECENTLY TAKEN OF MARS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon at 2:30, in the rooms of the Science and Astronautics Committee, 2318 Rayburn Building, we will have an opportunity to see the pictures that were recently taken of Mars. I have seen these pictures; I saw them at the White House this morning. Dr. Pickering and his staff are coming up to show them this afternoon.

I realize we have important business to dispose of today, but those of you who can get away to see them will be very well rewarded. I should point out that this invitation is to Members of the House only, and not to the staff.

INVESTIGATION OF BANKING CONCENTRATION AND CONTROL IN CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. PATMAN. 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. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a resolution adopted by the Ohio State Legislature indicates that the country is becoming increasingly aware of and alarmed by the tremendous concentration of economic power in the hands of little cliques which control the enormous assets of huge banks.

The Ohio House of Representatives, by a vote of 113 to 2, directed the State's Legislative Services Commission to investigate the legality and propriety of the officers of the Cleveland Trust Co., voting the bank's own shares to perpetuate their own control, and also using the bank's trust department to dominate many major corporations.

Although Ohio law bans corporations from voting its own stock, the Cleveland Trust Co., skirts this rule by assigning the voting rights to a third of its stock—which it holds in trust for various estates—to a dummy partnership known as A. A. Welsh & Co.

Through this same device, using the economic power of stock held for various estates by its trust department, this bank has placed its chairman, George Gund, and its president, George Karch, on the boards of 43 corporations. Through these board memberships, they either control or have a loud voice in the affairs of companies with billions of dollars in assets.

Through a combination of these positions and the power of their bank to grant or deny credit, these men wield vast economic power which would seem to be totally out of keeping with the principles of our economic free enterprise system.

It has long been the public policy of the United States to curb and prevent such concentrations of power of life and death over whole industries and the entire economy.

The Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, in previous investigations, has spelled out the interlocking directorates and close knit relationships through which the Nation's banks and many great corporations seem to be banded together to form a mighty confederation which, in many economic matters, may constitute more power than that held by the Federal Government.

The Ohio Legislature has taken cognizance of this threat to economic liberty and it seems to me that the appropriate Federal agencies should join the investigation.

Surely the Department of Justice has a responsibility to see if Ohio banks are violating Federal as well as State laws.

The Federal Reserve Board has a duty to require the Cleveland Trust Co. and other banks to make full disclosures of their operations, and to determine whether a self-perpetuating directorate is serving the interests of the depositors, or their own selfish self-interests.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation should require banks to observe the spirit as well as the letter of National and State laws.

State and Federal authorities should cooperate to assure that the Nation's big banks are law-abiding citizens, and not a group of economic czars who consider themselves above the law, and constantly devise cute tricks to evade and ignore both the letter and the spirit of statutes enacted to regulate them.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 21, 1965 and the Cincinnati Enquirer of the same date carry excellent and timely articles with respect to the Ohio banking investigation.

These articles follow:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, July 21, 1965]

OHIO HOUSE OK'S BANK STOCK STUDY

(By John E. Bryan)

A resolution to investigate banks, especially Cleveland Trust Co., voting large blocks of their own and other banks' and corporations' stocks was passed yesterday in the Ohio house of representatives by a vote of 113 to 2.

The resolution was introduced in the house by A. G. Lancione, Democrat, of Bellaire, and will be sponsored in the senate by Senators Ray T. Miller, Jr., Democrat, of Cuyahoga, and Oliver Ocasek, Democrat, of Summit.

The resolution requests the Legislative Service Commission "to study the legality and propriety of banks holding and voting extensive blocks of their own shares and shares of other banks and to direct the State superintendent of banks to launch an immediate investigation of such practices."

It notes reports that Cleveland Trust "holds a substantial share of its own stock, more than 33 percent, in a fiduciary capacity and votes such stock in election of directors and in other matters of corporate management and that other banks organized under the laws of this State follow similar practices."

Representative Lancione and Senators Miller and Ocasek said "It is apparent, in some cases, that groups of men have seized enormous economic power through either open defiance of the laws of Ohio and the Nation or because of loopholes in the law or ambiguity in existing laws."

They added it had been asserted in Washington that purposes of the far-reaching Bank Holding Company Act has been circumvented by Cleveland Trust Co. through A. A. Welsh & Co., a partnership nominee of the bank.

The legislators stated that "A. A. Welsh not only has legal title to the dominating shares in its own bank but also has legal title and votes large blocks of stock in the National City Bank and Union Commerce Bank of Cleveland, the Firestone Bank in Akron, and banks in other Ohio cities.

"A. A. Welsh & Co. also has legal title to a dominating interest in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the Sherwin-Williams Co., the Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co., Island Creek Coal Co., and many other prominent Cleveland corporations."

A Cleveland Trust spokesman said time was required for studying the resolution before making comment, possibly today.

President George F. Karch previously had explained that the purpose of A. A. Welsh & Co. is for efficient handling of numerous accounts, including those set up by individuals and charitable institutions.

He termed it a common practice among trust companies and financial institutions.

The other spokesman for the bank said this operation is permitted by the Ohio act, holding securities as fiduciary, passed in 1945.

The legislators pointed out that Chairman George Gund of Cleveland Trust and Karch are directors of 43 corporations and in most instances occupy these offices by reason of the A. A. Welsh & Co. holdings of stock in these companies.

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer, July 21, 1965]

STUDY TO CONSIDER CURBING BANKS IN VOTING OWN STOCK

COLUMBUS.—A study of the State banking laws, with a view toward restricting the right of banks and trust companies to vote their own stock, was called for in a resolution approved by the house here Tuesday.

The measure, which would provide for a study by the legislative service commission, was sponsored by Democratic leader A. G. Lancione, of Belmont County.

Senator Ray T. Miller, Jr., Democrat of Cleveland, and Senator Oliver Ocasek, Democrat of Akron, will sponsor the resolution in the senate.

In a statement issued in connection with the resolution, the sponsors made it clear that their proposal was aimed at the giant Cleveland Trust Co. Any changes in the banking laws would have far-reaching effect on all other State banks and trust companies, however.

Mr. Lancione said the study group should look into the methods and devices used by the banking firms to not only control the banks' own assets but to control other large industry.

"It is apparent, in some cases, that groups of men have seized enormous economic power through either open defiance of the laws or because of loopholes in the law," the sponsor said.

Citing Cleveland Trust as "a glaring example," the lawmakers said officers of that firm have circumvented the Federal Bank Holding Act through A. A. Welsh & Co., a partnership nominee.

The Welsh Co., they said, not only votes more than 33 percent of the bank's stock, but votes "what is practically control" of many of Ohio's big corporations.

In addition to the bank's own stock, the sponsors said the officers hold title to blocks of stock in the National City Bank and Union Commerce Bank of Cleveland, the Firestone Bank of Akron and banks in other Ohio cities. The partnership nominee firm also has legal title to a dominating interest in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the Sherwin Williams Co., the Cleveland Cliff Iron Co., Island Creek Coal Co. and many other corporations, they said.

The sponsors also asserted that two officers of the trust company are directors of 43 corporations by reason of stock holdings in the firms.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1965 AND ITS EFFECT ON WHEAT GROWERS

Mr. STALBAUM. 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. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, the Agricultural Act of 1965, which is now before the House of Representatives, contains provisions which vitally affect wheatgrowers and which to some extent may possibly affect consumers.

It is wise for us to listen when a single organization, representing both the interests of farmers and the interests of consumers, speaks on this legislation. Such an organization is the Cooperative League of the United States.

The Cooperative League of the United States, as most of the Members know, is a national federation of all types of cooperatives—electric co-ops, farm supply co-ops, insurance cooperatives, and co-ops handling consumer goods. Its president and executive director is Jerry Voorhis, a former Member of the House.

The Cooperative League's directors, meeting in Chicago July 19, approved the following resolution:

Considering both the interests of consumer and producers, the Cooperative League believes that Congress should approve the Johnson administration's 1965 wheat proposals.

This bill would end Agriculture Department subsidies on wheat sold overseas. To offset this cut in wheatgrowers' incomes—and to boost them a bit—the administration proposes to raise the price that millers must pay for wheat used in the United States. This would raise the cost of wheat in a 1-pound loaf of bread two-thirds of a cent, and it would raise the cost of wheat in a pound of white flour 1 cent.

Most wheatgrowers now aren't getting the equivalent of a 5-percent return on their farm investment and the minimum wage for their hours of work. Under the bill, they'd get about 15 cents more for the average bushel they produce.

The consumer's long-term best interests lie in reasonable and relatively stable farm prices that adequately compensate producers. This pending legislation would assure such prices. We appreciate Secretary Freeman's determined effort not only to increase wheatgrowers' incomes but also to alert consumers to the limited increases in flour and bread prices which are justifiable.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Cooperative League for thus considering the interests of both farmers and consumers and for striking a balance on this bill. I am pleased to call their views of the league to the attention of my colleagues.

THE EYE OF MARINER IV

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, today the President of the United States is viewing the 21 pictures taken of Mars by Mariner IV. That "the eye" of Mariner IV, a tiny 5-inch vidicon tube which took the pictures, was developed and manufactured by General Electrodynamics Corp. of Garland, Tex., is a source of considerable pride to myself and my constituency.

Garland is a busy suburb of Dallas, and it was there, less than 10 years ago, that General Electrodynamics Corp. was founded by its president, Francis J. Salgo.

This small industry, which has grown in its 9-year history from a 5-man staff to more than 200 men and women, is today one of the outstanding leaders in the world of electronics.

We in the Dallas area take particular pride in the accomplishments of this company, for they produce vidicon tubes for Ranger, the Nimbus weather satellite, the orbiting astronomical observatory, and the Surveyor Moonlander.

Heralded from coast-to-coast by television, newspapers, and periodicals, General Electrodynamics Corp. shares in the growth of the peaceful pursuits of our space program.

It is with singular pride that we point to just a few facts about this tiny vidicon tube. It survived a launch environment, traveled 325 million miles, withstood temperatures from −40° centigrade to a −50° centigrade, then 9 months after it was launched, when turned on, it operated with no adjustments to accomplish exactly what it set out to do. It photographed the red planet Mars. It came, it saw, and it conquered; and since antiquity, that has been the formula for success.

It is with considerable national pride that we honor the scientists and engineers at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, Calif., who managed the Mariner program for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. They search for the finest in equipment, and they have found that this excellence exists today in the small companies of the United States.

CRIME—LET US DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker once again the hue and cry is being raised about doing something with the crime situation in the District of Columbia.

There is no doubt that it is bad and it appears it will get worse before it gets much better. The question is what will we do about it? What can we do about it?

While the administration of criminal justice and the improvement of criminal procedures is important, it should be understood by all who know anything about the problem that this is only one facet of the problem, that criminal procedures and the administration of criminal justice look toward the detection of crime and the punishment for crime. Neither the detection of crime nor the punishment for crime prevents crime.

The real problem is how do we prevent crime.

Crime prevention can be accomplished by no single way or method or system. It requires a combination of many activities.

First and foremost is moral training. This must come primarily in the home and in the church and synagogue. It can be supplemented in the schools. Second is a matter of education—education which will not only teach the youngsters the A B C's or the three R's but will also teach them the skills that will make them valuable citizens when they reach the age when they must seek a livelihood for themselves and their families. Lastly and just as important as the first two is the matter of policing the community so as to deter the potential criminal from committing a crime, to arrest him when attempting the crime and, of course, arresting him and holding him for court action when a crime has been committed.

Moralists tell us that money is the root of all evil. That may be so. But more important, money can be the foundation of the prevention of crime and certainly for the detection and punishment of crime.

Money is needed for education. Money is needed for training. Money is needed for police protection. Money is needed for crime detection and for criminal prosecutions.

It is my opinion that the District of Columbia has been starved on all counts and insufficient money has been supplied to the District for those purposes. Our education system is not what it should be. Our training system is just about beginning to get underway in the President's new antipoverty program. I hope it will be successful. Most important is the fact that we have never had a sufficiently large police force in the city of Washington.

There is a minimum of crime on Capitol Hill and I believe that is because Capitol Hill is so well policed.

The city of New York has just proved my point. When crime got out of hand on its subway system, a policeman was put on every subway train during the hours when crime was most prevalent. The result is almost a 50-percent reduction in crime on the New York City subways. The same can be accomplished in the city of Washington. There should be more policemen, there should be more patrol cars, there should be more police dogs. The last time I made that statement I was asked does that mean putting a policeman on every corner. My answer is "Yes." If that is the only way to prevent crime in the city of Washington, "let us put a policeman on every corner." Of course, it will cost money, but it will be worth it.

Where will the money come from? It will have to come from the U.S. Treasury. The District of Columbia will never be able to raise enough money taxwise or otherwise to pay the cost of this additional burden. We should authorize and appropriate it and do it without too much delay. While doing that for the city of Washington, the National Park Police Force should also be augmented so that the parks are constantly patrolled, not only during the daytime but when the patrol is needed most, and that is between dark or sunset and morning of the next day.

AMENDMENTS TO LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION ACT

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a bill I am today introducing.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, during the 2d session of the 88th Congress, the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965 was enacted into law—Public Law 88–578. Although the law became effective on January 1, 1965, the implementation of certain aspects was not announced until March 9, 1965. I refer, of course, to the various fee schedules covering entrance to and use of Federal recreation areas.

A flood of protest poured out of my congressional district following the fee schedule announcement. Businessmen, sportsmen, ordinary citizens bitterly denounced this violation of long-established public policy—a policy whereby public lands and resources are developed and conserved for the public and used fully and freely by the public.

Mr. Speaker, when the land and water conservation fund bill was in committee last year, I sent out a newsletter to my constituents expressing strong opposition to certain aspects of the legislation. I called attention to the proposals involving recreation and user fees. I discussed with some of my colleagues the potential danger of an indiscriminate application of the fee schedules.

The fears I felt then have been realized. Fees and charges have been applied with a magnificent disregard for need or enforceability. In my own district it seems that every piece of Federal property with a tree, bush, stream, or picnic table thereon—however remote—now has an admission or user charge. An intolerable situation has been created.

At this point, let me emphasize that although I disagree with certain portions of the act, I must commend my colleagues in the House and Senate who participated in its drafting and passage, for I know they acted out of the highest motivation and concern for the national interest. My concern is not primarily

with the intent of the act, but rather with some of its methodology which directs various agencies to arrive at and administer the fee schedules.

Mr. Speaker, today I have dropped in the hopper a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 with respect to entrance admission and other recreation user fees and charges authorized thereunder. I include the bill in full at this point:

H.R. 10178

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460L–5)(a) is amended—

(1) by striking out "No fee of any kind shall be charged by a Federal agency under any provision of this Act for use of any waters" and inserting in lieu thereof "No fee of any kind shall be charged by a Federal agency under any provision of this Act for use of any waters or access thereto.", and

(2) by inserting after the third paragraph a new paragraph as follows:

"No entrance, admission, or other recreation user fee or charge shall be established or collected pursuant to this subsection, and the collection of any such fee previously established shall be suspended, unless and until a report describing such fee or charge has been filed with the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and following the date of such filing a period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress has expired without either House of the Congress approving a resolution stating in substance that such House does not favor such fee or charge. For the purpose of this paragraph (1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, and (2) in the computation of the sixty-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain."

Mr. Speaker, this bill amends section 2(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 in two particulars. First, where present law would prohibit any charge or fee for use of waters, this bill would add the words: "or access thereto."

Such amendment would permit long-established public policy to continue with respect to federally constructed lakes and reservoirs. In the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, Congress said:

> The navigable waters leading into the Mississippi and St. Lawrence and the carrying places between the same shall be common highways and forever free without any tax, impost or duty therefor.

In the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1962, Congress repeated and expanded this doctrine when it said:

> The water areas of such projects shall be open to public use generally without charge for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and other recreational purposes.

Section 1 of my bill would clarify the sense of Congress that there must be no charge for use of or access to Federal waters.

Section 2 would return jurisdiction by Congress to a portion of the power over the establishment and charge of user and entrance fees for public lands and waters. This power has been delegated, unwisely in my opinion, to the executive department.

My bill uses the sound, time-honored mechanism spelled out in the Reorganization Act which permits the President to make orders for reorganizing the executive department, but requires that these changes be filed with both Houses of Congress.

We ask no more than that the President submit to Congress any proposed fee schedules. These shall not become effective if either House passes a resolution against them within 60 days. I believe a serious error was committed when this obligation was delegated to the various executive agencies. Congress must do its duty to the people by retaining some power in its hands over this matter.

These two provisions of the bill would make unmistakably clear that Congress intends to jealously guard the right of our people to fully enjoy public lands and waters without undue charge. We will be saying there is to be no tampering with public policy unless and until Congress has given the matter serious study and review.

When he introduced similar legislation in the other body, the distinguished Senator HARRIS pinpointed the contradiction between these entrance fees and the administration's war on poverty and the "See the USA" programs. How can we spend hundreds of millions of dollars to rehabilitate people, and then make enjoyment of our natural resources dependent on wealth? How can we justify encouraging Americans to see their own country first, and then force them to drop coins in the box every time they turn around?

Many of my colleagues have already experienced the results of these fees. What has happened in my district has happened in theirs. They know of the thousands of impoverished families who can no longer enjoy the natural wonders of our great country because they cannot afford these entrance and user fees.

Mr. Speaker, let us undo the damage that has been done. Let us revitalize the public policy that allows everyone free access to our natural resources, and let us return control of such policies where it belongs—in the Congress of the United States.

VIETNAM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the American public are rightly and deeply concerned with our policies in Vietnam. It is an area of interest that must, by its very nature, be scrutinized fully.

It is most distressing, therefore, when efforts at a reasonable discussion are thwarted.

I call to the attention of the membership the statement of July 16, 1965, by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], chairman of the House Republican conference.

It deserves the attention of the House and I insert it here:

STATEMENT FROM THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE MELVIN R. LAIRD, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN

Has critical bipartisan discussion about our policies in Vietnam been abandoned?

It would seem so but I would hope not.

Certainly rational debate and reasonable discussion have been abandoned—not by Republicans, but by the leader of the President's majority in the U.S. Senate.

This fact is inescapable, and the situation it creates is deplorable.

The first attempt to scuttle bipartisan debate occurred on June 30, 1965. It was ignored by Republicans in the hope that the intemperate remarks in that speech were a mere lapse, an accident, and not a deliberate attempt to silence the dialog, impose conformity, and obliterate efforts to arrive at an informed and broadly supported policy toward Vietnam.

It was not a mere lapse.

Any doubt that it was was erased on July 8, 1965 when the majority leader of the Senate again launched a vituperative attack on the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

The natural reaction to the tone and innuendo of the majority leader's two recent speeches would be to reply in kind. This would be the natural reaction—and it would be fully justified.

But it would not be constructive.

Republicans could adopt similar tactics and join personalities rather than issues. We could attempt, for example, to impugn this particular spokesman's credentials to question criticism of foreign and military policy. For the Senate Democratic leader has himself contributed to the "dialog"—though not always in support of the President—and has himself participated rather fully in publicly questioning some of the actions taken in southeast Asia.

I suspect that the President may have wished at times that his majority leader and kept to himself such suggestions as the neutralization of all of southeast Asia.

The Senator's more recent statements concerning Republican contributions to the debate on Vietnam are confusing.

It would seem from the Senator's remarks that the distinction between statesmanship and political chicanery goes no further than the difference in party labels of those making the remarks.

If a Republican advocates a particular course, it is politics and irresponsible politics at that. If a Democratic President subsequently adopts that course, it is instantly transformed into statesmanship.

The President's decision last February to go North must have shocked and alarmed the Senator, for on "Meet the Press" just 1 month before (January 3), the Senator said: "I feel just as strongly that we cannot carry the war into North Vietnam because if you carry the consequences of that action to its ultimate conclusion, it means war with Communist China, and a situation will be created which will be worse than it was in Korea."

It should be remembered that at that time the suggestion to go north had been made by some Republicans. It was, in short, politics then. Only later did it become statesmanship.

The natural and certainly justifiable reaction to the Senator's recent statements could proceed along these lines.

But Republicans have proceeded in a reasonable and responsible manner. They have shown a spirit of fairness in standing up for administration policy against Democratic critics of that policy. In this spirit, I want to correct the blatant distortions which the

President's majority leader of the Senate has given to Republican pronouncements.

Senator MANSFIELD. "I am somewhat at a loss to understand public expressions from Republicans in which it is advocated, in view of the extent of the air and naval activity already pursued against legitimate military targets, what can only amount to an indiscriminate slaughter of Vietnamese by air and naval bombardment—a slaughter of combatants and noncombatants alike, of friend and foe alike."

The truth: No Republican has advocated the "indiscriminate slaughter of Vietnamese." Some Republicans have suggested and still suggest the more effective use of our air and naval power against more significant military targets in North Vietnam in order to bring about the President's stated objective of bringing the Communists to the conference table. Our suggestions were designed to minimize the possibility of the slaughter of American soldiers when other steps are still available.

Senator MANSFIELD: "Now one can advocate the course of the bombing of Hanoi or Peking or even Moscow and with or without nuclear weapons for that matter—in short, a course of virtually unrestricted violence as a suitable way for the United States, to achieve some worthwhile end in Vietnam."

The truth: Any resemblance between the innuendo and the public statements of any elected national official in either party is so remote as to be totally nonexistent. Such a distortion could be expected from an overzealous freshman assemblyman in the heat of a bitter political campaign, but surely not from the Majority Leader of the greatest deliberative body in the world in a discussion concerning a situation that contains within it the gravest consequences for the entire world.

Senator MANSFIELD: "And one can say too, I suppose, that we want a total victory in Vietnam, but we want it at bargain basement rates in American lives. We want it by firebombs or nuclear bombs and lead and steel or whatever but we don't want any talk about paying a bitter price in American lives on the ground."

The truth: No Republican since the President's Baltimore speech of April 7, 1965 has spoken of "total" victory in Vietnam. None has proposed using nuclear bombs. Many Republicans have hoped for victory there, as did President Kennedy when he said on September 12, 1963, "We want the war to be won"; as did President Johnson when he wrote on December 31, 1963, to Gen. Duong Van Minh, "We shall maintain in Vietnam American personnel and material as needed to assist you in achieving victory"; as did Secretary Rusk when he said on April 29, 1963, "We have no doubt of ultimate victory." By victory, Republicans and these Democrats meant—not the military conquest of Vietnam—but the establishment of conditions of peace and security in South Vietnam and an end to aggression against it. Republicans do want to attain the national objective in South Vietnam with a minimum loss of American lives. Call this "bargain basement rates in American lives," if you will.

Senator MANSFIELD: "And I suppose, finally, Mr. President, one can say that negotiations are bad; that you can't make peace by talking with the Vietcong or the North Vietnamese or anyone else for that matter; you can only make peace by war and more war."

The truth: Every Republican statement to which the Senator's remarks refer were uttered in the context of the pursuit of negotiations. The Senator did not in either statement—nor could he—directly quote any Republican leader as having called for "total victory" as having said "negotiations are bad;" as having stated or implied that "you can only make peace by war and more war."

This Republican would be very interested in seeing any quote that the Senator used upon which he based his gravely serious implications and charges.

The Senator's statements which I have quoted were all contained in his first speech, that of June 30, 1965.

They were met by Republican silence.

It was sincerely hoped that by ignoring this fantastically distorted presentation of the Republican position by the President's majority leader, responsible discussion could be resumed and bipartisanship in foreign policy could be restored.

These hopes received a setback on July 8, 1965 when the majority leader spoke out again—taking up where he had left off—with the same inattention to what had actually been said, thus making efforts at reasonable discussion impossible.

It would serve no useful purpose to respond, point by point and item by item, to the charges and innuendoes contained in the second speech for they are cut from the same artificial cloth as the first statement.

I have been listening in vain since the speeches of the majority leader for some voice of moderation from someone in his party—for calm and objective discussion of proposals made by some members of the minority party.

The stakes in southeast Asia are too high for any responsible official to seek partisan advantage from the situation there. Republicans who speak out on Vietnam are pointing out the course of action which they believe will promote the security of our Nation. If they were motivated by considerations of political gain, they would offer no suggestions. They would simply criticize the consequences of administration policy.

I still hope that someone in the administration will recognize the value of debate and discussion of foreign policy problems, and that Members of Congress again accord to each other the respectful hearing and the reasoned response without which debate cannot be conducted.

TALCOTT BILL TO AID FARMWORKERS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation—H.R. 10179—for the important twin goals of first, protecting U.S. farmworkers from the depressing effects of cheap foreign agricultural imports, and second, improving the status of foreign farmworkers. It would place Congress on record as opposing the importation of any agricultural commodity which is produced by low-wage foreign labor under substandard working conditions.

Titled the "International Farm Labor and Working Conditions Act," my bill would authorize the Secretary of Labor, upon request, to conduct investigations of situations involving the importation of foreign farm products to determine if they were produced under depressive or substandard labor circumstances.

If the Secretary found that the foreign workers had been exploited, he would determine the amount of import duty which would be necessary to remove this unfair cost advantage. He would submit his report and recommendations to Congress for whatever action it might deem appropriate.

The legislation would add an important new dimension to our international relations by imposing import duties on agricultural products to encourage foreign nations to elevate the wages and working conditions of their farmworkers. It is a unique and logical extension of our foreign aid program.

Enactment of the International Farm Labor and Working Conditions Act would open the way to preventing foreign growers and processors from realizing enormous profits from the sale of farm products, produced with low-wage labor under substandard working conditions, in the affluent U.S. market.

I urge that hearings on H.R. 10179 be scheduled at an early date.

A section-by-section analysis of H.R. 10179 follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 10179, THE "INTERNATIONAL FARM LABOR AND WORKING CONDITIONS ACT," INTRODUCED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BY CONGRESSMAN BURT L. TALCOTT OF CALIFORNIA'S 12TH DISTRICT

Enacting clause institutes the "International Farm Labor and Working Conditions Act.

Section 2 sets forth the declaration of policy, wherein the Congress declares it a policy to correct via duties those inequities which, through the use of U.S. commerce, have a deleterious effect on the dignity and welfare of foreign workers and concomitantly on domestic workers.

Section 3(a) authorizes the Secretary of Labor, under certain conditions, to investigate labor conditions, etc., in countries exporting agricultural commodities into the United States. Provides for public hearings and report and recommendation as to remedial action by the Secretary of Labor to the Congress.

Section 3(b) sets forth the criteria (wage rates, monetary exchange) upon which the Secretary of Labor shall premise his report and recommendation.

Section 3(c) provides that such report and recommendation shall be submitted by the Secretary to the President no later than 120 days after the application for investigation is instituted.

Section 4 defines agricultural commodity as any agricultural product imported in any form.

Section 5 provides that the effective date of this International Farm Labor and Working Conditions Act shall be 90 days after enactment.

CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE TO RURAL AREAS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, today I requested an accounting by the General Accounting Office of the actions of the U.S. Post Office Department in their curtailment of service to rural areas of the United States.

I called for this accounting in view of the many complaints that have reached my office. There has been no one who has expressed any favor or approval of the changes in service.

I have been meeting with Post Office Department officials in Washington in an attempt to find out their reasoning in the recent switch to star route mail service throughout much of the country, as well as the closing of many mail terminals all over the United States and the removal of mail from Soo Line trains in my district.

This drastic reduction in needed mail service to rural America has been misrepresented as "improved service and savings" by the Post Office Departmnt.

They have stated that these changes would result in a reduced cost of operation and provide better service. Statistics supplied this office do not leave any proof that either of these purposes has been or is being accomplished.

I feel this investigation should include some accounting of the additional cost that would be required in providing the same delivery and dispatch service that was provided to the many rural communities throughout the Nation prior to the July 1 change to the star system.

It should be emphasized that these people are not asking for any improvement in service but only want mail dispatches and deliveries to be on the same basis as before the change was made.

I hope that a GAO investigation of this matter would be as successful as the last one I called for. A year ago, my inquiries led to a GAO investigation of the Post Office Department's printing of stamped envelopes. This resulted in a $6 million saving to the U.S. taxpayer.

Bureaucracy's war on rural America must be stopped. It just does not make sense to deliberately try to eliminate tl e very unit of our society that must be maintained if the Nation is to continue as the world's example of greatness through personal initiative.

My letter to the GAO also contained a request for an accounting of the number of summer youth placement personnel that have been placed on the payroll and the total cost of the program in Minnesota.

MYTH OF TRADE EXPANSION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, there are endless discussions about our balance-of-payments position, restrictions on foreign investments, tourist expenditures, world liquidity, need for overhauling the international monetary system and other aspects of the standing of this country in the world competitive struggle.

At the same time we are flooded with assurances about the health of our economy, including forecasts about its growth to unheard of heights in 5 years from now.

Not once in these optimistic statements and appraisals is anything said about the deterioration of our position in world trade and the effects of rising imports on the future of our industrial growth. Everyone is concerned about the adequate growth of the domestic economy, and fear is expressed about the employment of the increasing number of jobseekers who are crowding the employment offices. Yet one of the principal factors that influences the prospects is largely ignored.

As I have said, one looks in vain for any misgivings or apprehensions about the role of import competition and the effect of the low-wage attraction of other countries for our investment capital. Yet there is a very close and inevitable connection between the health of our own economy and the wide gap that separates our wages from those paid in all other parts of the world except Canada. Our producers and manufacturers are in both direct and indirect competition with the goods made by the low-wage employers abroad. We have minimum wage laws that call for wages that are higher than the highest wages in most of the countries that compete with us; and our minimum wage is only 50 percent of our average industrial wage. This now stands a little above $2.60 an hour, or more than double the $1.25 minimum wage.

The fact that other industrial countries have in recent years greatly advanced their mechanical equipment and improved their production methods seems to be ignored. Our economists have so long dinned into our ears the theme that our higher productivity per man-hour overcomes the higher wages we pay that it is taken for granted that we have nothing to fear from the revolutionary advancement of foreign production. Without waiting for an answer these economists will say that foreign wages have risen so much more rapidly than the American that unit labor cost differentials have not widened.

Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary that unit labor costs have widened between us and other countries. They have been wide enough right along. The important thing is that the rise in foreign wages is far from closing the gap. The reason for this failure resides in the simple fact that our own wages have also risen. For example, in August 1960 the average wage of the production worker in manufacturing in this country was $2.27 an hour. In May 1965 it was $2.61 or 34 cents higher.

This was an increase of only 15 percent but it was equal to something like the total hourly wage in Japan. Should the Japanese wage have increased 100 percent it would still have lagged very far behind our minimum. As for European wages, our increase of 34 cents an hour since 1960 was equal to nearly 50 percent of their average total wage.

Mr. Speaker, these are exceedingly important considerations and it is nothing short of shocking to note the complete indifference of our economic soothsayers and professional optimists to them. It is more than difficult to understand why the implications of the difference in cost is so obviously and obtrusively ignored. The effects of this difference are underwritten by the strong tide of foreign investments of our private capital in Europe and elsewhere from industrial sources. Upward of $35 billion in the form of direct private investment has been made. Billions of dollars have moved abroad each year from this country into industries, mining operations, and commercial enterprises.

The earnings of these investments has been handsome in many cases. In fact it is reported by the Department of Commerce that the foreign sales of this expatriated capital in the form of enterprises now exceed our total exports by a wide margin. This is an index of the unfavorable competitive position of our domestic enterprises in the foreign areas. In order really to do business there it is necessary to send our capital abroad, where it has the privilege of hiring competent labor at rates that are generally far below our legal minimum.

Many of these companies find the domestic scene much less attractive. That is why they invest abroad. I do not blame them. Some of them could not remain in business without doing so. They are hard pressed by imports and their exports would diminish to the vanishing point should they rely on exports from this country. They can do much better by going abroad, setting up production, hiring the lower-priced labor and selling those markets from within; and in some cases using the foreign base as a point from which to export to third countries. In yet other instances they export back to this country.

Recently the president of one of our manufacturers who have moved much of their production abroad articulated his reasoning and his philosophy. It is very interesting. He recently spoke before the Machinery and Allied Products Institute in this city, on June 21. Said he:

> If we reach the point that we can no longer build a product in the United States and sell it competitively overseas—either forget the product, or move it overseas where we can be competitive. And then, by importing that product from ourselves, we can protect the American market. Unless we do it that way it is only a question of when, not if, that product will not be sold by us either overseas or in the United States.

This is the philosophy in a nutshell that supports the tariff-cutting authorization contained in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. It represents a rationalization of expatriation of capital in order to make a higher profit than could be realized in this country precisely because our costs are higher.

It is not a matter of efficiency, Mr. Speaker. If the same company that cannot compete when it manufactures in this country can compete beautifully when it produces abroad, it seems to me that the question of efficiency is washed out. Mind you, it is the same company producing both here and abroad—not some other company that might indeed be more efficient. The same product that cannot be manufactured at a cost competitive with imports here, may easily be manufactured at a competitive cost in a

foreign factory and sold profitably; and this is done by the same company using the same or similar production methods here and abroad. The reason is too plain to miss.

The same thing is seen in our merchant ships. The same shipping companies that cannot compete under the American flag because they are subject to American wage and living standards can and do compete successfully when they transfer to a foreign flag. Do these shipping companies suddenly become more efficient when they operate under a foreign flag? Are they less efficient while they operate under the American flag? To suggest such a change would be ludicrous.

The evidence is overwhelming that our low competitive standing in our foreign trade is traceable to the very underpinning of our economy, namely higher wages than those paid elsewhere. Initially this was because we had become much more productive. As our production came to lead that of other countries our wages went up faster. Our technology reduced the man-hours required to produce a given amount of goods. We could afford to pay higher wages. Recently, however, our competitors abroad have gained on us in point of productivity. Meantime, as I have already said, their wages remain far below ours.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we are not running a true export surplus in our foreign trade, even though the official figures recorded an export surplus of $6.9 billion in 1964. What appears to be a surplus is a compound of goods sold because of subsidy, giveaway, and similar transactions, plus the equipment and machinery drawn abroad by our thriving investments in plants, production and distribution facilities there.

Nearly a half of the surplus is further attributable to our failure to tabulate our imports at their actual cost to us. We set them down at their foreign value, without adding the transportation and insurance costs. It is estimated that our total imports of $18.7 billion in 1964 should have been recorded at a level some 15 percent higher if the real cost—without duty payment—were to be reflected. This would have run the figure up by about $2.8 billion. This addition to our imports would have shrunk our boasted export surplus by that much.

Together with the AID shipments, Public Law 480 exports, subsidized shipments of cotton, wheat, rice, and so forth these aggregates would have shrunk our export surplus almost out of sight. The increased machinery and equipment exports sold to our own companies investing overseas actually exceeded the increase in our total exports in recent years.

There is something of the disposition of whistling in the dark when public officials make such exaggerated claims about our exports. The United States has not been holding its own in foreign trade. This is true even when the noncommercial and subsidized exports are included. Should they be eliminated, our share in the export markets of the world would have shrunk even more.

Mr. Speaker, we face a dilemma that has not been recognized. Our industry is pressed to become more competitive by reducing costs; but in order to accomplish this, further automation must be resorted to. Unfortunately the displacement of workers by machinery has already created a serious problem of unemployment. The question is how far must we go in that direction in order to become competitive? Evidently as far as may be necessary to eliminate the present wage gap; and that would take us a long way; and it would add greatly to labor displacement.

Can we go this far? Can we reduce our payrolls and still maintain the high consumer demand that sustains our high level of production? Is that what the liberal-trade promoters seek? They pose as friends of labor but in the field of trade they advocate a policy that could do nothing more certainly than reduce payrolls, either by actual forced wage reductions or displacement of more workers by machinery or both.

One of the principal reasons for the heavy outward flow of American investment was the failure of the promises made when the trade program was launched, that no industry would be seriously injured or jeopardized by the increased imports that tariff reductions would invite. The record of the escape clause under the trade agreement program was so negative and so contrary to the promises that industry could reach no other conclusion than that the repeated promises that the escape clause represented a sure and prompt source of relief was false. When industry became convinced of this it found itself in the position of either seeing its domestic market shrink under the pressure of imports and from the discouragement caused by such a prospect, on the one hand, or protecting itself by moving important parts of its operations overseas on the other. There was the further dilemma that if it did not open up abroad it would lose more and more of its export market.

As it turned out these investments proved themselves profitable; and it is not surprising that the outward flow mounted to a veritable torrent. It has gone so far that official discouragement has been invoked to reduce the flow. Unfortunately this will do nothing to correct the basic cause. The fact remains that our economy rests on a higher cost level in most lines of production than the different levels by which it is surrounded. There is no way to mediate this difference without providing measures that will prevent erosion of our economic base.

In time other countries will move up to our level, but it will be a slow movement unless we turn about and make a descent to meet them. This would result in a catastrophe; and it is precisely what would happen if the Kennedy round of tariff reductions is carried out as is now proposed. It calls for a 50-percent cut in our existing tariffs with very few exceptions. Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to expose our already vulnerable industries to this operation. It would be an inexcusable mistake.

I join gladly in legislation that would dampen down the extreme proposal of a 50-percent tariff reduction, legislation that would offer real hope for a remedy to industries that are already suffering damage from imports. How can we expect such industries to contribute to expansion and employment in this country if we confront them with prospects that will cloud the future for them in the domestic market and increase the attractiveness of foreign investment and production overseas. The hopes of greater employment in this country do not lie in that direction.

I hope and urge the Ways and Means Committee of which I am a member not to wait to reexamine the implications of the Kennedy round.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have finished the legislative program for this week and will ask unanimous consent to go over, upon the announcement of the program, until next week.

Monday is Consent Calendar Day. There are five suspensions, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 81, Interstate System apportionment for fiscal year 1967, needs study, and highway safety program.

H.R. 4170, Foreign Service Annuity Adjustment Act of 1965.

H.R. 4905, conveyance of certain real property of the Federal Government to the board of public instruction, Okaloosa County, Fla.

H.R. 8027, assistance to States in local law enforcement.

H.R. 6964, rehabilitation of prisoners.

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day. Also on Tuesday, the conference report on the bill S. 1564, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, will be brought up.

There are two unanimous-consent bills which have been unanimously reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 7502, income tax treatment of casualty losses attributable to major disasters, and H.R. 6431, suspension of duty on certain forms of nickel.

Also on Tuesday, H.R. 8469, civil service retirement annuity adjustments, under an open rule, 2 hours' general debate, and waiving points of order, and H.R. 6845, correction of salary inequities for teachers overseas, under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate.

On Wednesday, the conference report on H.R. 8439, the Military Construction Authorization Act, will be called up. Also, S. 1742, International Finance Corporation, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate, and H.R. 7843, payment of unused accrued leave to survivors of members of the Armed Forces, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

Thursday and the balance of the week, H.R. 4750, Interest Equalization Tax Extension Act of 1965.

Of course, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

I may advise that in addition to the two very important conference reports that have been listed there will probably be other conference reports.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight Friday to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BRITISH REASSESSMENT OF NKRUMAH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an article from the London Economist of July 24, 1965, that is of timely interest in view of the selection of President Nkrumah of Ghana as a member of the peace mission of the British Commonwealth to Vietnam. The article in the reliable and influential London Economist reflects an objective reassessment of President Nkrumah that seems to be taking place in England.

Concerning the peace mission the London Economist quotes President Nkrumah as saying:

> It would be unrealistic to suppose that the United States would unconditionally surrender in South Vietnam * * *. We must regard both the National Liberation Front and the Saigon authorities as rival governments engaged in a civil war which it is our object to bring to a negotiated closed.

The London Economist comments:

> This is not the American position. It is, however, also a long way from being the Communists'.

With the opening of the Volta River hydroelectric power station this fall Ghana will be on her way to economic freedom from cocoa. It is to the credit of Ghana that she has met in full her obligations and commitments in connection with the Volta River project and that work is running ahead of schedule.

As one of the original advocates of the Volta River project, and among those who recommended our participation to President Kennedy, I am greatly pleased with the progress that has been made and the amity that has marked the relations of Chad Calhoun and other Americans with the Government of Ghana.

Ghana now is 8 years old, and the future certainly would not be as bright if it had remained wholly dependent on the cocoa market. The London Economist notes that the price of cocoa is now lower than for many years, and this is having serious repercussions. This I foresaw in my advocacy of the industrial development that would be assured by the Volta River project. There can be no stability in the economy of any country that rests on one crop, however much the United States with other countries may work, as they should, to fix world prices on an equitable basis. While the cocoa crop will continue to be a valuable asset to Ghana, happily with the completion of the Volta River project it will not be left alone to carry the economic load.

Here is the article from the London Economist that I recommend to the careful reading of my colleagues:

NKRUMAH'S RETURN: GHANA'S LEADER IS GETTING OLDER AND WISER—HE MAY YET CUT A FIGURE IN AFRICA, AND BEYOND

What can President Nkrumah of Ghana do for us? The old question has life in it yet. A few short insults ago Dr. Nkrumah was being written off, in Africa and countries beyond, as the politically bankrupt head of a bankrupt little West African Republic. With the summer, signs of revival have come. Given luck, the conference of heads of state of African countries due in Accra in September will in fact take place. A ripple of anxiousness to be fair to Dr. Nkrumah has been set up in Britain, started by the apology in the Daily Express on June 24. The newspaper had published a picture purporting to be of Ghanaian prisoners in chains; it was proved to be of Togolese.

But Dr. Nkrumah's real opportunity to be taken seriously again came on June 17, during the Commonwealth Conference. That morning, during a sunny garden party, Mr. Harold Wilson took Dr. Nkrumah by the elbow to a corner of the lawn of Marlborough House; that afternoon Mr. Wilson sprang on the assembled Prime Ministers his plan for a Commonwealth mission to Vietnam. Dr. Nkrumah was named as a member of the mission; he is still potentially a very important one.

Ever since he invented the Commonwealth mission Mr. Wilson has been able to produce a straw a week for everyone to clutch at. Last week's straw was the invitation from Hanoi to Dr. Nkrumah to pay President Ho Chi Minh a visit. On Tuesday Dr. Nkrumah's High Commissioner in London, Mr. Kwesi Armah (newly appointed Minister of Foreign Trade) set off for Hanoi via Moscow. By Thursday he was back in Zürich and it was still not certain whether he would get to Vietnam.

Whatever this produces for Vietnam, Ghana itself looks as if it is approaching a climacteric. The month to watch is September. If the African heads of state do materialize in Accra they will be trotted off to view the starting-up of the massive Volta River hydroelectric power station. September is also the month of Dr. Nkrumah's birthday. He will be 56, which makes him an elder statesman among the young Africans who govern most of the countries around him. Is age, plus the chastening experience of having been head of a country independent for 8 years (twice as long as most other black African states), starting to mature him?

There are signs that it may be. For evidence of the political middle age of an old revolutionary consider the statement Dr. Nkrumah issued in London on June 24. "It would be unrealistic to suppose that the United States would unconditionally surrender in South Vietnam," he said, and added that he completely supported Mr. Wilson's chairmanship of the Commonwealth peace mission. He said more. For the purpose of the mission, "we must regard both the National Liberation Front (the Vietcong) and the Saigon authorities as rival governments engaged in a civil war which it is our object to bring to a negotiated close." This is not the American position. It is, however, also a long way from being the Communists.

The Nkrumah statement could have been drafted by one of Ghana's band of able, sensible, men—Mr. Alex Quaison-Sackey, for example (who is now President of the United Nations Assembly and becomes Ghana's foreign minister in September). Ghana has others. Not all of them have been able to stand the politically stifling climate of Accra, but a lot remain. It is this corps of skilled and experienced African diplomats and civil servants that is the first reason for thinking that Dr. Nkrumah is still able to become a figure of importance in west Africa, and beyond it too. The trouble in the past has been that, like the other rough radicals in his party, he has neither trusted nor heeded his intellectuals.

Dr. Nkrumah has given in to his rough side too often. He may have given in once again a week ago in order to improve his standing with Hanoi. His Minister of State for Party Propaganda, Mr. Nathaniel Welbeck, said at the World Peace Congress in Helsinki on July 14 that "it would be a mockery of justice to negotiate on whether America ought to continue in Vietnam." This is not what Dr. Nkrumah said in London. Maybe it is the sort of language calculated to open doors in Hanoi. Certainly it is the sort heard all too often in Ghana. Yet Dr. Nkrumah's ability to translate from West-language to Communist-language could help one day to do the trick over Vietnam.

The second reason for taking Dr. Nkrumah seriously again is that he is in economic trouble. It is an exaggeration to say that Ghana is on the point of economic collapse; but cocoa (which normally represents up to two-thirds of its export earnings) has now dropped disastrously, as explained on page 368. It is at its lowest since the slump of the 1930's. Since independence Ghana has spent the foreign exchange with which it was launched in 1957 on new schools, roads, factories, and a vigorous pan-African and foreign policy. To say that this has been the squandering of a cash-happy dictator is unfair. Ghana remains one of the richest west African countries and could almost afford the manner of life to which it has become accustomed if it were not for the mad vagaries of a world market in cocoa over which, in spite of supplying a third of the world's consumption, it has no control.

Thus Dr. Nkrumah's call to the Commonwealth leaders for a search for a way of stabilizing the cocoa price came from the heart; what he would like the West to do for him

is to set up an international cocoa agreement. Meanwhile, he has appealed to the International Monetary Fund for help. Quite rightly, the IMF seems to have replied that first he must stop wasting money on Ghana airways; prune at least some of the 22 (out of 32) of his state corporations that are operating at a loss; reduce his spending on diplomatic missions abroad; and look again at defense spending (which takes roughly a seventh of Ghana's revenue).

To this Dr. Nkrumah can reply that Ghana is doing many worthwhile things. It has paid for the larger share of the Volta project from its own resources, and the bulk of the rest is coming from commercial-term loans. It is getting Africans involved in the workings of a modern society to an extent matched by no other black African country. The West should recognize this, while never dropping its dislike of the many downright nasty and needlessly totalitarian aspects of Dr. Nkrumah's regime. And while it is right for the IMF to insist on the same sort of preloan economic reforms from Ghana that it would demand from any other applicant, it is also fair enough, in these dog-days, for Mr. Wilson, the horse trader, to assess the usefulness of Dr. Nkrumah and to ask himself: What can I do for the Osagyefo?

INTEROCEANIC CANAL PROBLEM: INQUIRY OR COVER UP?—SEQUEL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include copies of a certain bill, copies of certain resolutions, letters, and documents in connection with the subject matter of my statement at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1965, I addressed this body on the major policy subject of the "Interoceanic Canal Problem: Inquiry or Cover Up?" Among the points stressed on that occasion were the nonpublication of the June 4, 1964, hearings on S. 2701, 88th Congress, before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the consequent denial to Members of this House of the Congress of vital background information on the canal question in the form of printed hearings before September 1, when this body was called upon to vote on the bill. I have been requested so many times before and since my April 1, address for precise information as to what actually occurred concerning S. 2701 that I shall elaborate on the facts set forth in that connection.

The witnesses of the executive agencies at the above indicated hearings were the then Secretary of the Army Stephen Ailes, Assistant Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann and Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg of the Atomic Energy Commission. All three presented prepared statements, with Secretary Ailes giving what amounted to a joint paper in support of objectives previously decided.

Having been invited to attend those hearings by the chairman, I listened to the three witnesses with the greatest care and was the last to testify.

Although I had originally intended only to read and submit a brief written statement, with a number of supporting documents attached, the self-serving nature of the testimony caused me to change my plans. Instead of reading my prepared paper, I made an oral statement, emphasizing the imperative necessity for a broadly based, competently constituted and independent inquiry as was contemplated in the Bow-Flood-Hosmer-Thompson bills of the 88th Congress. On completing my remarks, I submitted the written statement and its attachments for inclusion in the record of the hearings as a supplement to my oral testimony.

The impact of my spoken statement on those present, including the members of the committee was immediate and glaringly obvious, with signs of approval by certain committee members. The witnesses and other interested parties in the audience, at first surprised, became animated, some in apparent discomforture. In fact, they showed the greatest interest and confusion, with reactions that were manifest, indicating amazement that I should present another view of the canal question. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I was able to leave the hearings hoping that my testimony had clarified a situation that needed exposure to the spotlight of national publicity. As matters developed, my feelings were, indeed, over sanguine.

Supplied with copies of the three prepared executive agency statements, the mass news media of our country featured the testimony of the three official witnesses in massive coverage. As far as it has been possible to ascertain, this media completely ignored all that I stated, despite one of the most intense displays of animation that I have ever observed at a congressional hearing.

Subsequently, I received a most thoughtful letter, dated June 11, 1964, from Dr. Leonard B. Loeb, professor of physics, emeritus, of the University of California, strongly supporting my well-known views on the canal question. Because of the eminence of this distinguished scientist in the field of nuclear physics, I later requested that his letter be printed with other attachments to my written statement. Also, I have made repeated requests for the printing of the hearings but without avail. To this date, Mr. Speaker, the subject hearings have not been published.

The result of such nonpublication was denial to the House of indispensible information on one of the most important matters now before the Congress and the Nation. Notwithstanding that denial, the House, on September 1, 1964, and without the benefit of vital background knowledge in the customary form and inadequate time for debate, was called upon to pass, and did pass, S. 2701, which, in effect, gave complete control of the so-called canal inquiry to executive agencies responsible for the long record of policy failures at Panama.

Because of the severe limitation on time for consideration of a subject of such magnitude would not have been sufficient for adequate presentation of key arguments, I chose not to speak in opposition as I had initially intended to do but, along with 22 other Members, did vote against what has been widely condemned as a legislative monstrosity. Since then many Members who have become better informed have told me that they now wish that they had also voted against that self-serving measure. In addition, I have learned that a number of leading journalists, seeking information on my June 4 testimony, have requested copies of my statement from the committee but could not obtain them.

The full story of how S. 2701 was pushed through the House is still not known. It appears, however, to have been a prelude to the President's December 18, 1964, surprise announcement about interoceanic canal problems.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, my astonishment to read in an Isthmian newspaper a feature story on page 1 of the December 30, 1964, issue of the Panama Star and Herald on how the unknown professional staff members of the National Security Council have audaciously and publicly boasted of their victory, particularly the followthrough. Were they the ones who inspired the nonpublication of vital information and the gag-rule procedure in the House on September 1? In this light, it is not strange that the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, when queried by me about the procedures that featured the handling of S. 2701 in the House, answered by asking the question: "What is going on here anyway?"

Mr. Speaker, such dictatorial processes on the part of underlings in the executive agencies of our Government concerning crucial policy questions in which the Congress is the ultimate authority, are not only unconstitutional interferences with the legislative branch but also are well calculated to serve the special interests that would benefit from their own recommendations?

The resulting statute, Public Law 88–609, 88th Congress, approved September 22, 1964—78 Stat. 990—has been severely criticized by informed persons in various parts of the Nation as a legislative monstrosity, drafted to assure a predetermined mandate by the Congress for a predetermined type of canal and the exclusion of the solution of the problem of increased transit capacity that independent experts consider as the best when the matter is evaluated from all vital angles.

Such legislation, Mr. Speaker, will not, and cannot, meet basic canal issues that simply must not be "swept under the rug" for political expediency, as is so arrogantly attempted.

It is a recognized principle of fundamental morality that the only action worse than error is persistence in error. The attitude of persistence in error has often been exemplified in matters affecting interoceanic canal policy questions, not only recently but as well throughout much canal history. Notwithstanding such lapses, the combination of geographical configurations of the Central American Isthmus, the treacherous geological formations in that area and the economics of engineering, and diplomatic and political realities has always served to prevent irretrievable error despite a deplorable lack of vision

on the part of some who were temporarily in positions of power. So far, something has always happened to place the ship of state as regards Isthmian canal policy on a safe, even if not the best and most stable, course.

As summarized in my address to this body on April 1, 1965, the key canal issues are obvious and simple. Because obvious and simple solutions of all problems are usually the last to be seen and the most difficult to grasp, I shall repeat these issues. They are:

First, the transcendent responsibility of our Government to safeguard our indispensable sovereign rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone for the efficient maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal.

Second, the subject of the major increase of capacity and correlated superior operational improvement of the existing Panama Canal through the modification of the Third Locks project—53 Stat. 1409—to provide a summit-level lake anchorage in the Pacific sector of the Panama Canal to match the layout in the Atlantic end, on which project some $75 million was expended on enormous lock site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores before work was suspended in May 1942.

Third, the question of a new Panama Canal of so-called sea-level design, or modification therof, to replace the existing canal.

Fourth, the matter of the construction and ownership of a second canal at a site other than the Canal Zone, including Nicaragua.

As regards the modernization of the existing Panama Canal, Mr. Speaker, the Nation and the Congress should know that the plan for the major modification of the Third Locks project just mentioned was, as I previously and repeatedly emphasized, developed in the canal organization during World War II as the result of wartime experience and officially submitted to higher canal authorities. It was approved in principle and recommended to the Secretary of War by the then Governor of the Panama Canal, for "thorough investigation" and approved "in general" before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries by a succeeding Governor for the major operational improvement of the existing canal. Also, as I have previously stated, it aroused the interest and approval of Secretary of the Navy Knox and was supported by his successor, Secretary Forrestal. It was submitted to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who approved it as a postwar project and, for a time, appeared to be on its way to realization.

The advent of the atomic bomb in 1945, coupled with the death of President Roosevelt, who had studied the subject and could not be misled, served to divert developments from their logical course. Seized upon as psychological levers with which to browbeat the Congress and propagandize the Nation, the dangers of nuclear weapons were used in massive propaganda campaigns well calculated to confuse the issue and to delay decision on the solution that applied, and the matter is still with us.

To supply the Congress and the Nation with an adequately constituted body to conduct the necessary investigations with recommendations that the Congress and the Nation can, in good conscience, accept, Representatives WILLIAM R. ANDERSON and FRANK T. BOW and I have introduced identical bills to annul the recent, ill-advised statute and to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, which is quoted in the appended documentation.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by me many times before this House, the Congress and the people of our country have been denied vital information on canal problems through managed news policies, studied silence, exaggerated emphasis of irrelevant factors, and calculated confusion of issues.

The latest example of such tactics of usurpation is a request of the Bureau of the Budget sent to the Senate rather than to the House for an appropriation of $7,500,000 in the form of an amendment to the 1966 appropriation for a so-called "Interoceanic Canal Commission," which term does not appear in the authorization act—78 Stat. 990.

It does appear in the Anderson-Bow-Flood bills as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission." The unauthorized use of the term, "Interoceanic Canal Commission," is a bold, flagrant effort to muddy the waters to a still higher degree under the cover of which certain interests are determined to advance their predetermined objectives. The executive branch certainly has no power to amend an enactment of the Congress in the indicated manner and has no legal justification for using the term, "Interoceanic Canal Commission," instead of the term used in the indicated enactment.

The question arises how much longer is the Congress going to tolerate such transgressions on the part of our executive officials who are bound by oaths of office? Are we going to wait for a mass protest by the people of the Nation before we undertake to do our sworn duty? Certainly, the time has come to act but our action must be a wisely reasoned line of action founded on full information and not only a part of the story.

As a step in this direction, I quote my oral and written statements on June 4, 1964, the attachments to the latter, the June 11 letter of Dr. Loeb, and highly significant writings of former Principal Engineer Edward Sydney Randolph, Sr., of the Panama Canal. His views, as expressed in his perceptive letters and thoughtful writings in the "U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings," reflect the mature judgment derived from a lifetime of study, observation, and experience.

In this connection, I am well acquainted with the 1947 report of the Governor of the Panama Canal which was based on fallacious assumptions of so-called security and national defense as paramount and controlling. This report very properly failed to receive Presidential approval and the Congress took no action thereon, not even authorizing its publication. I am also familiar with the 1960 report of the Board of Consultants, Isthmian Canal Studies—House Report 1960, 86th Congress—which, in some most significant respects, is self-contradictory. Although both reports require the interpretation of experts to ferret out their fatal weaknesses, they do contain much valuable information, especially the conclusion in the latter of doubt as to ability to construct a sea level canal in the Canal Zone "without serious danger of a long interruption to traffic" and "slides of the first magnitude"—paragraph 16, House Report 1960.

Because of the quality of the information contained in the documents appended to this address, I commend them for the most careful study by all concerned with the interoceanic canal question, especially Members of the Congress, the executive agencies of our Government, and the several professional societies that are interested in various phases of the canal problem; economic groups that are substantial tax contributors, particularly the transcontinental railroads and trucking companies; the users of an isthmian canal, foreign and domestic, who will have to pay tolls reflecting the costs of construction; and above all, I would especially commend consideration of these statements by the President himself.

The above indicated documentation follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DANIEL J. FLOOD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 4, 1964

The CHAIRMAN (MR. BONNER). Are there any further questions? Mr. FLOOD, did you care to make a statement?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, may I make it from here?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. My only purpose in being here this morning is very simple. You were kind to ask me. You have put a rifle on the very narrow purpose of why we are here this morning. I have no quarrel with the purpose or intent of this proposal. I think it should be done. It has been badly delayed, long delayed. Last night was too late.

As my friend just suggested, the proposal as to time in the Senate bill is utterly and completely unrealistic. It should never have been in there in the first place. Of course, it should be removed. I took for granted this committee, in its wisdom, would dispose of that without any delay. I am sure you will as you see best fit. I see my friends agree. It was utterly unrealistic in the first place.

As to the proposal here, my problem is this. If this proposition is so important as to be dignified as you are dignifying it—placing it before your full committee, presiding yourself, bringing these distinguished people from State and Defense here—then once and for all, for heaven's sake, let us do this properly. It is my considered judgment that the bill you are considering will not do it properly. It will do it, but it will not do what I think you want done, what the committee wants done, what the Congress wants done, what the Nation and what the world wants done. This present bill will not do it.

You are going to send the Devil to investigate hell. That has been going on since 1945 for this purpose. In 1945 the bill called for having the investigation conducted in Panama by the Governor of Panama—imagine that, keeping in mind some of the Governors we have had and not naming names. This is my kind morning.

That being the case, the Congress and the President considered the 1945 report superfluous, ambiguous, and it is totally discredited. The President ignored it and so did the Congress.

The only difference between the 1945 bill and H.R. 80 is that you have substituted the Panama Canal Commission or Government for the Governor. That is just an exercise in semantics. The conclusion will be just as identical, the report will be just as ambiguous, the predetermination has been made. You are calling one bureaucrat to scratch the back of another one. You have been here, I think, since the War Between the States. You know what will happen. So do I. That is an exercise in futility. Just like the 1945 report, H.R. 80 cannot possibly do anything different. It merely substitutes one name for another.

Senator COTTON's bill is just as bad because all it does is give birth to some kind of commission which is unspecified in strength, type, composition, anything else. I would dismiss that.

The bill before you from the Senate does little more. It specifies so many people. Three of them must be State—I can imagine what will happen there—Army, and I know what will happen there. Then Atomic Energy Commission is so new I am not clear about it. I have my doubts that State and the fallout from Defense and Army will rub off on them. It always does.

I say this. There is before the House and before the committee H.R. 863, proposed, and three of four bills proposed by my colleagues Bow, THOMPSON, and myself.

Let me read this briefly.

If this is as important as I believe it to be and as I know it is, and I am sure you do, let us do it this way and get it done. We have all the advantage of 20 years of everything these bureaucrats could give birth to from the Army Engineers down—much of it good, absolutely indispensable, invaluable, must be utilized, couldn't be without it, will save us a great deal of time and money. A great deal of contribution will be made by these people. But that is the end of their act. Now, they are through. They have done their bit. Now let us do it properly.

The House measures, I suggest, are designed to provide the independent, broadly based type of inquiry that the Interoceanic Canal problems indisputably require.

Second, they provide for a predominantly civilian commission of 11 members, of which 8 would be civilians, 3 from the combatant elements of the armed services—combatant navigation people, no more. One of the civilians is to be chairman, mandatorily a civilian chairman. In the United States of America today, with all our technical know-how, brilliance, awareness, and understanding, the President of the United States will have no trouble picking these eight great, superior civilians that the world will not be able to equal for our commission. That is what we need in this year of our Lord 1964 if nothing else.

Their task would be the exploration and study of all canal proposals, not a predetermined type and kind of canal. If this is as important as it is, all kinds of canals should be examined and all proposals by this commission with the objective of recommending the best site, the best type, with due consideration to all crucial factors involved, not half a job, which will include vital treaty questions of sovereignty, duration, indemnities, annuities, all these things. Let us not worry about a 6-month interim report.

If we consider a sea level canal—you will—my Atomic Energy friend says he cannot move for 5 years. Of course, he can. They told me this 4 years ago. Their figures are still good. I have confidence in them.

This commission should be composed of the best-qualified men, fully objective in outlook, that this country can muster. Such a commission would permit selection of its members with backgrounds along the lines indicated in the following table, subject, of course, to different variances. This includes what my friend had in mind over here.

I would suggest this: A civilian chairman, who must be an executive and engineer, the best executive and the best engineer you can find—and we have them in the United States. They would be delighted to do it—delighted.

Second, a civilian of international trade and transportation. We have got them. They would be delighted to do it—the best in the business.

Third, a civilian who is in shipping, an executive in maritime shipping, an expert in the United States—and we have got them, the best in the world, they would be delighted.

That is what you want on this commission, no jobholders scratching each other's backs in the best tradition. That is nonsense any more. Civilian, legal, governmental; we have the best in the business. They would be glad to do it—civilian, legal, and governmental people. By governmental I do not mean a jobholder, I mean experts in government and law. We have got them.

Again a civilian, an engineer, this man to be a nuclear design and warfare expert, an expert in channel design, expert in canals, interoceanic communications work. These are the men we want, and we have those men. I can name a dozen for you. You pick them or the President could pick them.

Again an engineer. This must be an engineering expert in geology, in soil mechanics. These are the kinds of people that must be on this commission and not bureaucrats. We have them in our society, the greatest in the world, we have them standing by, they would be glad to serve.

Again an engineer. This man must be the best we have in hydraulics, the best we have in flood control. That is the man, Mr. Chairman, you want as one of those civilians. Those are the people. We have them, dozens of them, the best in the world.

Now the military people. We want an old line Army man, active or retired, I do not care which, could not care less, active or retired. Believe me, the Army has got them. I know it and the Secretary knows it. I want that guy. Who is he? You have got a lot of them, the best in the world. He must have broad military experience, he must know jungle warfare, he must know guerrilla warfare, he must know things, he must be on there. An active or a retired man. Alles has them. I know them, so does he.

You want an old line Navy type, active or retired, it does not matter which. We have got them up to the ears. He must have a broad knowledge of naval command, be a naval line officer, naval command line man. That is the type you want on this commission.

You want an Air Force man, active or retired, it makes no difference which. He must be an expert, the best we have, on Air Force defense, on all kinds of Air Force design and planning and defense.

Mr. Chairman, if you were going to have a commission, let us have it. That is the kind for the next commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Are there any questions by any members? The committee stands adjourned.

Mr. Chairman, I am Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania, member of the Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations.

As members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries know, I have devoted years to the study of problems of the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally, and made many addresses in the Congress on significant aspects of the subject. Those who have read my addresses and matters quoted in them realize that as a result of my inquiries I have come to hold some very positive convictions on how best to approach what is one of the gravest questions before our country, and about which there has been a great deal of bewildering propaganda as to what should be done.

Of all the problems involved the most pressing one is the clarification, making definite, and reaffirmation by the Congress of our historic Panama Canal policy as provided in House Concurrent Resolution 105, introduced by the late Chairman Clarence Cannon, which is identical with resolutions introduced by Representative Bow and myself. Though these resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I trust that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will use its influence to secure a favorable report and early action by the House.

The next most urgent matter is an independent inquiry into the overall interoceanic canal problem by an independent and broadly based Interoceanic Canals Commission as provided in bills introduced by Representatives CLARK W. THOMPSON, BOW, HOSMER, and myself. The Commission thus contemplated under congressional authorization would be created without delay and put to work.

In lieu of further detailed discussions by me at this time, I request that the full texts of the following papers be printed in these hearings as parts of my testimony in the following order:

1. FLOOD: "Panama Canal: Formula for Future Canal Policy," address in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 11, 1964.

2. FLOOD: "Panama Canal Questions: Immediate Action Required," address quoting an April 5, 1963, letter of E. S. Randolph in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 8, 1963.

3. E. S. Randolph: Letter of January 24, 1964.

4. E. S. Randolph: Letter of April 20, 1964.

5. FLOOD: "Prognosis for Panama Canal—Comment and Discussion." U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, June 1964.

6. DuVal: "Isthmian Canal Policy—An Evaluation," U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, March 1955.

H.R. 4871

A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. (a) A commission is hereby created, to be known as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), and to be composed of eleven members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows: One member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Army; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Navy; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Air Force; one member shall be a commissioned office of the Corps of Engineers (retired) of the United States Army; and seven members from civil life, four of them shall be persons learned and skilled in the science of engineering. The President shall designate one of the members from civil life as Chairman, and shall fill all vacancies on the Commission in the same manner as original appointments are made. The Commission shall cease to exist upon the completion of its work hereunder.

(b) The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $30,000 per annum, and the other members shall recieve compensation at the rate of $28,500 per annum, each; but the members

appointed from the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall receive only such compensation, in addition to their pay and allowances, as will make their total compensation from the United States $28,500 each.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized and directed to make and conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of all problems involved or arising in connection with plans or proposals for—

(1) an increase in the capacity and operational efficiency of the present Panama Canal through the adaptation of the third locks project (53 Stat. 1409) to provide a summit-level terminal lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with that in the Atlantic end, or by other modification or design of the existing facilities;

(2) the construction of a new Panama Canal of sea-level design, or any modification thereof;

(3) the construction and ownership, by the United States, of another canal or canals connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans;

(4) the operation, maintenance, and protection of the Panama Canal, and of any other canal or canals which may be recommended by the Commission;

(5) treaty and territorial rights which may be deemed essential hereunder; and

(6) estimates of the respective costs of the undertakings herein enumerated.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of conducting all inquiries and investigations deemed necessary by the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Commission is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Commission is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other officer, of the Commission, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Commission may deem relevant or material for the purposes herein named. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress, not later than two years after the date of the enactment hereof, a final report containing the results and conclusions of its investigations and studies hereunder, with recommendations; and may, in its discretion, submit interim reports to the President and the Congress concerning the progress of its work. Such final report shall contain—

(1) the recommendations of the Commission with respect to the Panama Canal, and to any new interoceanic canal or canals which the Commission may consider feasible or desirable for the United States to construct, own, maintain, and operate;

(2) the estimates of the Commission as regards the approximate cost of carrying out its recommendations; and like estimates of cost as to the respective proposals and plans considered by the Commission and embraced in its final report; and

(3) such information as the Commission may have been able to obtain with respect to the necessity for the acquisition, by the United States, of new, or additional, rights, privileges, and concessions, by means of treaties or agreements with foreign nations, before there may be made the execution of any plans or projects recommended by the Commission.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall, without regard to the civil service laws, appoint a secretary and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions, who shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission and shall receive compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 7. The Commission is hereby authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such engineers, surveyors, experts, or advisers deemed by the Commission necessary hereunder, as limited by the provisions in title 5, United States Code, section 55a; and may make expenditures, in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, for travel and subsistence expenses of members of the Commission and its employees while away from their homes or regular places of business; for rent of quarters at the seat of government, or elsewhere; for personal services at the seat of government, or elsewhere; and for printing and binding necessary for the efficient and adequate functions of the Commission hereunder. All expenses of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Commission, or such other official of the Commission as the Commission may designate.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

SEC. 9. The Act entitled "An Act to provide for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea-level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans" (Public Law 88-609, 78 Stat. 990), is hereby repealed.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS,
Berkeley, Calif., June 11, 1964.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: As a retired Naval Reserve officer of 27 years service, as a student of history and naval strategy, as well as a physicist somewhat familiar with nuclear devices, I have been much interested in the Panama Canal problem since the end of World War II. I have followed the changing aspects of the problem as it has unfolded in the ensuing years. I was first alarmed by the moves to attempt to build a new sea level canal sponsored by the heavy dirt moving equipment industry and others using as a subterfuge the danger of the atomic bomb. Obviously either canal, from a defensive viewpoint, would be equally vulnerable to the latter weapon and probably in proportion to its length. We have a canal which is now reaching saturation but can, at moderate cost with no diplomatic involvement, be rendered more navigable and of greater capacity and efficiency according to plans already formulated. Thus the sea level canal with untested problems is not needed. When the sea level canal was wisely sidetracked by Congress the danger subsided, but I was still uneasy about an uncommitted future plan.

With the general worldwide restlessness of underprivileged peoples who are unwilling to work and take the time gradually to evolve to higher standards and with the direct subversive activities of the Communist groups acting and more insidiously through international propaganda, as well as by this Nation's necessary involvement in the U.N., OAS, and similar groups, I have again felt concern about the future of the canal. This became acute through the Egyptian seizure of the Suez Canal. The bumbling of the State Department that led to that fiasco has permitted a precedent to be established that was immediately seized by the pacifists, ultra-liberal, and Communist propagandists relative to our Panama Canal. Now this pressure, coupled with political ambitions in Panama, Communist agitation in that area, etc., has gradually eased the State Department with its commitments to the U.N. and OAS into the soft attitude that has led to the present predicament as indicated by the flag incidents and the near loss of our control.

I am not surprised at the activities of Dr. Milton Eisenhower and similar "do-gooders" in this connection. What I am amazed at is the open defiance of these agencies and the President in acting contrary to the desire of the people as expressed by their representatives in Congress. It would at times seem that the executive branch is assuming powers beyond its constitutional rights.

In any event the actions of the State Department, the agitation of certain industrial interests, and now the naive and premature plan of the Atomic Energy Commission to find an outlet for their products through Project Plowshare and to keep themselves in business despite the saturation in nuclear weapons, has produced a combined effort to force the canal development along unsound and illogical lines.

In regard to the AEC Plowshare proposal for cheap excavation, I feel that the data we have to date on the feasibility of this mode of excavation on a scale demanded for a canal is inadequate to be used as the basis for any sound planning for some time to come. A very cogent article by Comdr. R. D. Duncan, USN, appears in the same issue of the Naval Institute Proceedings (June 1964, p. 49) in which the comments of yours on Professor Miller's article appear. His article deals with the atomic explosion digging of a canal across the Kra Peninsula. It appears that the only data on such a project stems from a theoretical survey by the Rand Corporation based on a few AEC tests. While the Rand Corporation has capable scientists on its staff, it lives off funds from Government survey projects such as the one leading to their report. Having been consultant to industries making similar surveys pertinent to my own field of technical competence, I have an uneasy feeling that such reports are purposely "sugar coated" to please the supporting agency despite discouraging findings. Under these conditions the premature optimistic publicity accorded to this application of nuclear energy is dangerous and probably unwarranted. Aside from the immediate effects of digging a hole some 300 feet deep and 1,000 feet in diameter in a 1-megaton explosion, the extension of such a series of craters to a row of some 200 or so contiguous holes to create a canal is a questionable procedure. I would not, for example, feel secure about untoward contamination effects on such a large scale operation. It is also far beyond the province of geologists and engineers to predict the consequences of such an extensive series of explosions in the completely unknown geological structures to be met in practice, in particular since the location and structures are unspecified. Caution rather than enthusiasm is certainly needed before one substitutes the politically reasonable and economically feasible solution to the modernization of the Panama Canal by such visionary projects.

On the basis of these considerations having read the various speeches you have made on this, our vital canal issue, I must confess I find myself heartily in agreement with your thinking and strongly endorse the views expressed by the competent engineers quoted in your speech of March 11, 1964, as shown in volume 110, part 5, pages 4948-4949 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—House. I also am heartily in favor of the bills H.R. 863, H.R. 3858, H.R. 5787, and H.R. 8563, and strongly and sincerely urge that they be passed.

It is also my hope that in due time and under the proper circumstances the Congress

will be able to assert its wishes and to ensure that in the future the policy of the executive arm follows the will of the people as in Congress expressed.

Yours most sincerely,

LEONARD B. LOEB,
Professor of Physics, Emeritus, Captain, U.S. Naval Reserve (Retired).

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 11, 1964]

PANAMA CANAL: FORMULA FOR FUTURE CANAL POLICY

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to this body on March 9, 1964, under the title of "Panama Canal: Focus on Power Politics," I dealt at length with certain crucial aspects of the overall interoceanic canals problem and suggested a plan of action for our Government. This program includes the following:

First. Prompt approval by the Congress of House Congressional Resolution 105, introduced by Chairman Clarence Cannon of the Committee on Appropriations.

Second. Prohibition by legislation of the use of any appropriated or other Government funds for the formal display of any flag in the Canal Zone, not authorized by specific treaty provisions, other than the flag of the United States and similar prohibition of the use of such funds to pay salaries for non-U.S. citizens in security positions of either the Canal Zone Government or the Panama Canal Company.

Third. Creation by the Congress of an independent and broadly based Interoceanic Canals Commission as outlined in bills introduced by Representatives BOW, HOSMER, THOMPSON of Texas, and myself, to make the necessary studies, reports, and recommendations as regards future Isthmian Canal policies.

Mr. Speaker, to aid the Congress in the consideration of this program for action, there is much factual information that should be understood. This, I shall try to summarize in a form that will facilitate its consideration.

I. PANAMA CANAL SOVEREIGNTY AND OWNERSHIP

First. The long-range commitment of the United States under the 1901 Hay-Pauncefote Treaty with Great Britain, which has been generally recognized provides, for exclusive control, ownership, and management by the United States of an Isthmian Canal.

Second. The United States acquired exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal through the grant by Panama of sovereignty in perpetuity in the 1903 treaty under international law.

Third. In addition, the United States acquired title to all land, water, and property in the Canal Zone, including the Panama Railroad and other holdings of the French Panama Canal Co. under the laws of France, Panama, and the United States.

Fourth. The title of the United States to this land, water, and property in the Canal Zone was also recognized by Colombia, the sovereign of the Isthmus prior to November 3, 1903, as "vested entirely and absolutely in the United States," in the 1914–22 treaty with Colombia, which still has vested interests in the Panama Canal comparable to those of Panama.

Fifth. Since 1939, U.S. sovereign rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone and canal have been eroded by first, a series of ill-advised surrenders by the executive branch of our Government to the radical demands of Panama, in contemptuous disregard of provisions of law, formal action of the House of Representatives, and international usage; and second, a number of unwarranted cessions to Panama by the treaty-making power of our Government, but without modifying the fundamental sovereignty and perpetuity provisions of the 1903 treaty.

II. TITULAR SOVEREIGNTY—ORIGIN AND DEFINITION

First. The first mention of Panamanian "titular sovereignty" over the Canal Zone was by Secretary of War Taft in 1905 when appearing before the Senate Committee on Interoceanic Canals, but he always emphasized that the term was not a valid claim except in a residual sense and did not affect exclusive U.S. sovereignty over the zone and Panama Canal to the entire exclusion of the exercise by Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority.

Second. Later, as President-elect and as President, Mr. Taft emphasized the position of the United States as the exclusive sovereign over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, as provided by treaty and in a 1912 Executive order, decreed that all of the Canal Zone is necessary for the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal.

Third. The question of sovereignty remained unclouded until 1959, when an emissary of the Department of State in Panama, on behalf of his superiors, announced recognition of Panamanian "titular sovereignty" over the Canal Zone but failed to define the term, which omission, as foreseen by experienced observers at the time, served to compound the confusion with more tragic results than those of the incident that this emissary was then attempting to solve.

Fourth. The term, "titular sovereignty" means a reversionary interest of Panama, just as used in deeds of real estate conveyance, and nothing more, in the sole event that the United States should fail to meet its treaty obligations to maintain, operate, sanitate, and protect in perpetuity the Canal Zone and Panama Canal. It does not extend to Panama any sovereign rights, powers, or authority which are vested entirely in the United States to the entire exclusion of the exercise by Panama in any respect as long as the United States maintains and operates the Panama Canal in conformity with treaty obligations.

Fifth. Under the circumstances that have evolved, the United States should now redeclare its policy on the question of sovereignty. Until this is done by our Government with an adequate redeclaration of our Isthmian policy, such as that in House Concurrent Resolutions 105, 113, and 120, Panama will continue to make wild, extravagant and impossible demands with a continuance of the present confusion and chaos.

III. PANAMA CANAL SOVEREIGNTY CLARIFICATION: HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS 105, 113, AND 120

First. Early in the 88th Congress, Representatives CLARENCE CANNON, BOW, and I introduced House Concurrent Resolutions 105, 113, and 120, respectively, identical measures to clarify, reaffirm, and make definite U.S. policy with respect to the sovereignty and ownership of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, which resolutions are now before the Committees on Foreign Affairs.

Second. The adoption of these measures by the Congress does not require approval by the President and thus would avoid Executive embarrassment as the responsibility therefor would be borne by the Congress and, in turn, by the people of the United States.

Third. Prompt approval by the Congress is imperative and urged as the first step in what will take a series of actions by our Government before the overall canals question is adequately resolved.

IV. CANAL AT NICARAGUA OR ELSEWHERE

First. The only interoceanic canal route other than the Panama site, now covered by treaty, is that at Nicaragua, which is provided for in general terms under the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty of August 5, 1914. No doubt a Nicaragua canal would require a supplementary treaty. In addition, such canal, for reasons of defense and others, may require treaties with Costa Rica, Salvador, and Honduras as well.

Second. As has been amply established in my previously cited address, the Panama Canal enterprise is governed and operated under a workable treaty and would not require a new treaty except in the sole event of a sea-level undertaking at that location. This is not covered by treaty and would require a new one to supply the specific conditions for its construction.

Third. Locations for interoceanic canals at other sites than the Canal Zone and Nicaragua would involve entirely different circumstances and would necessitate new treaty arrangements to specify the contractual provisions for site acquisition, construction, and subsequent operation and control.

V. OVERALL INTEROCEANIC CANAL PROBLEMS

First. The elements forming U.S. interoceanic canal policy, though ascertainable in textbooks and scholarly articles, have never been formally and authoritatively stated in one place.

Second. The problems that must be considered in the formulation of such policy include the following:

(a) The modernization of the existing Panama Canal through adaptation of the suspended third locks project—53 Statutes at Large 1409—to provide a summit-level lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal, to correspond with that in Gatun Lake in the Atlantic end, a plan favored by many experienced, independent engineers, atomic warfare, navigational and other canal experts, including virtually all the distinguished engineers who participated in the construction of the present canal, and who cannot be dismissed as uninformed, incompetent, or inexperienced.

(b) The construction of a new Panama Canal of sea-level design or any modification thereof in the Canal Zone near the present site.

(c) The construction and ownership by the United States of another canal at a different location.

(d) The operation, maintenance, sanitation and protection of a modernized Panama Canal or of any new canal that may be recommended.

(e) The treaty and territorial rights that may be deemed essential.

Third. Experience has shown that to secure a forthright determination and evaluation of the above listed problems, the services of an independent, broadly based, and highly competent Interoceanic Canals Commission under congressional authorization is indispensable. Experience has also shown that satisfactory results cannot be obtained by part-time or ex parte boards, necessarily dependent on administrative agencies, and that an independent inquiry is absolutely indispensable.

VI. OBSERVATIONS ON PENDING BILLS

First. A number of measures, introduced in both House and Senate, to deal with the overall canal problem require some comments to the ends that the mistakes of the fact will not be repeated, that the necessary investigations shall be comprehensive, and that the policies recommended may be realistic.

H.R. 80, INTRODUCED BY CHAIRMAN BONNER, OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

First. The key terms in this measure are identical with those in the ambiguous and discredited 1945 Public Law 780, 79th Congress, which directed the Governor of the Canal Zone—then Panama Canal—to investigate and report upon his own domain. The Governor's 1947 recommendation called for the construction of only a sea-level project in the Canal Zone, which recommendation the President did not approve and the Congress did not accept.

Second, H.R. 80 would merely repeat the same type of inquiry, with the name of the Panama Canal Company substituted for the Governor, which, in view of the facts involved, would merely supply another 1945–47 type of investigation, which was wholly inadequate in scope and directed toward securing authorization of a predetermined objective of a small professional group.

Third. H.R. 80, it is especially important to note, includes the terms, "security" and "national defense," in addition to the normal factors for such inquiry, "capacity" and "interoceanic commerce" as did the 1945 bill. The 1945 bill was drafted in the Panama Canal organization by those who later directed the inquiry under Public Law 280, 79th Congress.

Fourth. The terms, "security" and "national defense," it is most significant, were conveniently inserted in the 1945 bill and this enabled this exaggerated interpretation by the Governor as paramount and controlling, and hence a "mandate" from the Congress for a recommendation for only the indicated predetermined objection of certain professional engineers for a canal at sea level in the Canal Zone. This recommendation served to exclude from serious study what independent, experienced experts, maintenance and operational, consider to offer the best solution when evaluated from all crucial angles. Moreover, the 1947 report aroused wide professional criticisms, in and out of Government service, by eminent atomic warfare, economic, engineering, geological, navigational, and other experts, who were well informed, competent, and experienced.

Fifth. In the light of subsequent revelations, in lay and technical literature, it is fortunate that the Congress was not stampeded, for no action was taken and the 1947 report of the Governor's inquiry was not published, a procedure contrary to that normally followed in such cases.

Sixth. The Congress is far better informed today in 1964 about interoceanic canal questions than it was in 1945 and will not be fooled again by self-serving proposals for legislation.

Seventh. H.R. 80 would not supply an independent, broadly based body required by the situation but would give effective control of the resulting inquiry to the same ex parte groups primarily concerned with covering up their own errors, such as the Third Locks project fiasco, for which the advocacy of a vast sea-level undertaking in the Canal Zone has served quite effectively, and would leave the canal situation in a state of compounded confusion.

S. 2438, INTRODUCED BY SENATOR COTTON

First. With the exception of calling upon the President to appoint a "commission" of unspecified strength and qualifications, which shall include representatives of the Panama Canal Company, S. 2438 is identical with H.R. 80.

Second. For these reasons, the remarks on H.R. 80 apply to S. 2438.

S. 2497, INTRODUCED BY SENATOR MAGNUSON AND FIVE COSPONSORS

First. S. 2497 specifically calls for a predetermined type of canal across the American isthmus at a location to be decided upon and would vest three high administrative officials of our Government with the authority to make the necessary studies, reports and recommendations in a period of 6 months, which period is entirely inadequate.

Second. Like H.R. 80 and S. 2438 previously discussed, S. 2497 would not supply an independent and broadly based commission but would only be an administrative body necessarily interested in advancing its own proposals or in defending its errors.

Third. Because of these facts, it is entirely unacceptable to informed House leadership and would not be approved by the House.

H.R. 863, H.R. 3858, H.R. 5787, AND H.R. 8563 INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVES BOW, FLOOD, HOSMER, AND CLARK W. THOMPSON, RESPECTIVELY

First. These House measures are designed to provide the independent broadly based type of inquiry that the interoceanic canals problem indispensably requires.

Second. They provide for a predominantly civilian commission of 11 members, of which 8 would be civilians, and 3 from the combatant branches of the armed services, with 1 of the civilians to be chairman.

Third. Its task would be the exploration and study of all canal proposals with the objective of recommending the best site and the best type, with due consideration to all crucial factors involved, or which would include vital treaty questions of sovereignty, duration, indemnities, and annuities.

Fourth. This commission should be composed of the best qualified men, fully objective in outlook, that our country can muster. Such commission would permit selection of its members with backgrounds along the lines indicated in the following table, subject, of course, to any necessary variance:

"PROPOSED INTEROCEANIC CANALS COMMISSION

Statutory requirements, desired professional background combinations

"Civilian [1] chairman, executive and engineering.

"Civilian, international trade and transportation.

"Civilian, shipping executive and marine.

"Civilian, legal and governmental.

"Civilian (engineer), nuclear warfare and channel design.

"Civilian (engineer), engineering-geology and soil mechanics.

"Civilian (engineer), engineering-geology and heavy marine structures.

"Civilian (engineer), hydraulic and flood control.

"Army-line [2] (active or retired), broad military and jungle warfare experience.

"Navy-line (active or retired). broad naval and command experience.

"Air Force (active or retired), broad air and defense planning."

VII. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Mr. Speaker, the United States faces a combination of canal problems equal to, or exceeding, the magnitude of those that faced our country in the early part of the 20th century, with following issues resurrected in slightly different forms: the 1902 struggle over routes, the 1903 Panama Revolution and acquisition of the Canal Zone, and the 1906 "battle of the levels" as to type.

With history now repeating itself, the challenges of today offer an opportunity worthy of comparison with that seized and consummated by President Theodore Roosevelt. To meet these challenges, the leaders in our Government, both in the Congress and the executive branch have had the benefit of extensive documentations in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of all of the major aspects of the problems involved.

A study of these sources will disclose little of basic character that is different from what was considered with respect to the existing canal. The only matters that are really new are the responsible personnel involved which, for the most part, have not shown themselves to be adequately versed in interoceanic canal history.

[1] Commission will be predominantly civilian, with one of the civilians as chairman.

[2] Members from the Armed Forces will be officers of the line.

As to the oft-repeated contentions of sea level advocates concerning protection of the Panama Canal from enemy attack through passive defense measures embodied in the design of the canal, an examination of President Theodore Roosevelt's message of February 6, 1906, to the Congress, which is attached, will be helpful. This will disclose that he admitted that a "canal at sea level would be slightly less exposed to damage in event of war" but that he disregarded this assumption as controlling and decided on the basis of operational merit, engineering feasibility and costs.

In 1905–06, the debates and arguments over the type of canal centered on the questions of relative vulnerability. In 1964, the terms embodied in some of the bills cover the same subject under the new terms, "security" and "national defense," which are mere matters of difference in nomenclature.

Upon the advent of the A-bomb in 1945, advocates of a sea level canal in the Canal Zone seized upon this powerful weapon as a psychological lever to force the Congress to authorize what was their own predetermined concept going back many years. Subsequently, some of the leading nuclear warfare and other experts of the highest eminence, in and out of Government service, opposed such misuse of the A-bomb as a weapon in propaganda and as irrelevant in the planning of navigational projects. The result was that the Congress, despite a determined drive by these advocates and their industrial supporters, heeded the warning of nuclear experts and did not accept the recommendation of the 1947 Governors' report, made under the authority of Public Law 280, 79th Congress, which urged authorization of only a canal at sea level with tidal locks in the Canal Zone.

Mr. Speaker, the entire world is watching to see what we do with regard to the increase of transisthmian transit capacity. Let us pull together on this vital matter and provide the Nation and the Congress with the indispensably needed independent commission so that this crucial policy matter can be resolved on the highest plane of statesmanship.

Above all, at this critical period in the history, we must not permit current hysteria and self-serving propaganda concerning a second canal divert us from what must be our first objective: to stand firmly against unreasonable demands at Panama where we have a fine canal now approaching saturation and obsolescence and an adequate treaty covering the major enlargement of the existing canal. Moreover, there is no better place or way in which to make a legitimate stand for the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

To facilitate reference to the documents mentioned, I include as part of my remarks the texts of House Concurrent Resolution 105, H.R. 3858, President Theodore Roosevelt's message to the Congress on February 19, 1906, and a 1954 memorial to the Congress prepared by distinguished engineers and others who participated in the construction of the Panama Canal and which, with minor revision, applies with equal force today, and a 1964 release of the Atomic Energy Commission.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 105, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 4, 1963

(Mr. CANNON submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs)

Whereas the United States under the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 with Panama, acquired complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity for construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

Whereas all the jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone ceased

on exchange or ratification of the 1903 treaty of February 26, 1904; and

Whereas since that time the United States has continuously exercised exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal; and

Whereas where responsibility is imposed there must be given for its effectuation adequate authority; and with respect to the Panama Canal the treaty of 1903 so provided; and

Whereas the United States has fully and effectively discharged all its treaty obligations with respect to the Panama Canal and the only legitimate interest that Panama can have in the sovereignty of the Canal Zone is one of reversionary character that can never become operative unless the United States should abandon the canal enterprise; and

Whereas the policy of the United States since President Hayes' message to the Congress on March 8, 1880, has been for an interoceanic canal "under American control," that is to say, under the control of the United States; and

Whereas the grant by Panama to the United States of exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the aforesaid purposes was an absolute, indispensable condition precedent to the great task undertaken by the United States in the construction and perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, for the benefit of the entire world; and for which rights, the United States has paid the Republic of Panama the full indemnity and annuities agreed upon by the two nations; and

Whereas, on February 2, 1960, the House of Representatives in the Eighty-sixth Congress, by an overwhelming vote, approved H. Con. Res. 459, favorably reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties of 1903, 1936, and 1955 between the United States and the Republic of Panama, with special reference to matters concerning territorial sovereignty shall be made only pursuant to treaty."

Whereas, because of continuing claims of sovereignty over the Canal Zone by Panama which, if granted, would liquidate U.S. control of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, a further declaration by the Eighty-eighth Congress is deemed necessary and timely: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (1) the United States, under treaty provisions, constitutionally acquired and holds, in perpetuity, exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

(2) That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any sovereignty of whatever character over the Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges its duties and obligations with respect to the canal; and

(3) That the formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States is violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic canal policy of the United States as fully upheld by its highest courts and administrative officials; and will lead to confusion and chaos in the administration of the Panama Canal enterprise; and

(4) That the provisions of H. Con. Res. 459, Eighty-sixth Congress, are reiterated and reemphasized.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF CONSULTING ENGINEERS FOR THE PANAMA CANAL

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I submit herewith the letter of the Secretary of War transmitting the report of the Board of Consulting Engineers on the Panama Canal and the report of the Isthmian Canal Commission thereon, together with a letter written to the Chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission by Chief Engineer Stevens. Both the Board of Consulting Engineers and the Canal Commission divide in their report. The majority of the Board of Consulting Engineers, eight in number, including the five foreign engineers, favor a sea-level canal, and one member of the Canal Commission, Admiral Endicott, takes the same view. Five of the eight American members of the Board of Consulting Engineers and five members of the Isthmian Canal Commission favor the lock canal, and so does Chief Engineer Stevens. The Secretary of War recommends a lock canal pursuant to the recommendation of the minority of the Board of Consulting Engineers and of the majority of the Canal Commission. After careful study of the papers submitted and full and exhaustive consideration of the whole subject I concur in this recommendation.

It will be noticed that the American engineers on the Consulting Board and on the Commission by a more than 2 to 1 majority favor the lock canal, whereas the foreign engineers are a unit against it. I think this is partly to be explained by the fact that the great traffic canal of the Old World is the Suez Canal, a sea-level canal, whereas the great traffic canal of the New World is the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, a lock canal. Although the latter, the Soo, is closed to navigation during the winter months, it carries annually three times the traffic of the Suez Canal. In my judgment the very able argument of the majority of the Board of Consulting Engineers is vitiated by their failure to pay proper heed to the lessons taught by the construction and operation of the Soo Canal. It must be borne in mind, as the Commission points out, that there is no question of building what has been picturesquely termed "the Straits of Panama"; that is, a waterway through which the largest vessels could go with safety at uninterrupted high speed. Both the sea-level canal and the proposed lock canal would be too narrow and shallow to be called with any truthfulness a strait, or to have any of the properties of a wide, deep water strip. Both of them would be canals, pure and simple. Each type has certain disadvantages and certain advantages.

But, in my judgment, the disadvantages are fewer and the advantages very much greater in the case of a lock canal substantially as proposed in the papers forwarded herewith; and I call especial attention to the fact that the chief engineer, who will be mainly responsible for the success of this mighty engineering feat, and who has therefore a peculiar personal interest in judging aright, is emphatically and earnestly in favor of the lock-canal project and against the sea-level project.

A carefuly study of the reports seems to establish a strong probability that the following are the facts: The sea level canal would be slightly less exposed to damage in the event of war, the running expenses, apart from the heavy cost of interest on the amount employed to build it, would be less, and for small ships the time of transit would probably be less. On the other hand, the lock canal at a level of 80 feet or thereabouts would not cost much more than half as much to build and could be built in about half the time, while there would be very much less risk connected with building it, and for large ships the transit would be quicker; while, taking into account the interest on the amount saved in building, the actual cost of maintenance would be less. After being built it would be easier to enlarge the lock canal than the sea level canal. Moreover, what has been actually demonstrated in making and operating the great lock canal, the Soo, a more important artery of traffic than the great sea level canal, the Suez, goes to support the opinion of the minority of the Consulting Board of Engineers and of the majority of the Isthmian Canal Commission as to the superior safety, feasibility, and desirability of building a lock canal at Panama.

The law now on our statute books seems to contemplate a lock canal. In my judgment a lock canal, as herein recommended, is advisable. If the Congress directs that a sea level canal be constructed its direction will, of course, be carried out. Otherwise the canal will be built on substantially the plan for a lock canal outlined by the accompanying papers, such changes being made, of course, as may be found actually necessary, including possibly the change recommended by the Secretary of War as to the site of the dam on the Pacific side.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 19, 1906.*

THE PANAMA CANAL PROBLEM—A MEMORANDUM TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS, 1954

HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES: The undersigned, who in various capacities participated in the construction of the Panama Canal, venture to bring to your attention the matters hereinafter discussed:

1. The necessity for increased capacity and operational improvement of the Panama Canal—a much-neglected waterway, now approaching obsolesence—has been long recognized. The traffic volume is the highest since 1914. With the saturation point approaching, it is essential to provide, without further delay, the additional transit capacity and operational improvements required to meet future needs.

2. The two major proposals for increased facilities are:

(a) Improvement of the existing canal by completing the authorized third-locks project, adapted to include the features of the well-conceived terminal lake plan (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 21, 1948, p. A2449—approved in principle by the Governor of the Panama Canal in hearings on H.R. 4480, 79th Cong., November 15, 1945, p. 9). A total of $75 million was expended on this project, mainly on lock-site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores, before work on it was suspended. The terminal lake plan provides for removing all lock structures from Pedro Miguel and for regrouping of all Pacific locks at or near Miraflores, thus enabling uninterrupted navigation at the Gatun Lake level between the Atlantic and Pacific locks, with a greatly needed terminal lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal. As thus improved, the modified third-locks project can be completed at relatively low cost—estimated under $600 million. The soundness of this proposal has been established by 40 years of satisfactory operation of a similar arrangement at Gatun.

(b) Construction of a practically new Panama Canal known as the sea level project, initially estimated in 1947 to cost $2,500 million, and which would be of less operational value than the existing canal it was designed to replace, but which, under present conditions, would likely cost several times that amount. The Governor of the Panama Canal (a member of the Corps of Engineers) at that time definitely went on record as advocating none but the so-called sea level project for the major increase of canal facilities, which action served to exclude what may be the best solution when evaluated

from all angles. This report, under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, was transmitted to the Congress by the President, December 1, 1947, and, significantly, without comment or recommendation. The Congress took no action, and the report was not published.

3. The terminal-lake-third-locks project has been strongly urged as the proper form of modernization by experienced civilian engineers who took part in the construction of the present canal. They have spoken from personal knowledge of the original construction. Their views are shared by many independent engineers and navigators who have studied the subject. All these insist that the present lake-lock type should be preserved as supplying the best canal for the transit of vessels which it is economically feasible to construct. They, together with many of the leading atomic warfare authorities, stress the points that the defense of the canal is an all-inclusive Federal responsibility which must be met by active military and naval measures and by industrial planning in the United States, that passive protective features embodied in construction design are inadequate, and that the proper bases for planning canal improvements are capacity and navigational efficiency. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the effective destructive power of the atomic bomb has been tremendously increased since the formal recommendation for a sea-level canal. Any canal, whatsoever the type, can be destroyed by atomic bombing, if permitted to strike.

4. The recent authorization to expend funds for repairs and alterations of present lock structures at an estimated cost of $26,500,000 is, as we believe, makeshift in character, and is without real merit. Consummation thereof, in lieu of fundamental improvements, will inevitably delay the basic and long-overdue solution of the problems involved.

5. In addition to the Panama projects, there are urgent proposals for canals at other locations, some of which have strong support, particularly Nicaragua. In developing a long-range Isthmian Canal policy to meet future interoceanic transit needs, these should certainly receive full and unbiased consideration.

6. Transcending personal considerations, but nevertheless to state the matter candidly, we submit that the third locks project, as originally planned in 1939 by the Governor of the Panama Canal, has proven most disappointing. We have every reason to believe that the insistently advocated sea-level project (which, as a matter of fact, would require tidal locks as well as vulnerable flood-control reservoirs and dikes) would prove to be a monumental boondoggle, costing the American taxpayer billions of dollars. Both of these efforts were directed by routine administrative agencies, and at heavy public expense.

7. We wish to stress the fact that, aside from the A-bomb, the recurrent discussions as to the relative advantages and disadvantages of the lake-lock and "sea-level" types of canal were exhaustively investigated, debated, and considered in 1905–06 when the Congress and the President decided in favor of the lake-lock plan—under which the canal was constructed, and (with the exception of certain operational defects in the Pacific sector) has been successfully operated. The operational defects, we believe, can be adequately corrected.

8. It must be always borne in mind that the greater the cost of increased facilities at Panama the heavier will be the load on the already overwhelmingly burdened American taxpayer; and that also such cost must be reflected in ship-transit tolls, with all that increased tolls imply.

9. We respectfully urge the early enactment of H.R. 1048. 83d Congress, introduced by Representative Thomas E. Martin, of Iowa, and supported by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, who introduced a like measure in the 82d Congress. Both of these experienced and highly competent legislators have been thorough students of interoceanic canal problems, which have grave diplomatic implications affecting all maritime nations and the relations of the United States with all Latin American countries—especially Panama. As to Panama, we would most strongly emphasize that among the features overlooked in the report under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, is the fact that the sea-level project recommended in that report is not covered by existing canal treaties and would necessitate the negotiation of a new treaty with a tremendous indemnity and greatly increased annuity payments involved. As evidence of this it may be noted that upon demand of the Panamanian Government, and the appointment by it of a commission for the purpose, the U.S. Government has named a like commission, to negotiate various questions, including that of the present annuity of $430,000 (originally $250,000), which Panama insists should be substantially increased. These negotiations began in September, 1953; when the President of Panama and members of the Panamanian Commission visited Washington in behalf of the indicated demands.

10. References to the "Governor of the Panama Canal" herein apply to the incumbent Governor at the time of the stated action.

CONCLUSION

Because of these considerations, it would seem to be clear that the indicated Commission should be created without delay, and put to work, so as to develop a timely, definite, and wisely reasoned Isthmian Canal policy. Such a body should be made up of unbiased, broad gaged, and independent men of the widest engineering, operational, governmental, and business experience, and not of persons from routine agencies, all too often involved in justifying their own groups.

Respectfully submitted,

James T. B. Bowles, Baltimore, Md.; Ralph Budd, Chicago, Ill.; Howard T. Critchlow, Trenton, N.J.; Roy W. Hebard, New York, N.Y.; Herbert D. Hinman, Newport News, Va.; William R. McCann, Hopewell, Va.; E. Sydney Randolph, Baton Rouge, La.; Hartley Rowe, Boston, Mass.; William E. Russell, New York, N.Y.; Caleb Mills Saville, Hartford, Conn.; John Frank Stevens, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Ellis D. Stillwell, Monrovia, Calif.; William G .B. Thompson, New Haven, Conn.; Robert E. Wood, Lake Forest, Ill.; Daniel E. Wright, St. Petersburg, Fla.

THE PETITIONERS

James T. B. Bowles, chemical engineer; in charge water supplies, superintendent filtration plants, Canal Zone, 1910–14; lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers, AEF.; director, secretary, and technologist of Crown Petroleum Corp.

Ralph Budd, civil engineer; chief engineer Panama Railroad, 1906–09; president, Great Northern Railway; transportation commissioner. The Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense; president, Burlington Railroad; now chairman of Chicago Transit Authority.

Howard T. Critchlow, civil and hydraulic engineer; district and chief hydrographer, Panama Canal, 1910–14; New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development on water supply, construction of dams, and flood control; past president, American Water Works Association; now director and chief engineer, Division Water Policy and Supply (New Jersey).

Roy W. Hebard, assistant engineer, resident engineer, and contractor, Panama Canal, 1905–11; major, Corps of Engineers, AEF; president, R. W. Hebard & Co., Inc., builders of highways, railroads, waterworks, and divers structures throughout Central and South America.

Herbert D. Hinman, construction engineer, whose first job for the Pacific Division in 1907 was boring to find rock for the locks; assistant engineer in charge of construction of the Pedro Miguel locks, and later in the building of the fortifications on the Pacific side; president of Virginia Engineering Corp., engaged in divers heavy construction in Virginia and the Southeastern States.

William R. McCann, assistant engineer and supervisor of construction, 1st Division, Panama Canal, 1907–14; engineer, Stone & Webster, Inc.; engineer, Allied Chemical & Dye Corp.; project manager, Buckeye Ordnance Works; now consulting engineer.

E. Sydney Randolph, civil engineer, Panama Canal service, 1910–46; office engineer, designing engineer, construction engineer, principal engineer, and consulting engineer, handling various projects such as technical supervision of maintenance and lock improvement, Madden Dam and power project exploration and investigations for additional locks, defense structures, emergency gates, increased spillway capacity, and augmented power facilities; now consulting engineer.

Hartley Rowe, electrical and construction engineer, various divisions, Panama Canal, 1905–15; engineering and construction, Lockwood, Greene & Co.; member of General Advisory Committee, Atomic Energy Commission; chief engineer, United Fruit Co.: now vice president thereof.

William E. Russell, Panama Canal service, 1905–09, under all three chief engineers, attached to office of superintending architect, and engaged in building construction; attorney, New York City; chairman of the board of several magazines in which he has controlling interests; headed committee for reevaluation of housing in New York State; has been lifelong student of Panama Canal affairs, and of the treaties pertaining thereto.

Caleb M. Saville, hydraulic engineer; in charge Third Division Panama Canal, 1907–11, investigating foundations for Gatun Dam, flow through spillway, and Chagres River hydrology; manager and chief engineer, Hartford Metropolitan District; now consulting engineer thereto.

John Frank Stevens, life student of Panama Canal problems; son of first Chairman and chief engineer, Isthmian Canal Commission, who planned the construction, organization, and plant, and was largely responsible for the adoption of the lock-lake type of waterway.

Ellis D. Stillwell, electrical engineer; served on Panama Canal, 1912–49, assistant superintendent Gatun locks, superintendent Gatun locks, and superintendent Locks Division in charge of lock operations and transits, and responsible for lock maintenance and biennial overhauling.

William G. B. Thompson, civil engineer; Panama Canal service 1905–16 supervising, among other assignments, construction of Balboa Terminal; State highway engineer of New Jersey; vice president and chief engineer, Gandy Bridge Co., St. Petersburg, Fla.; with Allied Chemical and Dye Corp. as superintendent of construction and as project manager Kentucky Ordinance Works; now consulting engineer.

Robert E. Wood, assistant quartermaster, chief quartermaster, and director Panama Railroad, 1907–14; Brigadier general, U.S. Army (retired), and later acting quartermaster general; president, Sears, Roebuck & Co.; now chairman of the board thereof.

Daniel E. Wright, civil engineer; Panama Canal service, 1904–18 as municipal and sanitary engineer, Central Division, extended subsequently to all divisions and to Panama City and Colón; contracting and consulting

in Central and South America; with Rockefeller Foundation and U.S. Public Health Service as sanitary expert on various commissions to Middle East, Greece, France, Burma, China, India, Egypt, and elsewhere; captain, U.S. Army, World War I; colonel, U.S. Army, World War II.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 8, 1963]

PANAMA CANAL QUESTIONS: IMMEDIATE ACTION REQUIRED

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since the nationalization in 1956 by Egypt of the Suez Canal and the precedent-making recognition and support by our Government of that action, the Panama Canal has been the victim of a series of diplomatic aggressions on the part of the Republic of Panama against the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the United States over the Canal Zone. Immeasurably complicated by the ratification in 1955 of the secretly contrived Eisenhower-Remon Treaty, our Government, both the Congress and the Executive, has failed to meet these assaults with forthright declaration of policy. Instead, through mistaken acts of generosity and timid attempts and placation, it has aggravated the situation in the Canal Zone, with conditions there verging on chaos.

Underlying the present sovereignty agitation, and related to it in many ways, is the transcendant question of increased transit capacity, a subject that has been under congressional consideration since the advent in 1945 of the atomic bomb. In that year, the Congress, on recommendations of administrative authorities, enacted Public Law 280, 79th Congress, authorizing the Governor of the Panama Canal—now Canal Zone—to study the means for increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense, including consideration of canals at other locations, and a restudy of the Third Locks project authorized by act approved August 11, 1939.

This construction project, hurriedly started in 1940 without adequate study, was suspended in May 1942 by the Secretary of War—Stimson—after an expenditure of some $75 million of the taxpayers' money, mainly on lock-site excavations for parallel sets of larger locks at Gatun and Miraflores, most of which can be used in the future. Fortunately, the suspension of that project occurred before excavation was started at Pedro Miguel.

The wording of the 1945 statute, which was drafted in the Panama Canal organization that would later supervise its execution, is most significant in that this law was the first basic canal statute to include the terms, "security" and "national defense," along with the usual terms, "capacity" and "interoceanic commerce" for such laws.

Under a far more extreme interpretation of this conveniently worded enactment, those who directed the inquiry emphasized the "security" and "national defense" factors as paramount and controlling, and even as a "mandate" from the Congress for a recommendation of a new canal of sea level design at Panama. Later developments revealed that this design had been one of the undisclosed and unauthorized objectives of the 1939 Third Locks project.

The report of the Governor, heedless of the diplomatic consequences and costs involved, recommended only a sea level project at Panama for a major increase of transit capacity, on the basis of its alleged greater "security" primarily against atomic attack and the needs of "national defense." This action served to obscure the plan for the major improvement of the existing canal which, when evaluated from all significant angles, may be the best solution.

Forwarded to Congress by the President on December 1, 1947, and significantly without approval, comment or recommendation, the Congress took no action and the report was not published as is usual in such cases.

In the ensuing discussions of the 1947 sea level recommendation in the Congress, distinguished Members described its significant features and exposed the fallacies upon which it was founded. Notable among those discussions were statements by such leaders as Chairman Fred Brandley and Schuler Otis Bland of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Representatives Thomas E. Martin and Willis W. Bradley, all of whom strongly opposed the sea level proposal.

The special attention of the Congress is invited to two addresses by Representative Willis W. Bradley, which admirably clarified the issues and made strong appeals for an independent inquiry: "What of the Panama Canal?" CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 10, page A2449; and "The Why's of the Panama Canal," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 12, page A1304. With minor revision, the arguments presented in these two addresses apply with equal force today.

Unfortunately, nothing specific was done is this regard until 1957, when the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, pursuant to House Resolution 149, 85th Congress, appointed a part-time board of consultants to investigate the short-range plans for improving the Panama Canal.

This board made no new field engineering studies and based its report on data and studies made by others for the Panama Canal Company, or by the staff of the Company. Its report, House Report No. 1960, 86th Congress, signed on June 1, 1960, recommended no action toward a major increase of canal capacity, but that the entire situation be reviewed in 1970, or an appropriately earlier date if traffic estimates are exceeded.

The time, Mr. Speaker, has now come for our Government to undertake the important task of deciding upon the matter of increased transit capacity for the Panama Canal.

For this purpose, there are a number of bills now before the Congress, which I wish to discuss briefly.

One group, illustrated by H.R. 863, introduced by my colleague from Ohio [Mr. Bow], and H.R. 3858, by myself, would create the Interoceanic Canals Commission. This independent body would be directed to study, first the question of increasing the capacity and operational efficiency of the present canal through adaptation of the suspended third lock project to provide a summit level terminal lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with that in the Atlantic end; second, the construction of new canal of sea-level design at Panama, and third, the question of a second canal. Consideration of the treaty and territorial rights involved, which so far have been ignored, would be one of the main features of this inquiry.

An entirely different approach, however, is represented by H.R. 80, introduced by my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. This bill would authorize the Panama Canal Company to study the means for increasing the security and capacity of the Panama Canal or construction of a new canal to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense. The key terms of this bill are identical with those of Public Law 280, 79th Congress, and equally ambiguous. Nor do they provide for consideration of the treaty or territorial questions involved. Moreover, it would keep the inquiry under the control of the same advocates who have long had the predetermined objective of a sea-level canal at Panama for reasons other than navigation.

These advocates, Mr. Speaker, have unjustifiably opposed any major improvement of the existing waterway on the ground that such improvement would delay "conversion" to sea level. This is no reason at all, but a challenge to which the Congress should be alert. Every factor in the situation demands that the question of the future increase of transit capacity should not be undertaken by administrative agencies but by an independent body under congressional authorization, which should be composed only of those of the highest qualifications.

In anticipation of the present situation, I requested Mr. Edward Sydney Randolph, of Baton Rouge, La., a former member of the 1957 board of consultants, to review the 1960 report of that body which he has done in a letter to me dated April 5, 1963. The fact that he was not a member of this board during its consideration of the long-range program left him free to comment upon its report objectively.

His long service in the Canal Zone in responsible engineering capacity, familiarity with the problems involved, independence and vision, enabled him to prepare specific comments of rare merit that reflect a lifetime of observation and study. Not only that, his knowledge has enabled him to present a most constructive engineering program that should be considered only by an independent commission, with powers as set forth in H.R. 863 and H.R. 3858.

Every consideration in the overall subject demands that our Government energetically strive to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission at the earliest date, for too much time has already passed.

In these general connections, we must not overlook the fact that the well-known and tested Terminal Lake-third locks solution for the Panama Canal would not require the negotiation of a new treaty with Panama, but that the sea-level proposal would so require. The first is covered by existing treaties but the latter is not so covered. These features in themselves ought to be sufficient to determine the matter; but, in any event, the proposed commission would consider this important treaty question.

An indispensable prerequisite before undertaking any plan for the increase of capacity of the Panama Canal or for a second canal at another site is the clarification and reaffirmation of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone, which is constantly being contested by Panama. Such results are contemplated in House Concurrent Resolution 105, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon], and House Concurrent Resolution 113, introduced by myself.

Mr. Speaker, delay and confusion have, for too long, plagued the situation on the isthmus as regards the sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone and also the determination of an adequate plan for increased transit capacity and operational improvement of the Panama Canal. The time has come for action, for which the 1960 report of the Board of Consultants was a constructive first step.

In order to make Mr. Randolph's statesmanlike engineering analysis of this 1960 report easily available not only to the Congress and the Executive, but as well to all interests concerned with interoceanic commerce and have to bear the costs of tolls, as well as to the nations at large, I quote it as a part of my remarks:

BATON ROUGE, LA.,
April 5, 1963.

To: The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, House of Representatives, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

From: Edward Sydney Randolph, registered professional engineer, Life Fellow, American Society of Civil Engineers.

Subject: Panama Isthmian Canal—Bill to create an Interoceanic Canals Commission.

Reference: Letter of Congressman FLOOD to E. S. Randolph dated October 4, 1962, and later matter.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: This is in response to your request for comments on the above subjects.

A list of references is at the end of this letter. For brevity references will be to year and page number. Most references are to

the 1960 consulting board report. Although I served on the Board while it produced the short-range program, July 15, 1958, published as a committee print, I did not contribute to the long-range program, nor did I know what the contents were, until after its publication. The short-range program has long ago been implemented.

To reduce confusing details, this letter will deal chiefly with the locked-in parts of the Panama Canal from Gatun locks at the north to Miraflores locks at the south end. The 1960 board report states at page 8, "The sea-level sections may take traffic in both directions simultaneously." The sea-level section from Gatun to sea is nominally 6.43, and at Pacific end, from Miraflores locks to sea is nominally 7.41 nautical miles. (Pilot's Handbook, revised 1956, p. 17.14.)

If in the remote future, there will be a need for some improvements to the sea-level sections of the lock-canal, it might be economical to perform these operations when needed and not associate them with any program for new locks. The sea-level sections do not seem to be limiting factors to the capacity of the canal.

The several very distinguished members of the board which produced the long-range program, signed June 1, 1960, were engaged for almost 3 years on the short- and long-range programs. Significant is the statement (1960 p. 1) "No new field engineering was done for the purpose of this report. It is based on data and studies made by others for the Panama Canal, or by the company's staff." Under the circumstances, I do not know how they could have produced a better report at that time. I do not question their findings. At the time of signing, the board possessed far more late information than I. In this letter, I hope to show reasons why the inquiry should be energetically continued at an early date. Any discussions in this letter are to point up the need for inquiries, not with the intention of deciding any other issues.

The board was provided with several plans and estimates for lock-type and sea-level canals at the Canal Zone. The board made some comments on them but did not recommend any for construction.

Several names have been used to differentiate the several lock-canal plans, but obviously any third lane of new locks will, in fact, be a third set of locks. There are wide differences in estimated costs, times required for construction, dimensions of lock chambers and conveniences of operation in the lock plans offered to the board and shown in the 1960 board report. There might be more and different plans for locks developed, perhaps leading to something superior, if further investigations were vigorously and objectively pushed, by a representative group of able men, empowered to act. The proposed bill, H.R. 3858, to create an Interoceanic Canals Commission, now before Congress, would be the best agency for securing the best plan for the future Panama Canal—or a canal in any other place.

The 1939 report (H.D. 210, 76th) led to the authorization by Congress of a third set of locks. Construction was started July 1, 1940, but was suspended by the Secretary of War in May 1942, due to shortage of ships and materials more urgently needed in wartime. (Encyclopedia Britannica, 1961, p. 173.) Construction was not resumed. Other plans were put forward—for a sea-level canal, and a third lock canal which would elevate the Miraflores Lake to summit level (the Terminal Lake Canal). These two were widely publicized and discussed. (See 1949 Transactions of the Am. Soc. C.E., vol. 114, pp. 558–906.) Accordingly, it appears that the lock canal plan is still the one approved and favored by Congress. But events since the board report dated June 1960 would justify a new look at all lock canal plans heretofore published and others to be devised.

In the 1960 report, I found no recommendation for the resumption of the lock construction program. However, at page 7, recommendation 7, is stated: "The entire situation should be reviewed in 1970, or if the present traffic estimates are appreciably exceeded, at an appropriately earlier date." At the time of signing the report, it was doubtless quite clear that a new examination of the matter should be based solely on traffic density. But the situation will be different after year 1967, when it is expected that the enlargements recommended in the 1960 report will be accomplished. Also, the investigations recommended by the Board are yielding data, which should be evaluated by the proposed commission.

In the 1960 report, at page 38, is shown "Plan 1: Interim Improvements to Present Canal (cost $61 million)." The interim program is all that was recommended for construction. Other recommendations included various investigations, one concerning the construction of a sea-level canal and another concerning water supply for lockages.

What will happen after the year 1967? Should the United States be ready with the best plan for construction of new locks, in case of need? Even those lock plans revised in 1958 (1960, p. 319, app. 3) are not on a comparable basis. How can the best plan be found? It is probably true that a third flight of new locks can be constructed in much less time than any sea-level canal, and for a fraction of the first cost.

After the year 1967, there will be an ample waterway from lock to lock. So deep that the full increase in depth will not be required for a long time. The original locks will have some perfections added but will limit the size of the maximum ship to 102 feet wide, 800 feet long and 38 feet fresh water draft (1960, p. 38). When only one lock lane is available the maximum traffic will be 38 lockages in 24 hours (p. 19). It was estimated that the outage time of one chamber could be reduced to 72 or 96 hours, for repairs (p. 19). That is 3 or 4 days. If during one of those 3-day periods transits happened to be at a peak rate there could be a piling-up of ships. The maximum peak day rate in 1959 was 39.2 transits (1960, table at p. 24). Estimated peak day traffic for 1976 was 47.1, and for year 2000 was 61.9. While these possibilities of delays to ships during several days do not seem alarming now, the situation needs consideration together with the overall planning of the future canal. At page 19, is the statement: "If these outage times can be selected for minimum traffic interference, the maximum capacity could be achieved."

(1960, p. 17): "Basically, the absolute measure of the canal capacity is the maximum number of lockages that can be processed in 24 hours." And at page 21: "It is generally predicted that the capacity of a single lock lane would be insufficient at times to meet the needs of expected traffic beyond the year 1960."

It is time for a hard new look at the several problems as they will be influenced by the passage of time, interim improvements, the yield from the investigations recommended in the 1960 report, and by other scientific advances. Congress must decide all major questions based on suffcient information. A commission can present data, to Congress, based on the commission's massive investigations. Engineers, and other experts, employed by the commission, can provide answers to lesser questions and information for consideration by the commission.

In the press there have been statements to the effect that some improvements in capacity of the American Isthmian Canal will be required by year 1980. If true, the leadtime is running out. Such statements are subject to question by a representative body such as a commission. For each proposed plan in the 1960 report is shown a construction schedule. The minimum is 8½ years for lock construction including 2 for engineering and administration (1960, p. 373). At pages 382 and 386 are shown construction schedules for Plan III—Consolidated Third Locks (Terminal Lake) and Plan IV—Zone Sea Level Canal, both 12 years for completion after authorization. These schedules are for necessary work after authorization (1960, p. 324). To be added to the above time periods are the time for congressional action and before that time for commission actions. There is so vast a field for investigation that several years might be required by a commission alone.

Crash programs are costly and likely to be far from the best. The only possible means for the full accomplishment of all the interlocking inquiries concerning an enlarged waterway would be by means of the proposed commission.

Each basic fact relating to the problem has a number of variations and different advocates.

The interim improvements recommended by the 1960 board included the deepening of the summit level by 5 feet, from nominal fresh water depth of 45 feet to 50 feet, or 11 percent, and for the widening from 300 to 500 feet minimum, or 67 percent, and this is expected to be accomplished by year 1967. In the meantime all commercial tonnage applying for passage is accommodated by the original channel while in the process of widening and deepening. The installation of lights and signals along the canal, already implemented, will enable vessels to pass in both directions simultaneously during night or day (1960, p. 302). "Lighting both Gaillard Cut and the locks would * * * increase the capacity * * * by permitting two-way traffic in Gaillard Cut during darkness, thus making 24-hour operations possible."

It is implied that the widened and deepened canal will (except for the locks) have ability to handle the traffic, in tons, until the year 2000 (1960, p. 3, conclusion 8). "Comparison of capacity and demand also shows that even the present canal, after completion of the short-range program and plan I, will have fully adequate capacity to meet the demands of traffic beyond the year 2000 * * * except * * * when repairs or overhauls are being made to the locks." And at page 26: "The life of the dredged channel can be perpetuated by periodic dredging."

From the above, it might be construed that there need be no more massive deepening or widening programs for the waterway as far as man can foresee. (Even the 37-foot salt water draft of the carrier U.S.S. *Constellation* would be comfortably accommodated.)

The added depth, particularly in the restricted Gaillard Cut, will permit some extra drawdown of Gatun Lake level in dry seasons, which will permit some added electric power generation at the Gatun Station. At first this will permit a certain amount of fuel saving. But as ships increase in size it is probable that the minimum lake level will again be increased. The water level must provide sufficient depth above the lock sills at Gatun and Pedro Miguel to float ships conveniently.

At page 25 of 1960 report is stated:

"(d) Water supply: The usable water supply in Gatun Lake is increased under this plan * * * by deepening the channel 3 feet more than required for ship maneuverability. With this increase the water supply is considered adequate for the operation of the canal as reconstructed under this plan."

The authors of the report seem to have taken a long look ahead—to the time when the third flight of locks is a reality. Then the 3 feet added depth will be very welcome for larger ships.

The minimum depth of 47 feet (occurring only at ends of long dry seasons) should

suffice for many years, if new and deeper locks are provided. If deeper water will ever be a necessity, at that date consideration might be given to adoption to a higher minimum level which would lend itself to a gradual increase in depth; or to lowering the bottom of the canal, which would need to be done in a larger step, to be economically performed. It must, at some time, be decided which expedient will be adopted, how much increase in depth at one time, and when the deepening will be imperative, if ever.

A full inquiry by the commission might show that the channel, harbor, and aids to navigation will not require large improvements above those accomplished and now in progress within the predictable future. Also that the dates of the needs for larger locks, deeper channels, and added water supply may be based on different factors.

In the cost estimates, provided for consideration by the consulting board, starting at page 389 of the 1960 report, for additional locks, are shown items which might not be appropriate after the current program of widening, deepening, lighting, etc., of the channels is completed. Assume the waterway will then be adequate until some time like year 2000 (too far ahead for any accurate forecast). In that case a third lane of new and larger locks will accommodate practically all traffic, even very large ships.

Under the above assumption, there would fall from the cost estimates those items already accomplished, in whole or in part, such as channel deepening and widening, lighting, signals, harbor improvements, and ship salvage facilities; none of which would need attention merely because there were larger locks and probably would need only maintenance for a very long time.

If these items are deducted from the cost estimates, as shown on table 1 (following), the costs (1939) would be reduced to—

Millions

For plan II, 3d locks, reduced amount_ $468
For plan III, Terminal Lake—3d locks_ 875

The published estimates in the 1960 report are not in so much detail that I can determine exactly how much of each item should be excluded as unnecessary to the functioning of any of the locks.

TABLE I

(Part or all of the following items in estimated costs might be found unnecessary or inappropriate for any new cost estimates for a new flight of locks in the Panama Canal)

	Plan II, 3d locks	Plan III, consolidated 3d locks (Terminal Lake), 3 lifts
Page references, 1960 Board report	389, 390	393–395
Items 3 and 4. Channel excavation	$197, 770, 000	$204, 010, 000
Item 5. Harbor improvements	3, 300, 000	12, 950, 000
Item 6a. Excavation, unclassified	17, 180, 930	
Item 6b. Excavation, unclassified		
Item 6c. Excavation, unclassified	15, 321, 250	
Item 12. Aids to navigation	11, 500, 000	
Item 11. Aids to navigation		11, 498, 000
Item 11. Ship salvage facilities		8, 240, 000
Total	245, 072, 180	236, 698, 000
Engineering design and supervision, exploratory work, and inspection of materials (at 8 percent)	19, 606, 000	18, 936, 000
Total (assumed deductible)	264, 678, 000	255, 634, 000
Original total estimated cost	733, 080, 001	130, 310, 000
Balance, original total less deductibles	468, 402, 000	874, 676, 000

NOTE.—It is possible that for plan III an additional item of $23,000,000 would be deductible, it being "Excavation unclassified" at Gatun.

I have not seen costs, on a comparable basis, for the plan III, the Terminal Lake plan, and plan II, the third locks plan. Those presented in 1960 are based on plans so different in size and other respects that a cost comparison cannot be found. In plan III, the construction of the two upper chambers, in Miraflores Lake, to make the Miraflores locks a continuous 3-lift affair to summit level, would be terribly difficult, long drawn out, would make navigation during construction very inconvenient. The cost for the two parallel chambers, about $178 million (1960, p. 394) would go far toward building another 3-lift lock at Miraflores, if of reasonable size. The construction time would be shortened from 12 to 8½ years (p. 381) and would not interfere with traffic during construction. Each of these items would materially reduce the cost of the project.

The chamber size of 200 by 1,500 feet for plan III, new locks, is a carryover from 1947 studies. The horizontal area is 78 percent greater than for locks 140 by 1,200 feet. The U.S.S. *Constellation* is 252 feet wide. Any lock large enough to accommodate such craft as the *Constellation* would have no commercial value. However, the enlarged waterway (except locks) would carry the *Constellation*. If it were found necessary to accommodate such vessels, a special lock at each end of the canal might be built and operated for the account of the Navy Department. Due to probable infrequent use, there might be possible some economics of construction. Obviously, if such a lock system were ever to be built, the cost and inconvenience would be much less if the locks were built in only two, rather than three locations.

Water control: Most essential for floating and locking vessels. This tremendously involved subject is too time consuming for direct consideration by Congress. Better that engineers work up the data, then a commission draw conclusion for submission to Congress.

It is axiomatic that the Gatun Lake was developed as an integral part of the waterway. The lake is wholly within the Canal Zone but most of the watershed is in the Republic of Panama. Thus the Republic of Panama is free to build reservoirs on the upper watershed for their own purposes, such as municipal uses and possibly for power. However, any spillage from such reservoirs would almost inevitably flow into the Gatun Lake. This use of water by the Panama Republic will become the subject of news items, I feel sure.

"Water supply appears to be adequate for lock operation and for municipal uses" (1960, p. 24). And on page 723: "In the present canal, therefore, the available water supply will be ample for anticipated traffic beyond the year 2000."

Probably, by the year 2000, considerable pumping into Gatun Lake will be required, of sea water (or brackish water) from one of the sea level approaches to the locks. The cost was estimated at $250 per lockage, year 1931 (report, 1931, p. 31). Now the costs will be more. The procedure for operating pumps is subject to variations in order to meet varying needs. To limit the cost in plant and in power demand (in kilowatts), a program wherein the pumps would be operated for a longer period than for the period of actual need of extra water for depth and for lockages might be worked out if scientific forecasting is somewhat improved by the end of this century. In any case, if too much water were pumped, it could be later used to generate part of the power consumed in the pumping. The subject is very complicated. It is one for consideration of a commission with the advice of engineers.

Pumping water into reservoirs is not new. At the newly finished Robert Moses Niagara Powerplant (National Geographic, April 1963, p. 581): "At night when power demand is low, Niagara-powered electric pumps store water in reservoirs. During the day's peak demand, the stored water flows out through the same pumps, which become turbogenerators producing more electricity."

For a long time the Gatun Lake has been mildly saline, at the upper ends of the terminal locks, due to the mixing action caused by the filling jets in the lock floors. The heavier saline water lies at the bottom of the lake or cut. With heavy pumping the salinity might become objectionable when water is intended for municipal uses. By the time pumping in large amounts becomes necessary, great advances in the desalting of water will have been made. In Barron's magazine, April 1, 1963, at page 3, is stated: "A plastic-like membrane * * * filters dissolved salt out of water."

Electric power: Traditionally water has been drawn from Gatun Lake to generate at Gatun Station. As lockages increase, water for power must decrease (1960, p. 24). "There is not enough water for hydroelectric units to generate all the power required for the Canal Zone in the dry season and in some subnormal rainy seasons." And at page 22, is stated: "There is insufficient diesel power generating equipment on the isthmus to handle all power requirements."

In the 1960 report, page 25, at bottom, reference is made to "* * * deepening the channel 3 feet more than required for improvement of ship maneuverability." It is implied that the lake level can be lowered by all or part of this 3 feet, and so provide added water during dry seasons. That is, only 2 feet of the 5-foot deepening in plan 1, was for maneuverability. In early years this would permit saving in fuel for power generation. The proposed lowering of lake bottom to elevation 30, for plan III (1960, p. 29) would permit more drawdown, but would deprive the old locks at Gatun of much useful depth. The cost of deepening to elevation 30 would be tremendous. I cannot make an exact determination of it from the estimates in the report.

FINANCIAL MATTERS

The financial policy of the Panama Canal has not been quite like that of a commercial enterprise. One test might be: Could a new flight of locks be financed by a bond issue sold to the public? The answer is obvious, because experience shows that the original investment would not be recovered.

From report, 1960, page 2: "Unless improvements are made for security reasons alone, the carrying charges of all capital expenditures, including appropriate amortization, as well as cost of operation of the canal, should be borne by canal tolls."

Any new cost analyses might very well include amortization as favored by the 1960 board.

There is talk of constructing another canal, away from the present one. Should we so multiply our financial losses?

A new canal, at some other location, would, besides the construction cost, involve the duplication of many plant items, now on the Canal Zone, and at modern prices. Some items are: accommodations to foreign countries, land rental, harbors and harbor facilities (including drydocks and repair shops), dams and reservoirs, waterworks, power system, fuel stores, industrial plant for operations, storehouses, dwellings, community buildings, roads, and streets, sanitation and hospitals, telephone system, possibly a railway. (There is also the installation system for national defense.)

It seems overoptimistic to assume that a better treaty, or perhaps one as good as we still have with the Republic of Panama, could be negotiated.

All of the plant items, now in operation on the Panama Canal would serve as well with a third flight of locks as they do at present. Any needed additions would serve to increase the volume of business and should

reduce the overhead and other operating costs, per vessel in transit.

It would be impossible, of course, to make an offhand cost estimate of the ancillary items above listed. I would not be surprised if it exceeded half a billion dollars.

A businessman's viewpoint might indicate that the plan requiring the smallest outlay of money, over the years, would be most likely to succeed.

Other lock plans suggested for study: It would be interesting and possibly very valuable to have at least two lock canal plans investigated by a commission. One to be a variation of the plan II, Third Locks Canal which would bypass Pedro Miguel locks on the west side, and have a duplicate of the Gatun new locks at the Miraflores site, and a channel on west side of Miraflores Lake.

The other would be a variation of plan III, consolidated Third Locks Canal (in the 1960 report), better known as the Terminal Lake plan, which would naturally follow the completion of the plan II variation having the bypass channel ready, the second Miraflores flight of locks would be simple to accomplish, relatively inexpensive. Then with two new locks at Miraflores, the completion of the Terminal Lake would be the final step.

Both plans could make use of the enlarged waterway between locks as well as the sea-level sections, without change. Both would be designed to the same dimensions, having locks, probably 140 by 1,200 feet in plan and about 50 feet deep, or any more appropriate size selected by the commission. Both would include, in construction cost, only the new locks, approaches, and such essential appurtenances required to make locks workable.

By omitting the new Pedro Miguel west lock there would be saved costs of 4,500 feet of lock and approach walls, 260 linear feet of lock floor, two caisson seats and a pair of gates. Also the bottom of the excavated bypass channel would be about 27 feet higher than in case of plan II. There would be savings in cost due to working in only one location at the Pacific end of canal. There would be savings in operating and maintenance costs.

There need be no change in the Gatun locks as now planned, unless the dimensions are changed. Both, of course, being at the same dimensions, as adopted for the Pacific end.

In the first plan (bypass Pedro Miguel locks), the cost of the bypass channel would be involved. The channel would pass along the west side of Miraflores Lake. The present canal channel and the new would require separation by a substantial dike, which would later be removed when the Terminal Lake permanent structures were completed. The difference in water levels would be nominally from 54 feet to 85 feet. But the summit level could possibly rise, during a great flood to 92 feet. About 38 feet would be the difference in water levels to be provided for.

In the first plan, the completed arrangement on the Pacific end would match that at the Atlantic end of the canal. One flight of locks at each end, from summit level to the sea in three steps. It appears that the variation of plan II, above described would be less costly to construct than plan II with locks at three locations.

The greater saving resulting from the suggested plan above would be realized when a second lock were placed at Miraflores beside the first new lock—then both would be served by the same bypass channel. (If a special lock for aircraft carriers were added, the saving would again be realized.)

For the Terminal Lake plan, here suggested, the elimination of the two upper chambers at the old Miraflores locks would make available a saving in cost of about $178 million (1960, p. 394). That would go far toward the construction of a second lock for the new twin locks at the west Miraflores site, required for the Terminal Lake plan. Shortening the construction period would make a material saving in first cost. Avoiding any interference with traffic during construction would make a large saving. The old locks need not be altered at all until it was time to abandon them and complete the closure of the Terminal Lake at Miraflores.

After construction of a pair of twin locks at Miraflores west site, the final step in the competion of the Terminal Lake plan would include the enclosing of the Miraflores Lake to permit its surface elevation to be at summit level, the relocation of facilities involved, and the removal of part or all of the old Pedro Miguel locks.

It might be prudent to try for the single lock at Miraflores with the Pedro Miguel bypass channel first because of the relatively small outlay in money. Later, at the appropriate date, develop the second lock at Miraflores. (If this date is not too remote, it might be possible to get along with only one new lock at Gatun while using the old Gatun locks. This expedient would greatly reduce the second outlay of money, and permit some of the money to be used to elevate the Miraflores Lake.)

My personal feeling is that the step-at-the-time construction program would be easier to finance. Any of the items of construction is large enough to avoid the objections to small contracts.

The following steps can be financed singly, or in combination:

1. Build a flight of new locks at Gatun and one at Miraflores, with bypass channel west of Pedro Miguel locks and in west side of Miraflores Lake.
2. Build second west Miraflores lock, use same bypass channel.
3. Raise Miraflores Lake.
4. Add second lock at Gatun, east.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. RANDOLPH.

REFERENCES

1. The 1931 report, House Document No. 139, 72d Congress, 1st session, by U.S. Army Interoceanic Canal Board.

2. The 1939 report, House Document No. 210, 76th Congress, 1st session, by the Governor of the Panama Canal, "Report on the Panama Canal for the Future Needs of Interoceanic Shipping."

3. The 1947 report, "Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal," under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, 1st session, Isthmian Canal studies, 1947.

4. The 1958 report, "Improvements to the Panama Canal—Short-Range Program," July 15, 1958, by Board of Consultants, Isthmian Canal studies, committee report, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5. The 1960 report, House Report No. 1960, 86th Congress, 2d session, by Board of Consultants, Isthmian Canal studies, "Report on a Long-Range Program for Isthmian Canal Transits," signed June 1, 1960.

6. The 1949 volume of transactions of the American Society of Civil Engineers, volume 114, pages 558 to 906. Contains a paper by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, "The Marine Operating Problems of the Panama Canal and their Solution." Describes at length the Terminal Lake plan and has been widely read by engineers. Also are many papers relating to the sea level subject. This is the only reference containing discussions from both sides.

7. Encyclopedia Britannica, 1961 edition, pages 172 to 174.

8. U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, March 1963, at page 152, shows overall dimensions and draft of the aircraft carrier *Constellation* (1,047 feet long by 252 feet wide by 37-foot draft. Completed December 1961.

9. Panama Canal Company, Pilots Handbook, revised 1956.

BATON ROUGE, LA.,
April 20, 1964.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: In reply to yours of April 10, concerning policy statement of Dr. Milton Eisenhower, shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 6, pages 7192–7196, statement appears to be a political paper by the opposition to the party in office. The injection of the highly advertised issue regarding the Panama incident, the sea level canal issue and some proposition for a solution of all the problems there was probably to attract the maximum attention. I suspect, also, that the proposals are intended to alleviate the sense of shame felt by patriotic Americans when, in 1960, the flag of the Panama Republic was raised over the zone.

The premise that a sea level canal will be built is entirely without substantial foundation and will be untenable unless the Congress so orders. Also the proposition that we must abandon the present fine canal and donate it to the Republic of Panama is intolerable to a person experienced with the building, operation and financing of the original canal. The very weakness of the proposed policy proposed in the statement will give much comfort and encouragement to those who are greedy and contriving to take over any U.S. property within reach.

Dr. Eisenhower is no doubt a splendid man in his own field. But any efforts in the field of Latin American policy might better be left to our many trained and experienced diplomats. In this way we might tend to avoid some incidents and defeats in the future.

With the Panama flag flying over the Canal Zone, the Governor is serving under two flags. An impossible situation on its face. I agree that the Governor is actually the manager of the Panama Canal Company, hence is employer of any Panama workers there. As long as the United States maintains an embassy in Panama, the Governor should not attempt to make policies with respect to Panama citizens. All of our recent difficulties are the result of making Panama a no man's land. The fight will continue as long as that is the case. Let us admit someone made a mistake, and now we have proof of it so only one flag will fly over the canal in the future.

At page 7194, column 2, upper, "insist that the $460 million of debt owed by the Canal Company to the U.S. Treasury be assumed and repaid by the Panama Government."

Even if we were to give away the Panama Canal, I would say the idea that Panama should promise to pay a debt we owe to ourselves is an absurdity. If we wish that debt paid we need only to increase tolls a little and dedicate that extra revenue to debt reduction.

At p. 7195, 1st col. upper, "the present canal could handle most traffic, other than the largest ships, for about another 25 years."

Twenty-five years is a long time in this disturbed world. Will the old locks hold up that long? Will the present rate of growth of shipping continue? We would be wise to reinforce our hold on the present canal and zone and also to see to it that Panama does not go the way of Cuba. Before 25 years have passed, there will be needed larger, stronger locks; for otherwise, we will lose much in tolls from larger size ships and perhaps more important the continued development of trade through the canal. The new locks would be several times stronger than the old (built 1909 to 1914). The scientists and engineers would see to that, and make them very resistant to attacks from nature and man.

At p. 7195, 3d col. lower. "When a new (sea level) canal has been built * * * donate the homes, schools, hospitals, and other facilities * * * to the Republic."

Of course, I do not believe a sea level canal can be justified as a business venture, whereas an improved lock canal can. The facilities only a few mentioned are worth a half-billion dollars or more. If they were donated, the Panama Republic would be left without income as traffic would be diverted to the other canal. The result of taking that income from Panama would be chaos. No indemnity could be large enough to compensate for the jobs and income Panama does and will receive from the Panama Canal while owned, operated and controlled by the U.S. Government. This donation, hence abolition of the canal to Panama, would be the most costly way possible to end the error of 1960 when the Panama flag was flown over the canal.

For the present, let us hold fast to what we have, and make no new promises of gifts. If and when we find a better way to handle ships, and at less cost, then we might take up the necessary revisions to treaties. We must cease our endless retreat for we are not guilty.

I enclose two clippings from the Times Picayune, New Orleans, giving an account of the troubles of handling a too-big merchant vessel in the Mississippi River. These outsize, ships will become unpopular, I think.

Yours sincerely,

E. S. RANDOLPH.

Enclosure: Two.

BATON ROUGE, LA.,
January 24, 1964.

Subject: Sea level canal by nuclear excavation—need for a commission.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD:

1. This answers Mr. FLOOD's letter dated January 8, 1964, inviting my comments and suggestions on the matter contained in the documents listed below, relating to plans and estimates for nuclear blasted canal through the American isthmus. These plans seem still to be esoteric.

(a) Dated January 1960. "Annex VI. Isthmian Canal Plans—1960," "Engineering Plan for Construction of a Sea Level Canal by Nuclear Methods" by a private engineering firm. Although this document is 4 years old, I was unable to see it before this month.

(b) Dated June 9, 1962. "Plowshare program, Project Sedan, Application of Nuclear Explosives for Peaceful Purposes." U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. This explains the need for Project Sedan using shots larger and deeper in the ground than formerly made.

(c) Copy of a letter from Chairman, AEC, to Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD with two enclosures (date of letter not reproduced, about August 1963).

(1) Enclosure: Cost estimate for canal on Route 17 (not dated).

(2) Enclosure: Eight documents described below.

(d) Eight documents of AEC having the general title "Project Sedan, Nevada Test Site/July 6, 1962." The date appears to refer to date of a detonation for experimental purposes. The documents appear to evaluate the effects of the nuclear blast with regard to various aspects—radiation, fallout, ejecta, seismic, etc.

2. The January 1960 document was prepared in the manner of a preliminary engineering study and is more graphic and easily followed by the uninitiated than the others listed. However, because of the intensive work on nuclear devices it is probably largely obsolete after 4 years. It is stated in the August 1963 letter that the enclosed cost estimate is from a non-AEC report that is not publicly available. When and if said report becomes available we can hope that it will contain more description, plans, quantity estimates, and other pertinent data than has yet been shown. Then a commission of widely experienced engineers and others will better be able to judge of its merits.

3. The data contained in letter from AEC, August 1963, probably presents a later, hence more accurate, cost estimate for a canal. However, it is more difficult to understand than a proper engineer-type estimate supported by sufficient maps, drawings, and quantities of work involved. Its quantitative data is mostly limited to the nuclear blasts. Naturally, a string of blast holes is only a part of the ship canal.

4. The cost estimate next above totals $750 million, which is practically the same as contained in the engineering report dated January 1960. However, differences in some items indicate the older estimate was worked over or made new.

5. The data furnished me indicates that a cut through the isthmus can be made by nuclear devices and I have no means of challenging the cost figures for the open cut. However, the uncertainties of costs of atomic materials and services (August 1963) is shown by the statement that charges for "minimum yield plan" are $470 million, and for "minimum yield plan" are $203 million. The tentative sum used for that item was $250 million. This is explained by the expectation that very substantial reductions in nuclear costs can be realized. By this time a more precise evaluation may be known to the AEC.

6. Lack of former experience in canal excavation by nuclear blasting is evident in the cost estimates. As everyone knows, no such work has been done (unless by the Soviets). The large contingency items introduced in places are perhaps necessary. It is an enormous project to contemplate without previous experience. A remark attributed to Mr. John S. Kelly, Director of AEC, in U.S. News & World Report dated June 10, 1963, at page 74, follows: "He suggested feasibility should first be shown on a job in the United States such as nuclear excavation of part of the proposed waterway to connect the Tennessee River with Alabama's Tombigbee River."

7. A weighty uncertainty in predicting costs of nuclear excavation in a ship canal will be the heights of ridges left between adjacent craters. These ridges must be cut down to canal dimension by dipper dredges or dragline dredges, and such conventional excavation is costly per cubic yard. If shots are placed close together to avoid ridges, more shots and cost will result. Probably knowledge could be gained as the work progresses, but such would prolong the period of nuclear excavation. For instance, a few holes loaded and exploded according to theory would produce a certain result. Based on that experience, the next few holes could be better planned. This step-by-step would increase cost of operations due to lengthening the time of the job. Some cost would be saved by lessening the need for conventional excavation to some extent.

8. Annex VI, of January 1960, dated 5 months before the June 1960 report of the Board of Consultant's report, might account for the mysterious language on page 3 of the Board's report. "The ultimate solution to the basic problem is probably a sea level canal." This statement was the subject of an exchange of letters between us; yours dated June 24, and my reply dated July 4, 1963.

9. Tidal regulation, August 1963: "Ships can probably transit at speeds well in excess of current velocities and consequently under good control." I think analyses of tidal currents and small scale model tests to verify analyses should be made. Better not wait to see until a canal is completed for the loss of use of a canal can result while tidal controls are installed.

10. Pilots: "It is further assumed that pilots will not be required * * *." I believe it should be assumed that pilots would be required. Some vessels may require them while smaller and highly powered ones may not.

11. It was assumed that naval facilities, drydocks, shops, etc. would not be needed but that if needed those at present canal would be usable. Will we continue to occupy and operate two canal zones? If we do we are (will be) in a deep financial hole.

12. Tunnel: Probable cost of tunnel shown at $25 million. It should be in the cost estimate; because, experience has shown that the native country will demand and receive a bridge or tunnel.

13. "Cost of administration, legal services, and right-of-way are not included." All are a part of the net cost of acquiring a new canal. The single item "right-of-way" appears to be buried with two smaller items. The smaller items might be lumped in at about 10 percent. The right-of-way might be around $1 billion. It would include, in Panama, something like—

Indemnity for leaving the present canal;

Purchase price of real estate for location of new canal;

Indemnities for claims as the result of nuclear damage;

A large share of the gross tolls collected for transits;

Numerous highly paid jobs for native administrators;

Numerous jobs, at U.S. rates, or better, for ordinary employees;

Possibly an attempt to limit the defense forces to little more than a police force; and

Some other costly items the native country might think up.

14. Should we move out of the present Canal Zone, and abandon our facilities there, there would be a need to gradually rebuild them. They include: harbors and docks, drydocks, shops, fueling facilities and oil storage, industrial plants, storehouses, towns with water, fuel, electric current, roads, parks, schools, police stations, courts, parks, dams, reservoirs, waterworks and distribution, electric power plants, telephone system, sanitation and hospitals, etc. Not to mention defensive installations of great value and at each terminal of the present canal. These items are immovable. To replace the above civil installations might cost an additional $500 million. (I am in no position to estimate costs of defensive works.)

15. If we cannot retain the canal we now own, we might be compelled to consider getting out of the canal business in Central America. But consider what we have to lose by abandoning our canal.

We now have a fine canal, we know it will work, we know how to work it.

We know how to enlarge it from time to time.

We have a workable treaty, although, at present, abrogated.

We have no other workable treaty (except in Nicaragua, and I have read of a move to consider abrogation of it).

We have experienced the abrogation of a treaty, in Panama.

We have defended our canal by use of force.

We would need to exercise the same force in any other nation.

We can, if desired, pay off the debt of the Panama Canal by an increase in tolls.

Besides the cost of the waterway of a new canal we might be forced to expend $1.5 billion for right-of-way and installations abandoned at present Canal Zone. (Not including defensive items.)

Sincerely yours,

E. S. RANDOLPH.

U.S. NAVAL INSTITUTE PROCEEDINGS, JUNE 1964—COMMENT AND DISCUSSION

"PROGNOSIS FOR THE PANAMA CANAL"

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, Member of Congress: As a member of the Subcommit-

tee of the House Committee on Appropriations charged with the formulation of appropriation bills for the Armed Forces and as a student of Panama Canal history and interoceanic canal problems over many years, I have read with the greatest interest the article by Professor Miller. All thoughtful Members of the Congress that I know concur with his conclusion that: "Any real erosion of our position in the Canal Zone is bound to have widespread and adverse effects throughout the Caribbean, in Latin America generally, and on our global relationships." This is a realistic appraisal of the situation now facing the United States with respect to the Panama Canal, which has long been the key target for the communistic revolutionary conquest of the Caribbean.

The sovereign status of the United States over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal is the direct result of a long-range commitment by our Government for the construction, and perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of an Isthmus Canal by whatever route that may be considered, pursuant to the 1901 Hay-Pauncefote Treaty with Great Britain and the 1902 Spooner Act authorizing the securing of perpetual control of the Canal Zone by treaty with the sovereign of the Isthmus of Panama.

As a result of the Panama revolution of November 3, 1903, and the diplomatic intervention of President Theodore Roosevelt, the necessary treaty was made with Panama, a successor state, rather than with Colombia, the sovereign of the isthmus prior to the 1903 revolt. This treaty, prepared under the close supervision of Secretary of State John M. Hay, granted sovereignty en bloc over the Canal Zone to the United States, "in perpetuity" and most significantly to the "entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority." Moreover, the United States obtained ownership of all land and property in the Canal Zone by purchase from individual owners as well as sovereignty of the entire Canal Zone and its auxiliary areas by payment of $10 million as indemnity.

This control and ownership of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal was formally recognized by Colombia in the Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of April 6, 1914, proclaimed March 30, 1922. In return, Colombia received certain rights for transit of the Panama Canal and transport over the Panama Railroad comparable to those enjoyed by the Governments of the United States and Panama.

Thus the commitments of the United States, as regards the perpetual operation of the Panama Canal, are rooted not only in law but also in three important treaties. The width of the Canal Zone and the grant of sovereignty in perpetuity over it are not happenstances attributable to unauthorized clandestine maneuvering of foreign agents, as partisans have implied, but are due to the important studies made by the Isthmian Canal Commission (1899 to 1902) headed by Rear Adm. John G. Walker, one of the most distinguished officers of the Navy. In his report on January 18, 1902, he emphasized that suitable treaty arrangements must be made "if an isthmian canal is to be constructed by our Government across the Isthmus of Panama," that "the grant must be not for a term of years, but in perpetuity, and a strip of territory from ocean to ocean of sufficient width must be placed under the control of the United States," and that "in this strip the United States must have the right to enforce police regulations, preserve order, protect property rights, and exercise such other powers as are appropriate and necessary.

History has amply justified the vision of this distinguished naval officer in laying the basis for United States treaty-granted exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal in an area that has been the scene of endless bloody revolution and political instability. The isthmus is less stable today than it was in 1903, and the challenge of the 1903 treaty by Panama has not been met in a forthright manner by the United States. Experience has certainly shown that should the time ever come when any part of the Canal Zone or Panama Canal becomes a political pawn of Panamanian politicians, the days of U.S. control will be numbered. The inevitable result will be taken over by Communist revolutionary power.

Lest the current enthusiasm for a second Isthmian Canal serve to divert due consideration for fundamentals, attention is invited to the following facts:

1. The United States has a fine canal at Panama now, but it is rapidly approaching saturation.

2. Experience has shown that it will work, that our Government knows how to maintain and operate it, and how to provide for its major increase of capacity and operational efficiency without the requirement of a new treaty with Panama, all of which are paramount considerations transcending wishful thinking of promoters and idealists.

3. This modernization program, which was developed in the Panama Canal organization from meticulous studies of operations during World War II, provides for the adaptation of the existing Canal to the principles of the Terminal Lake solution. This idea has been authoritatively recognized by maritime agencies of our Government and independent engineers, navigators, and lawyers as providing the best operational canal practicable of achievement, and at the least cost without involvement in treaty negotiations. The last, indeed, is a prime consideration.

4. The United States now has workable treaties for the Panama Canal granting the indispensables of undiluted sovereignty and ownership over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal and its auxiliary areas, and the protection of the summit level water supply of the Chagres River Valley.

5. The United States has suffered abrogation by ill-advised treaty amendments and nullification by executive actions of vital parts of the 1903 treaty through policies and practices in direct opposition to the 1923 position of Secretary of States Charles E. Hughes, who considered such reversals unthinkable.

6. The United States has had to defend its sovereignty over the Canal Zone by the use of force—an action absolutely necessary to protect the lives of our citizens and to save the canal itself from destruction by Red-directed mobs from Panama.

7. The United States has a treaty for a canal at Nicaragua, which would require a supplementary treaty with that country to supply necessary details as well as conventions with Costa Rica, Salvador, and, possibly, Honduras, but it has no treaties for a canal at any other site.

8. The United States would have to defend a new canal at any site of any type constructed in addition to the Panama Canal from lawlessness and disorder as was illustrated at Panama from January 9 to 11, 1964, and against aggressive warfare.

9. The use of nuclear explosions for excavation is limited by the nuclear test-ban treaty and, in any case, is still in the conjectural stage, requiring from 7 to 10 years of experiment and the expenditure of some $250 million to develop proper devices for such excavation by nuclear explosion.

10. The expenditure of vast sums on an extravagant so-called sea-level project in the Canal Zone in the name of security and national defense will inevitably divert huge sums from other, more pressing programs for the defense of the United States and, on the whole, will involve much greater fixed costs than the present canal as improved by the economic means of additional locks. Moreover, dogmatic assertions that a canal at sea level would only require a small number of employees, perhaps 500, to operate and maintain it are perfectly absurd. A much larger number would be required because of the related conditions involved.

11. While it is true that a sea-level project at Panama has the support of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and industrial interests and professional engineers associated with it, there has been, and still is, sharp opposition to this project on the part of many independent nuclear warfare, engineering, maritime and other ship canal experts who cannot be dismissed as uninformed, incompetent, or inexperienced.

12. If the United States does not stand firm at Panama it cannot stand anywhere else, and weakness at Panama will cause other nations having possible canal sites to be more demanding in their consideration of treaties for new canal construction.

Certain writers, whose experience hardly entitles them to speak with authority, have urged that the United States surrender its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal to the United Nations or some other international body. They do not reveal that such transfer has been a prime objective of Soviet policy since 1917 and is directly related to Soviet aims to secure the control of the Dardanelles. Moreover, such a transfer would not solve problems but would be an abdication of responsibilities and would bring about the complete extinction of the Monroe Doctrine designed for the protection of the Western Hemisphere. In the light of what has happened in the Caribbean since 1959 when Castro took over Cuba, any such proposal is, to say the least, naive and, in its effect, amounts to downright subversion.

The Isthmian Canal policy of the United States, as basically evolved, has had for its objective the best canal at the best site for the transit of vessels of commerce and war on terms of equality and at low cost of construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection in the interest of tolls which interoceanic commerce can bear.

The most comprehensive, scholarly, forthright, and objective yet brief and rigorous clarification of overall canal problems ever written is that by Capt. Miles P. DuVal.[1] This article has become a state paper of the first importance and is must reading for all who wish to know the truth about this very confusing subject.

In planning our future interoceanic canal policy, it is imperative to stick to fundamentals. And the first of these is retention of indispensable and undiluted sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal, for if any part of the zone or interest in the canal becomes a political pawn for Panamanian politicians, the days of efficient operations of the Panama Canal, indeed, will end. Moreover, no one has ever been able to explain how the United States can adequately maintain, operate, and protect the canal with less authority than that accorded in the 1903 treaty.

An Engineer's Evaluation of Isthmian Canal Policy

(By E. S. Randolph)

(Note.—A registered professional engineer in Baton Rouge, La., Mr. Randolph, was employed for some 35 years in the Canal Zone. He was in direct charge for the Government of the construction of Madden Dam and later headed the organization making the investigations for the third locks project.)

Within less than 50 years after completion of the Panama Canal, the United States is faced with the fact that as magnificent a construction job as it is, the canal cannot much longer fill the needs it was built for. It is being outdated both as regards the size and number of ships that need to transit. Recognition of this fact is evidenced not only

[1] Miles P. DuVal, "Isthmian Canal Policy—An Evaluation," U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, March 1955, pp. 263–275.

in the constant study by congressional committees but in numerous articles appearing in magazines and newspapers.

The high level lake and lock canal with modifications as proposed by numerous authorities can be readily constructed by altering the present canal without interrupting traffic.[1] All needed improvements can be built into the structures and waterways as the work progresses. The plan is entirely practical as an engineering project and is the first comprehensive plan for the marine operational improvement of the shipway. It is a plan for which precedents exist concerning the engineering and construction, estimates of cost and of time required to build, and cost of maintenance and operation year after year.

The canal enterprise includes all services of management and government for the population as well as for transit and other accommodations for the vessels in passage. These administrative problems can be very engrossing, as can the problems of correlating the interests of the diplomatic service and Armed Forces with the canal interests. Engineering considerations of long-range planning are therefore likely to receive secondary priority.

The policy during the construction of the canal was to retain a chief engineer, a member of the Commission, for the duration of the project. After completion, the policy has been to replace the controlling engineer about each fourth year. For the control of landslides there was no substitute for the experience gained before and after admission of water to the cut. For the control of floods pouring into Gatun Lake there was long-range experience to be gained. Now, as the canal approaches the limits of its commercial capacity, there is a wealth of knowledge gained by long observation of the behavior of geologic formations and engineering materials, and the efficiency of different shapes and types of navigation structures, which knowledge is possessed by those who have devoted years of time to observation and study of the many special problems. Looking back, it would seem that the better policy would have been to establish a career position of chief engineer in the operating organization and to have filled it with a person having long and continuous responsible engineering experience in the canal service on the Isthmus of Panama and whose vision, projections, and accomplishments all stemmed from intimate knowledge of, and association with, the Panama Canal. As long as such a policy is not adopted, errors made in the past must inevitably be repeated.

This writer, after 35 years employment on engineering works on the canal, during and after its construction, and additional years in the United States, concludes that it is neither necessary nor desirable that the head of the civil government of the Panama Canal be a professional engineer, but it is necessary that he be a capable executive. The engineering considerations relating to the maintenance and improvement of the utility are so broad, numerous, and highly specialized that the responsible engineer can do them justice only if he functions expertly and freely in his assigned duties, unhampered by responsibility for administration of the canal and by detailed directions, however well intended.

It is apparent that unceasing consideration should be given to future programs for maintaining the canal in adequate condition. Major modifications should be planned years ahead of need, and plans should be periodically modified to meet changing conditions. The first consideration is: When will expanded facilities be required? Because this question cannot be exactly settled, it should be reviewed at yearly intervals. If not done, it is probable that the too late start made in 1940 will be repeated.

The start of the Third Locks project in 1940 followed an investigation made without adequate funds to perform the immense investigation essential before successfully undertaking such a construction program. After war threatened, there was insufficient time to complete the investigation.

The 1947 report of isthmian canal studies contains much valuable technical information, but the recommendations no longer meet the tremendous changes in the art of warfare, nor do they now present a true picture of presentday costs. There is no Government agency which can properly undertake a comprehensive plan of major action for the modernization of the ship canal across the American isthmus.

The high-level canal plan is characterized by its maximum utilization of the present waterway, with retention of the best features proven by over 40 years of operation during both peace and war and with a correction of those features which have been found to be defective. The work of construction would involve problems that were solved during the construction and maintenance of the original canal.

The convenience and certainty of operation would be a foregone conclusion. The maintenance problems would be known with certainty. The most economical use of existing structures and waterways would be made. The present firmly consolidated earthern dams and dikes would be retained as they are or strengthened if found necessary. The Gatun Lake receives the waters from the tributary rivers and diverts them to useful purposes. This high-level canal can be planned with every assurance of success and can be constructed for less cost and in less time than can any other design so far considered. The simplicity and relatively moderate proportions involved in the high-level plan may render it less glamorous and so operate against its adoption. The judges of the merits of the "high-level" plan may find it has less popular support than its excellent and serviceable qualities warrant.

The sea-level plan contains engineering and constructional features which are grossly without precedent in the Isthmian area. There would be masses of excavation and embankment work involving a wide variety of soils and rocks, earthern structures of great size and weight, and deeper cuts than previously made. The oversize dredging equipment required for deepening the cut before lowering the water level would necessitate a program of development involving unforeseeable risks, delays, and costs. Without experience, there is no solid basis for the evaluation of the action of the materials under the new order of pressures which would be developed.

Because tidal currents would prevail if locks at the Pacific entrance of the sea-level canal were not used, the waterway would necessarily be deeper, wider, and straighter than required for the "high-level waterway. Heavy maintenance problems (perhaps insuperable) would develop because of the higher banks through a longer distance. The bottom of the proposed new channel would be about 108 feet lower than the bottom of the present cut, at Contractor's Hill, thereby cutting into an heretofore undisturbed geologic formation known to be unstable.

The success or failure of such a waterway would be a matter for demonstration after completion rather than before it is commenced as in the case of high-level plan. The time and the cost to build the sea-level construction, not to mention the cost of maintenance after completion, are unknown quantities, but all would be vastly greater than required for the high-level plan.

The complexity of the sea-level plan and opportunities for experimentation are of a nature to intrigue members of the engineering profession. The massiveness of the physical work contemplated might well attract manufacturers and construction contractors to the project. The judges of the merits of this plan must ever be on guard against any enthusiasm which is not justified by its overall qualities inherent in the plan itself, or by any result to be attained therefrom.

Contrasting the high-level and sea-level plans, the former would not require any initial lowering of the undisturbed bottom of the 8-mile cut to obtain increased depth for navigation. The latter contemplates tremendous excavation of a new channel through the central mass that would be more than 100 feet deeper than the present cut and many miles longer. The problem of landslides would be greatly accentuated. The experience gained from maintaining the present slopes would probably not apply to the proposed new slopes at much greater depth becuase the qualities and arrangement of geological formations encountered would be different, as would be the internal stresses. The present cut is bordered by great valleys where once landslides were in motion.

Having walked in the bottom of the deep cut and having explored and studied the moving earth slides, this writer, who perhaps has a more respectful attitude toward them than have those who merely read of their histories, advises against stirring up numerous new and greater landslides unless justification is so overwhelming that the experience of the years can be deliberately rejected.

In the "sea-level" plan, the great diversion dams are proposed to be constructed by dumping excavated spoil from barges through the waters of Gatun Lake. Later the lake would be drained during an interval when it must be closed to traffic. There is no previous experience to guide the engineer to a safe conclusion of this work. The problems of subsidence, heaving, and lateral flow of the swamp muck under the lake will be present, but its action may be delayed until the lake water is lowered and the dikes become operative.

The builders of the Panama Railroad, about 100 years ago, projected a line and built a fill through the Chagres River Valley and upon the swamp muck. Any engineer who has to deal with that muck should make a thorough study of the difficulties encountered then, also again when the present railroad causeway was built on the drained swamp bottom to a height of 92 feet above sea-level.

During the construction of the causeway the weight of the new fills caused, at places, a subsidence under the fill accompanied by an upheaval at the sides of the fill. This action was overcome by laying counterweight fills where heaving was observed or anticipated. The work was in plain sight above water, which would not be the case when depositing fill through water. Engineers who have encountered this swamp muck have invariably experienced difficulty.[2]

Having been employed by the Panama Railroad Company when the causeway carrying the relocated railroad line was being constructed, this writer doubts the advisability of carrying out the "sea-level" diversion plans without much additional assurance of their reliability.

The optimum water level in Gatun Lake is that maximum desirable level for required increase in navigable depth through the 8-mile length of the central mass and for other purposes. Increase in depth can be better attained by raising the water level than by cutting below the undisturbed bottom, thereby causing additional stresses in

[1] See "Isthmian Canal Policy—An Evaluation," by Capt. Miles P. duVal, U.S. Navy (retired), in the March 1955 proceedings.

[2] R. C. Sheldon, Transactions of the American Society of Civil Engineers, vol. 114, 1949, pp. 847–849.

the high banks of the cut and precipitating new slides. Associated is the appreciable increase in minimum depth which would result from the damping of surge waves if the Pedro Miguel Locks were removed. The optimum level can be determined only after a major engineering investigation. As long as such increase is possible, no new structures should be erected along the high-level waterfront without ample freeboard.

Widening and straightening of navigation channels could proceed before, during, and after the building of new high-level locks, by dredging at an economical rate, only when required for the accommodation of larger vessels, and by use of an augmented maintenance fleet of standard dredging equipment. The minimum dimensions, as determined by navigational considerations, need be anticipated only a few years in advance. Within the 8-mile length of deep cut, considerations of slide-control dictate that proportions be determined by more rigorous analysis than in all other reaches.

It is doubtful if any security would be gained by rejecting a high-level-lock canal in favor of a low-level-lock canal. I submit that the insecurely poised banks of any economically feasible sea-level cut through the Isthmus of Panama would be susceptible to atomic bombing so as to close the canal to traffic for an indefinite period, possibly years. There appears to be a relation between the depth of cut and security against refilling from the sliding of banks.

The interoceanic canal problem, includes, besides engineering and geology, grave questions of diplomatic relationships, economics, and marine operations. However great may be the pride of authorship of any proposal, the issues must be decided on their merits at the highest plane of wise and experienced judgment and statesmanship. This I firmly believe can be best accomplished by an independent and broadly constituted Interoceanic Canals Commission as provided in the Martin-Thompson bills now pending.

[From the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, March 1955]

ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY—AN EVALUATION

(By Capt. Miles P. DuVal, U.S. Navy, retired)

ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY ROOTED IN HISTORY

The Panama Canal, opened to traffic on August 15, 1914, is an interoceanic public utility for the transit of vessels of commerce and war of all nations on terms of equality as provided by treaty. The history of this undertaking is epic.

The idea of its construction traces back more than four centuries. The development of it includes extensive explorations, grave crises, and weighty decisions. Out of these the Isthmian Canal policy of the United States gradually evolved. Yet, despite the vast literature on the canal question, nowhere are the principles of this policy comprehensively stated in one place, and they are not adequately understood. For these reasons a knowledge of key episodes of this important historical subject is essential.

The advantageous geographical position of the American Isthmus was recognized by the early Spanish who, within an incredibly short time after their arrival in 1502, explored its regions and reduced their fields of investigation to four main areas: Tehuantepec, Nicaragua, Panama, and Darien-Atrato.

Because of the lower continental divides at Panama and Nicaragua and penetration of the jungles there by river valleys, these two avenues quickly became the great rivals for trans-Isthmian commerce. They are still potential rivals.

At Panama, mountainous terrain and torrential rivers, notably the Chagers, at first represented insuperable barriers to the construction of a canal. At Nicaragua, the existence of a large lake, with the then navigable San Juan River flowing from it into the Atlantic, reduced the magnitude of that undertaking simply to cutting across the narrow strip separating the lake from the Pacific. These facts undoubtedly supply the basis for the initial predilection of the United States in the 19th century for a Nicaraguan canal.

Eventually, the control of the Nicaragua route became a focal point of international conflict, with Great Britain and the United States in a diplomatic deadlock. This difficulty was not removed until 1901, when the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty superseded the earlier Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850, which had deprived the United States of exclusive control of any Isthmian canal.

PATTERN OF ISTHMANIAN CANAL ISSUES EVOLVES

Meanwhile, French interests under the dynamic leadership of Ferdinand de Lesseps had decided to construct a canal across the Isthmus. An International Congress for Consideration of an Interoceanic Canal met in Paris in 1879. There, this Congress wrestled with the difficult questions of selecting the best site and deciding on the best type. De Lesseps, the hero of Suez, (a simple sea-level canal), lent the full force of his prestige and his genius toward securing approval for a "sea-level" undertaking at Panama—a wholly different problem.

One engineer, the only one in that Congress who had adequately studied the geography of the Isthmian regions and grasped their significance, when he saw the trend toward decision for the "sea level" type rose in strong protest.

He understood the topography at Nicaragua and how its elevated lake, 105.5' high, would contribute toward the construction and operation of a canal there. He knew the surface features at Panama—the continental divide about ten miles from the Pacific, the torrential Rio Obispo-Chagres flowing into the Atlantic, and the smaller Rio Grande into the Pacific, both through contiguous valleys suitable for the formation of lakes. Interpreting these elements in the light of maritime as well as engineering needs, he recognized the lake idea as offering the solution of the canal problem.

Then, with the vision and simplicity of true genius, he proposed a "practical" plan for the Panama Canal, here summarized: "Build a dam at Gatun and another at Miraflores, or as close to the seas as the configuration of the land permits. Let the waters rise to form two lakes about 80 feet high, join the lakes thus formed with a channel cut through the continental divide, and connect the lakes with the oceans by locks. This is not only the best plan for engineering but also best for navigation." Essentially, that was the plan for the Panama Canal eventually adopted in 1906. The man who conceived and presented the plan was Adolphe Godin de Lépinay.

The applicability of this plan—the only one which at that time could have had any chance for success—was not understood. De Lépinay's great idea was ignored. His conception of this plan, however, and its dramatic presentation before the Paris Congress of 1879 established him as an architectural and engineering genius—the originator of the plan from which the Panama Canal was eventually built.

The French, despite De Lépinay's timely warning, launched upon their ill-fated undertaking. Ten years later, in 1889, their effort collapsed and the Isthmus returned to the jungle. Yet, before the failure, the French, to save time and money, were forced to change their plans from "sea-level" to a modified high-level lake and lock type.

Thus, as the 19th century closed, the pattern of interoceanic canal's focal political and engineering issues had evolved: first, a struggle among competing interests in the choice of route; and second, debate as to the type of canal, with final decision for the high-level-lake and lock type at Panama.

PANAMA WINS THE BATTLE OF THE ROUTES

In 1899, after more than half a century of exploration, including a number of naval expeditions, the United States started serious investigations by means of an Isthmian Canal Commission for exploration, 1899–1902, of which Rear Admiral John G. Walker, a distinguished line officer of the U.S. Navy, was president.

After an extraordinary political struggle, known as the "battle of the routes," the Congress authorized the acquisition for the United States of a canal zone in what was then a part of the Republic of Colombia, the purchase of the French holdings, and construction of a canal at Panama, with provision for the Nicaragua Canal as an alternate project, if suitable arrangements could not be made for one at Panama.

To this end, the Chargé d'Affaires of Colombia, Dr. Tomás Herrán, a graduate of Georgetown University and well acquainted with American governmental leaders, succeeded, after many months of arduous labor, in negotiating what was considered a most favorable canal treaty for his country—the Hay-Herrán Treaty of January 22, 1903, which was ratified by the U.S. Senate on March 17, 1903.

Unfortunately, this treaty became involved politically in Bogotá. The Colombian Senate, called into special session on June 20, 1903, for its ratification, rejected the treaty on August 12, 1903, against urgent pleadings of Dr. Herrán in Washington and U.S. Minister Arthur M. Beaupré in Bogotá.

Panamanian leaders, fearing that after all Panama still might lose the canal to Nicaragua, set out to prevent that possibility. Under the leadership of Dr. Manuel Amador, the state of Panama seceded from Colombia on November 3, 1903, and declared its independence. This was quickly recognized, first, by the United States, and appropriately, second, by France, the country that started the waterway. Then followed the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of November 18, 1903, which was ratified first by Panama and then by the United States.

In this treaty the Republic of Panama granted to the United States "in perpetuity" the "use, occupation and control of a zone of land and land under water for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection" of the Panama Canal—and as if the United States were the "sovereign" of that territory. The ratification of this treaty sealed the choice of the Panama route.

The technical justification for this fundamental action was supplied by the Isthmian Canal Commission, 1899–1902, which, under the direction of Rear Admiral John G. Walker, explored all canal routes. He also headed the first Isthmian Canal Commission for construction of the Panama Canal (1904–05) under which the Canal Zone was acquired, the Canal Zone Government organized, and preliminary work started. These achievements place him in history as a principal architect of Isthmian Canal Policy.

BATTLE OF THE LEVELS AND THE GREAT DECISION

Work under the United States control started haltingly, with increasing uncertainty as to the type of canal that should be constructed—the high-level-lake and lock type or a canal at sea-level. Each proposal had strong advocates.

Fortunately, when the time for decision approached, President Theodore Roosevelt selected the great railroad builder, explorer, and business executive, the late John F. Stevens, as Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission.

Mr. Stevens' qualifications were unique. He had read everything available on the proposed Panama Canal since the time of Philip II, built railroads in the Rocky

Mountains, and supervised open mining operations in Minnesota. Thus, in his experience he had witnessed what occurs when the balances of nature are altered, and understood the hazards involved in excavating a navigation channel through mountains.

Arriving on the Isthmus on July 25, 1905, at the height of a crisis, he had matters under control within 24 hours. Experienced as he was in large undertakings, he promptly provided housing for employees, organized commissaries, encouraged sanitation, ordered equipment, planned the transportation system, and formed the basic engineering organization for building the Panama Canal. Indeed, so rapid was his progress that he found himself hampered by having to wait for a decision as to the type of canal, then being considered by an international Board of Consulting Engineers.

In its report of January 10, 1906, this board split—eight members, including five Europeans, voting for "sea-level"; and the five remaining Americans voting for high-level-lake and lock. The naval member on the Isthmian Canal Commission at that time was the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, who, in a minority report, favored the "sea-level" plan as "affording greater immunity from hostile injury."[1]

Meanwhile at Panama, Stevens had walked through the entire length of the canal route and studied the topography. Interpreting it in the light of navigational requirements as well as construction, he decided upon the high-level-lake and lock plan, with the Atlantic terminal dam and locks at Gatun. For the Pacific end, he favored placing its locks in one group south of Miraflores at Aguadulce, just as he planned to do at Gatun.

Testifying in Washington before congressional committees in January 1906, with a conviction for the high-level plan that no one could shake, he voiced his determined opposition to the "sea-level" idea.

But one appearance was not enough. In June, he was again in Washington, still leading in this memorable struggle, later described by Col. George W. Goethals as the "battle of the levels." On this occasion Stevens even more forcefully and fearlessly urged the high-level-lake plan as the logical solution.

In the end, with the support of President Theodore Roosevelt, Secretary of War, William H. Taft, and the Isthmian Canal Commission, the recommendations of Chief Engineer Stevens prevailed. Congress, by the act approved June 29, 1906, adopted the high-level-lake and lock plan as proposed by the minority of the international Board of Consulting Engineers. That was the great decision in building the Panama Canal, for the second time completing the pattern of interoceanic canal political and engineering debate.

Here it should be noted that when making his recommendation to the Congress for this action, President Roosevelt did so after evaluating all available evidence of relative vulnerability and operational effectiveness of the two types. Although he understood that the "sea-level" type would be "slightly less exposed to damage in event of war,"[2] he recommended the high-level plan because of its economic and operational superiority.

The transit from 1914 through August 31, 1954, in both peace and war, of more than 230,517 vessels of various types has completely established the wisdom of that decision. Moreover, it secured Chief Engineer Stevens, who was primarily responsible for bringing it about, his great fame as the basic architect of the Panama Canal.

[1] Report of Board of Consulting Engineers for the Panama Canal (Washington, 1906), p. xix.

[2] Ibid., p. iv.

CIVILIAN CONTROL REPLACED BY MILITARY

Though the high-level plan, as approved by the minority of the International Board of Consulting Engineers, provided for placing all Atlantic Locks at Gatun, it also specified separation of the Pacific Locks into two groups. Chief Engineer Stevens, who had had railroad operating experience, recognized the operational inconvenience of this arrangement and never favored dividing the Pacific Locks.

Eventually, on August 3, 1906, Stevens tentatively approved a plan developed by William Gerig. The proposal placed all Pacific Locks in three lifts south of Miraflores with the terminal dam and locks between two hills, Cerro Aguadulce on the west side of the sea-level section of the canal and Cerro de Puente on the east side—on a natural perimeter that would have supplied the same arrangement as at Gatun. This plan, had it been followed, would have enabled lake-level navigation from the Atlantic Locks to the Pacific, with a summit-level anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal to match that at the Atlantic end.

Regrettably, Stevens was under great pressure to start construction. Advocates of the "sea-level" proposal, stung to the quick by their defeat in Congress, were poised ready to take advantage of a major change in the approved program as evidence of weakness in the high-level plan. Opponents of any canal at all were also seeking some means to delay the enterprise. These two forces together represented a political and economic strength that could not be disregarded.

Stevens' foundation explorations, necessarily made in great haste, proved unsatisfactory, and he did not dare to jeopardize the project by further delay. Twenty days later, on August 23, 1906, still confident that this important question would rise again, he voided his plan marking it, "not to be destroyed but kept in this office," and proceeded with the approved plan for separating the Pacific Locks.

In 1907, after having brought construction to a point where the success of the project was a certainty, Stevens resigned his positions as Chief Engineer and Chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission, to which combined offices he had been appointed by President Roosevelt in recognition of his contributions. He was succeeded by Colonel George W. Goethals under whose able direction the work was carried forward.

PANAMA CANAL OPENED FOR TRAFFIC

Notwithstanding this shift in administrative control of the canal enterprise from civilian to military in 1907, the Stevens proposal to combine the Pacific Locks did not die. Colonel William L. Sibert seriously studied it and, on January 31, 1908, formally submitted a definite plan that reflected his appreciation of marine needs as the basis for navigational planning.[3] But, unfortunately, the Sibert proposal likewise was not approved for reasons then deemed adequate.

In this connection, it is pertinent to comment that after the resignation of Rear Admiral Walker in 1905 there was no experienced navigator on the Isthmian Canal Commission. Thus, one can only ponder what might have been the result had such a person been readily available for consultation with Stevens and Sibert on marine planning. In the light of later operational and engineering knowledge, developed in 1941–44, when there was such consultation between experienced engineers and marine operating officials, it is indeed regrettable that the Stevens-Sibert proposals were not adopted.

[3] William L. Sibert and John F. Stevens, "The Construction of the Panama Canal" (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1915), pp. 139–146 contains a summary of the Sibert proposal and its disposition.

Colonel Goethals headed the project to the end, making a number of important but nonbasic changes, which included a widening of Culebra (Gaillard) Cut and the locks. He developed the first permanent operating organization under the Panama Canal Act of 1912 and, as the first Governor of the Panama Canal, opened the canal to traffic on August 15, 1914, and overcame the early slide crises. He and his associates won great fame as builders of the Panama Canal.

In this connection, it should be explained that the original concept of the functioning of the canal enterprise as a civil agency under the Panama Canal Act was dual: in peace, as an interoceanic public utility under a Governor; in war, under the supreme control of the Commanding General of U.S. Army on the Isthmus. In either status, the operational mission of the waterway remained as the transit of vessels under the obvious assumption that the Panama Canal, like other transportation facilities in the United States, would serve in war as well as in peace.

DEFENSE CONCEPTS BECOME ASCENDANT

After the opening of the canal to traffic, the great builders left the Isthmus; operation and maintenance became matters of routine, and the project was uncritically accepted. The rapid development of the airplane and other modern weapons following World War I, dramatized by periodic fleet exercises off Panama, made considerations of defense matters of increasing concern; those of marine operations became secondary.

In the excitement preceding World War II, the Congress authorized construction of a third set of larger locks, primarily as a defense measure,[4] known as the Third Locks Project, at an authorized cost of $277 million. The proposed layout placed a new set of larger locks (140' x 1200') near each of the existing locks but at some distance away to afford greater protection through dispersal and increased lock capacity for large naval vessels. The new locks were to be joined with the existing channels by means of bypass channels.[5]

Significantly, the plan included a number of construction features for future changing of the canal to "sea-level." Thus, discerning students recognized the Third Locks project as renewing the old "battle of the levels" in a new form—that of "conversion."

The Third Locks project layout at the Atlantic end of the canal, which duplicates an operationally sound arrangement at Gatun, is likewise sound. At the Pacific end, however, the proposed new channel layout contained three sharp bends—29°, 47°, and 37°—in succession from north to south. The latter, if it had been completed, would have created operational problems and navigational hazards of the gravest character.

Construction started in 1940 and was pushed vigorously until suspended in May 1942, because of shortage of ships and materials more urgently needed elsewhere for war purposes. No excavation was accomplished at Pedro Miguel; that at Gatun and Miraflores was substantially completed. Some $75 million was expended.[6]

WAR EXPERIENCE INSPIRES PLAN FOR CANAL IMPROVEMENT

The suspension of the Third Locks project, however, afforded an opportunity, while there was still time left to make such a study, for its reexamination in the light of opera-

[4] Public Law 391, 76th Congress, approved Aug. 11, 1939 (535 Stat. 1409).

[5] H. Doc. 210, 76th Congress, 1st sess. (1939).

[6] House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Executive Hearings on H.R. 4480, 79th Congress, 1st sess., Nov. 15, 1945, p. 4.

tional needs demonstrated by marine experience. This was at a period when the Panama Canal was the scene of many military and naval expeditions on their way to and from combat zones in the Pacific. This, it should be also noted, was before the advent of the atomic bomb.

These studies conclusively established that the principal marine operational problems of the existing Panama Canal are:

1. Dangerous traffic bottleneck at Pedro Miguel and a lack of a Pacific summit anchorage.
2. Double handling of vessels at separated Pacific Locks.
3. Effect of fog in Culebra (Gaillard) Cut on capacity and operations.
4. Lockage surges in Cut caused by operating Pedro Miguel Locks (3′ max. amplitude).
5. Limited operating range of Gatun Lake water level (87′–82′).
6. Navigational hazards in the restricted Cut (300′ min. bottom width).
7. Inadequate dimensions of present locks for largest vessels (110′×1000′).[7]

From the nature of these inadequacies, it is obvious that locating the Pedro Miguel Locks at the south end of Culebra (Gaillard) Cut, where it created a traffic bottleneck and other problems, was the fundamental error in operational design of the Panama Canal.

Under the basic assumption that the prime function of the Panama Canal is the safe and convenient transport of vessels, it is self-evident that the wide channels of Gatun Lake afford safer and more convenient navigation than can any necessarily restricted channel at sea-level. Moreover, the advantages of unrestricted lake navigation outweigh the minor hazards and time lost by passage through locks. Thus, the best operational solution is not provided by lowering the Gatun Lake water level to sea-level, or to some intermediate-level, but by raising it to its highest feasible elevation.

The obvious economic operational solution thus is a major improvement of the existing canal according to what is known as the Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan, which includes the following program:

1. Removal of the bottleneck Pedro Miguel Locks.
2. Construction of all Pacific Locks in continuous steps near Miraflores.
3. and 4. Elevation of the intermediate Miraflores Lake water level (54′) to that of Gatun Lake to serve as an anchorage during fog periods and to dampen surges.
5. Raising the summit water level to its optimum height (approximately 92′).
6. Widening Culebra (Gaillard) Cut.
7. Construction of a set of larger locks.

These modifications will remove the traffic choke at Pedro Miguel, correct present operational dissymmetry and simplify canal control, increase channel depths, and improve navigation, mitigate the effect of fog, reduce marine accidents, decrease transit time slightly, conserve water, and increase capacity. Thus, the plan supplies the best operational canal practicable of economic achievement.

This plan was publicly revealed by its author on May 20, 1943, in an address before the Panama Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, under the title, "The Marine Operating Problems, Panama Canal, and the Solution."[8] Attended by high Army, Navy, and Canal Zone officials, the presentation aroused the interest of the Commandant of the 15th Naval District, Rear Admiral C. E. Van Hook, who was present. He later submitted the plan to the Navy Department. On September 7, 1943, the Secretary of the Navy forwarded it to the President. Subsequently, this proposal was approved in principle by the Governor of the Panama Canal for the major modification of the existing canal. According to the report of a 1949 Congressional investigation, it can be accomplished at "comparatively low cost."[9] Moreover, no doubt exists as to its soundness because a similar arrangement at Gatun has been tested since 1914 and found eminently satisfactory.

ATOMIC BOMB RESURRECTS SEA-LEVEL PLAN

The spectacular advent of the atomic bomb in 1945 injected a new element into the canal picture. Under the force of its impact, canal officials sought authority to conduct an "overall review" of the entire interoceanic canals question in the light of the then newest developments in the "military and physical sciences."[10] This was before the hydrogen bomb.

Accordingly, the Congress in 1945 enacted legislation[11] authorizing the Governor of the Panama Canal to make a comprehensive investigation of the means for increasing its capacity *and security* to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce *and national defense*. The law also provided for a restudy of the Third Locks Project, a study of canals at other locations, and for consideration of any new means for transporting ships across land. Thus was launched the second major canal crisis in the 20th century. It served to resurrect the corpses of the 1902 "battle of the routes" and the 1906 "battle of the levels" with a rehashing of all the main arguments of the earlier struggles on the basis of the newer term, "security," rather than the older one, "vulnerability."

Under a far more extreme interpretation of the "security" factor of the statute than was intended by the Congress that enacted it, the investigation was directed toward obtaining authorization for a sea-level project at Panama, with the "security" and "national defense" factors as paramount, and money costs not a "governing consideration."[12] In line with the 1905–06 precedent, the naval representative on the Board of Consulting Engineers for the greater part of this engineering investigation was the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

In the ensuing public hysteria centered on the dangers of the atomic bomb and other modern weapons, the long-range and fundamental mission of the Panama Canal to provide efficient and economic transit of vessels was generally overlooked.

The report of the 1946–47 Isthmian Canal Studies[13] recommended only the sea-level project for major canal construction at Panama, initially estimated to cost $2,483 million. With the exception of the two terminals, this project provides for constructing a virtually new Panama Canal of 60′ minimum depth in navigation lanes and of 600′ width between sloping sides at a depth of 40′ on a new alignment somewhat removed from the present channel, which it crosses several times. The project includes a tidal lock (200×15,000′) and a navigable pass at the Pacific end, many miles of dams for flood control reservoirs on both sides of the projected canal, diversion channels and other structural features. This program would result in abandonment of the greater part of the existing waterway and the investment that it represents.

Although the 1947 report contained studies of plans for a Terminal Lake-Third Lock Project, which it did not recommend, it offered a relatively minor program for improvement of the present canal installations "to meet the needs of commerce" as a preferred alternative to the major improvement of the existing waterway as recommended to the President in 1943 by the Secretary of the Navy.

Transmitted by the President to the Congress on December 1, 1947, and, without presidential approval, comment or recommendation, the report promptly encountered sharp opposition. The Congress took no action on this report. Instead, in 1949, it authorized an investigation of the organizational and financial aspects of the canal enterprise,[14] for which study Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, a retired Marine Corps Reserve officer, served as Chairman. This investigation resulted in the first basic change[15] in the permanent canal operating organization that was established in 1914.

The new Act requires that transit tolls be established at rates that will place the operation of the canal enterprise on a self-sustaining basis—a new principle in Isthmian Canal Policy with far-reaching implications affecting the future economic management of the Panama Canal and interoceanic commerce. This subject is now under further Congressional study.[16]

CLARIFICATIONS RESTORE OPERATIONS AS BASIS FOR PLANNING

Meanwhile, in the Congress, the "security" and "national defense" premises, on which the recommendation for the Sea-Level Project was primarily based, were vigorously challenged.

As to the atomic bomb, Representative Willis W. Bradley, a retired naval officer, summarized his views: "As far as I can ascertain, the greatest authorities on modern weapons of war who have given this subject serious attention hold uniformly that any canal would be critically vulnerable to the atomic bomb, regardless of type; that a sea-level canal would be in the same security class as a lake canal; that a sea-level canal could be closed for prolonged periods of time beyond any hope of speedy restoration; and that a sea-level canal cannot be considered secure in an atomic war. These same authorities also agree that the atomic bomb is irrelevant as a controlling factor in the planning of operational improvements for the Panama Canal."[17]

Representative now Senator, Thomas E. Martin, of Iowa, a retired Army officer, developed the national defense clarification, repeatedly stressing that protection of any type of canal, wherever located, is "an over-all governmental responsibility, and that its defense, like that of the seaports, airports, railroads, highways, and productive centers of the United States depends upon the combined industrial, military, naval, and air power of this Nation as obtained in both world wars, and not upon passive defense

---

[7] Hon. Willis W. Bradley, "What of the Panama Canal?," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 10 (Apr. 21, 1948), p. A2449 and "The Why of the Panama Canal," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 12 (Mar. 4, 1949), p. A1304 contain extended discussions of marine problems.

[8] ASCE Transactions, vol. 114 (1949), p. 558.

[9] H. Rept. 1304, 81st Congress, 1st sess. (1949), p. 2.

[10] Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, op. cit., p. 5.

[11] Public Law 280, 79th Congress, approved Dec. 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663).

[12] See statement of Board of Consulting Engineers, quoted in Panama American, Aug. 5, 1946, p. 3, cols. 4–6.

[13] Summarized with discussions in ASCE Transactions, vol. 114 (1949), pp. 607–906.

[14] H. Res. 44, 81st Congress quoted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 2 (Feb. 28, 1949), p. 1617.

[15] H. Doc. 460, 81st Congress, 2d sess. (1950) and Public Law 841, 81st Congress, approved Sept. 26, 1950, (64 Stat. 1038).

[16] Hon. John J. Allen, "Panama Canal—Interim Report," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 10, p. 13367.

[17] Bradley, "What of the Panama Canal?," op. cit., p. A2451.

measures, such as may be embodied in inherent characteristics of canal design." [18]

Here it should be stated that leading atomic warfare authorities, who studied the problem of Canal Zone defense in 1947, considered that arguments as to relative vulnerability of types of construction are entirely without point and that the Sea-Level Project would, in effect, constitute a "Maginot Line." This view has been greatly strengthened by the later development of the hydrogen bomb, which is measured in megatons of T.N.T. equivalent as compared to kilotons for the atomic bomb.

In the course of extensive discussions of the Sea-Level Project recommendation,[19] congressional and administrative leaders often stressed the point that this project, if justified primarily for "national defense," would divert both funds and resources from projects and programs in the United States that are far more essential to national security. The combined effects of the defense clarifications have been toward eliminating the concept of inherent resistance to attack as the governing consideration in planning at Panama. Thus, it appears that the only justifiable security design feature is adequate protection against sabotage, which is chiefly an administrative function.

Eventually, a group of engineers and others associated in building the Panama Canal submitted their views in a memorandum to the Congress. This memorial challenged the official cost estimates in the 1947 report, charging that the Sea-Level Project would cost several times its initial estimate—$2,483 million—and that the Third Locks Project adapted to the principles of the terminal lake proposal (widening Culebra Cut excepted) can be accomplished at relatively low cost as compared to that of the Sea-Level Project—estimated as under $600 million.

The statement also criticized the 1953 program for repair and alteration of present lock structures as makeshift in character and without sufficient merit, pointing out that it will delay the fundamental and long-overdue solution of the problems involved. It stated that the Governor's recommendation of none but the Sea-Level Project for major increase of Canal facilities served to exclude what may be the best solution when evaluated from all angles.

Included in an address to the House by Representative Eugene J. Keogh of New York [20] this memorandum was promptly recognized by the engineering profession.[21]

Strong appeals for the creation of a wholly American, independent, broadly based, predominantly civilian, strictly nonpartisan and objective Interoceanic Canals Commission, composed of able men who may not be dominated or unduly influenced by Federal executive agencies, have been made by responsible Congressional leaders as the best means for developing a wisely-reasoned Isthmian Canal Policy.[22]

The consequences of prolonged arguments, in and out of the Congress, have been towards restoration of economic thinking and an increased appreciation of fundamental planning concepts so well expressed during the 1905–06 "battle of the levels" by General Henry L. Abbot, the great student of the Charges, members of the Comité Technique of the French Panama Canal Company and the international Board of Consulting Engineers, and an advocate of the high-level type. His words were: "The true criterion is ease and safety of transit, and * * * this test leaves no doubt as to which type of canal should be preferred at Panama." [23] This standard, both obvious and simple, is as true today as it was when written in 1905. Moreover, it is applicable in evaluating not only canal proposals at Panama but also those at other locations.

DIPLOMATIC IMPLICATIONS

The juridical basis for the Canal Zone rests with the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, which authorized a zone 10 miles wide extending 5 miles on each side of the center line of the canal. After extended diplomatic discussions, the boundaries of the Canal Zone were later fixed in the Price-Lefevre Boundary Convention of September 2, 1914.

An examination of the general plan of the proposed Sea-Level Project discloses a number of features not covered by current international agreements. Among these are: a new main channel alinement substantially removed from the existing channel from which Canal Zone boundaries are measured; flooding of additional territory in the Republic of Panama in the Chagres River valley downstream from Madden Dam (Alhajuela); diverting the Chagres River from its present path west of Limon Bay to a new path east of the bay that crosses a Panamanian highway; and draining the central portion of Gatun Lake. The last feature would disrupt present navigation channels to Panamanian settlements on the lake and uncover large and forbidding swamp areas with resulting health and sanitation consequences.

These aspects of the "sea-level" undertaking would undoubtedly bring a demand from the Republic of Panama for a new treaty covering the specific conditions for its construction. What concessions such a treaty would cost cannot be predicted. But, based upon previous experience in such diplomatic negotiations, these costs would be far greater than earlier ones, inevitably adding to the total estimate and increasing tolls.

Furthermore, such negotiations would be fraught with considerable uncertainty in the relations of the United States with Panama and other nations of Latin America, not to mention threats to the security of the enterprise through the process of its internationalization, for which there have been persistent demands.

In contrast, the Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan, being merely an "enlargement of the existing facilities" [24] that does not call for additional "land or waters" or authority, will not require a new canal treaty. This, it must be obvious, is a truly paramount consideration.

The construction of a canal at another location would introduce an entirely new diplomatic situation, which would be just as complicated as that at Panama.

The salient elements of this situation, however, are: that the 1947 report does not present these significant diplomatic involvements; that the need for negotiating a new treaty with Panama to cover the Sea-Level Project was not submitted to the Congress; and that the Congress has not authorized such negotiation as was done in the Spooner Act of 1902 for the original construction of the Panama Canal.

ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY MUST BE REDETERMINED

The evolution of Isthmian Canal Policy has been slow. Its principal objectives have long been the best type of canal at the best site for the transit of vessels of commerce and war on all nations on terms of equality as provided by treaty—and at low cost of construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection.

Often beset by bewildering confusions of ideas, the progress of fundamental concepts has, at times, deviated from their logical courses. Yet events have thus far conspired to avert irretrievable error. Now, with the main arguments clarified, the interoceanic canal problem in its national relationships is coming to be better understood and attention is focusing on the true objectives of securing requisite capacity and operational efficiency. Nevertheless, the evolving situation is of such grave concern that it must be protected by ceaseless vigilance and fully matured objective judgment.

The Panama Canal is now entering its fifth decade of operations. Its navigational inadequacies have been established. The Canal as completed contains fundamental errors in operational design centered on the location of the Pedro Miguel Locks. These can be corrected only by the major reconstruction of the Pacific end of the Canal as contemplated in the Terminal Lake-Third Locks proposal.

Commercial traffic through the canal has reached the highest volume in history. The Navy has vessels that cannot transit. Issues raised by questions of "security" and "national defense" have been formally submitted but never accepted. The principle of economic operation of the canal has been embodied in law.[25] Yet, in a physical sense, the shipway is still essentially what it was in 1914. Thus, the time has come to provide, without further delay, the additional interoceanic transit capacity and operational improvements to meet present and future needs.

The solution of this problem is not the simple proposition that it may appear. Instead, it is a highly complicated one of the greatest national importance, rising above purely personal and group considerations. It involves questions of fundamental operational and engineering planning, the decisions on which will affect the welfare of the United States and other maritime nations through the indefinite future.

These facts call for a further reassessment of the entire interoceanic canals problem [26] based on realities, with a comprehensive restatement of Isthmian Canal Policy as derived from a reasoned line of action. This is the task that sooner or later the Congress and the Nation must meet.

[From the Panama (R.P.) Star & Herald, Dec. 30, 1964]

CAREFUL STAFF WORK LED TO PC ANNOUNCEMENT

WASHINGTON, December 29.—The surprise announcement by President Lyndon B. Johnson on December 18 that he had decided the United States should press forward on plans for a sea level canal in Central America and should propose to the government of Panama

---

[18] Hon. Thomas E. Martin, "An Interoceanic Canals Commission, the Best Solution of Panama Canal Problem," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 14 (July 18, 1951), p. A4481.

[19] Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON, "Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States—Bibliographical List," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 16 (Aug. 25, 1949), p. A5580 and subsequent statements of distinguished Members of Congress.

[20] "Panama Canal Construction Engineers Favor Interoceanic Canals Commission," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 5, p. 5795.

[21] "Panama Canal Problem," Civil Engineering, vol. 24 (July 1954), p. 460.

[22] H.R. 8457 and H.R. 8458, 82d Congress, H.R. 1048, 83d Congress, and S. 766 and H.R 3335, 84th Congress.

[23] Henry L. Abbot, "Problems of the Panama Canal." (New York: Macmillan Co., 1905), p. 224.

[24] Hull-Alfaro Treaty of Mar. 2, 1936, art. II.

[25] Public Law 841, 81st Congress, approved Sept. 26, 1950 (64 Stat. 1038).

[26] Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON, "Interoceanic Canals Problem," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 98, pt. 8 (Jan. 15, 1952), p. A163.

the negotiation of an entirely new treaty on the existing Panama Canal was the result of careful work by the U.S. national security staff.

In a White House office, a small staff of experts whose names are virtually unknown to the public is at work daily to help President Johnson plan and coordinate national security affairs.

Their parent organization, the National Security Council (NSC), comprised of the President's chief advisers on both national and international aspects of defense and security, is called into full session by the President ordinarily only in the most urgent situations. But the White House National Security Affairs advisers assist in day-to-day organization of basic recommendations and in the followthrough on the execution of the President's decisions.

The National Security Council's professional staff, headed by McGeorge Bundy—who also doubles as special assistant to the President for national security affairs—is not a separate organization in between the President and the Secretary of State.

Bundy explains: "The principal responsibility for advising the President and for acting as his executive agent in the great matters of national security falls to the men who are in charge of the major operating departments—the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and others with similar operating responsibilities."

What Bundy and his staff perform is the coordination of the many arms of Government involved in national security—State, Defense and Treasury Departments, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, Bureau of the Budget, Agency for International Development, and the U.S. Information Agency.

One way the national security staff works can be seen in the activities prior to the President's announcement in the Panama Canal issues.

The preliminary planning for the decisions has been carried out under the leadership of Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Thomas C. Mann, and Secretary of the Army Stephen Ailes. (The U.S. Army supervises administration of the Canal Zone). When this planning was completed, Bundy set up a meeting, not of the full National Security Council, but of the President with those Cabinet-level officers directly concerned—Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, Undersecretary of Defense Cyrus Vance, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. At this meeting the President listened to the arguments pro and con. No votes were taken, however.

A week after this meeting, the President informed Bundy that he had made up his mind to go ahead on the sea level canal and the treaty. The announcement was prepared under the direction of the National Security Council staff. Immediately after the President made the announcement, Bundy's staff was at work coordinating the follow through for the President.

The actual carrying out of the President's instructions in day-to-day work evolves in an operating branch—in this case Mann and the State Department.

At the other end of the scale are the meetings of the entire National Security Council. On October 17, for instance, the day after the detonation of the Communist Chinese nuclear device and the change in government in the Soviet Union, the National Security Council met with President Johnson in the Cabinet Room. In addition to the NSC members designated by law—the President, Vice President, Secretaries of State and of Defense, and the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning—the President invited the chiefs of the Central Intelligence Agency, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Atomic Energy Commission, as well as the Director of the Budget, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, several other Cabinet members, Bundy, and presidential staff advisers.

For an hour the President and the Council listened to a presentation of the available information and discussed the international situation. The Council expressed the view that there was no present cause for national alarm and no immediate emergency. And it recommended that the President himself give to the American people and assessment of the international situation. Johnson did so the following evening on nationwide television.

During the 1962 crisis when the Soviet Union set up offensive missile sites in Cuba, a small executive committee of the National Security Council held 38 meetings to discuss possible courses of action and to advise the then President Kennedy.

The decisionmaking power in all cases remains with the President alone.

As now constituted under McGeorge Bundy, the few national security assistants have definite responsibilities for geographic areas and to maintain liaison with certain Government agencies. Bundy maintains personal liaison with the Secretaries of State and Defense and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

This man who coordinates national security affairs for the President is generally recognized as one of the most brilliant and capable young men in the Nation. At the age of 45, he has behind him such activities as collaborating with and editing papers for Henry Stimson (Secretary of War under Franklin D. Roosevelt) and for Dean Acheson (Secretary of State under Harry S. Truman); serving as a consultant on the Marshall plan; and participating as an Army intelligence officer in the planning of the invasion of Normandy during World War II. From 1953 until early 1961 he was dean of the faculty of arts and sciences, the No. 2 job at Harvard University, holding a staff of more than 1,000. He was selected personally by President Kennedy as special assistant to the President for national security affairs, and has held the position since the beginning of the Kennedy administration.

His relationship with President Johnson, as it was with the late President Kennedy, has been extremely close.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION MISREPRESENTS THE TRUTH ABOUT THE SOLVENCY OF ITS PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers in recent days have carried very interesting articles about President Johnson's instructions to his Cabinet officers to economize on their respective agencies programs for fiscal 1967. This is a commendable effort by the President and we all applaud him for it. However, he might give serious attention also to having his executive agencies be more honest in their reports to the people on the activities and solvency of their ongoing programs. A particular case in point is the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior.

The Bureau of Reclamation recently released a fancy folder printed by the U.S. Government Printing Office—1965–0–761–963—entitled "Reclamation Account to You—A Summary Report of the Bureau's Financial Condition and Operations for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1964." The folder presents a glowing picture of repayment of the Federal investment in electric power, indicating a net income for the year 1964 of $22,057,-927. The figure evidently was derived from an internal agency document entitled "Annual Financial Report—1964" which allegedly presents a concise report on the Bureau's financial position at the end of the fiscal year and its operations during the year supported by financial statements in considerable detail. The intention of the folder obviously is to portray the Bureau of Reclamation's power operations as being a successful and lucrative business for the taxpayers.

To the unsuspecting citizen, unversed in the wiles of financial legerdemain, the folder would appear to be based on the data in the annual financial report. Yet, when it is subjected to the bright light of truth, the outright, flagrant, and brazen deception contained in the folder exceeds that of the worst stock manipulator who operated prior to the birth of the Securities and Exchange Commission. No honest businessman would think of stooping to the levels engaged in by the Bureau of Reclamation, a Government agency, a servant of the people, in preparing and publishing a misleading piece of propaganda portraying a favorable picture which does not, in reality, exist.

So far as I can determine from a quick examination of the figures in the report, the statement of total income from power operations is probably correct. After all, it would be quite foolish to attempt to falsify such amounts which are reported regularly in statements of the Treasury Department. However, on the cost side of the ledger, such a situation just does not exist. One of the main factors contributing to the ease of deception is the fact that several Federal agencies are involved in the operation, and failure to properly include in financial statements the costs of all agencies involved results in a completely inaccurate and distorted conclusion. The irony of the case is the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation appears to have deliberately left out of the folder the fine print footnote in its internal document stating that costs incurred by other Federal agencies in the generation and transmission of power are not included in the financial statements of the Bureau. Had these costs been properly included, net income would have shown a deficit of at least $5 million in 1964 rather than an excess of more than $22 million. In other words, when the whole truth is out, the facts reveal that revenues failed to meet costs even with the liberal standards of cost allocation, the interest subsidies, and the absence of any allowance for taxes as permitted by law and administrative policy, by more than $5 million in 1 year.

An excellent example of gross understatement of cost is found in the Missouri River Basin Power System where power

revenues of $34,043,731 and costs of only $21,920,083 are claimed, leaving what might appear to be a highly profitable net income of $12,122,928. However, as indicated above, these costs represent only the expenditures of the Bureau of Reclamation and not the major cost of production of the power, most of which is generated by Corps of Engineers dams. It is surprising that such substantial costs would be omitted from the financial statements of any responsible agency. This cannot be accidental. Had such appropriate costs for this one power system alone been included in the tabulation, practically all of the net income shown in the folder would vanish since the $12 million plus of net income for the Missouri River Basin System turns out to be more than a $9 million loss when all costs are included.

The accounts for the Falcon project of the International Boundary and Water Commission—United States and Mexico—on the Rio Grande River, have been afforded similar treatment. Moreover, in this case, no costs are shown for production and transmission of electric power, since the Bureau of Reclamation does neither, but the total revenues from power sales are included on the income side of the ledger. In other words, a commodity or service is sold which, according to the Bureau's point of view, costs nothing to produce. Ridiculous.

Another major defect with resulting great deception in the tabulation, is the failure to include in the Columbia Basin project figures the commitment of power revenues to repay some $628 million of irrigation costs. Furthermore, the Bureau of Reclamation tabulation includes a large net income for this project; whereas, in reality, the amounts allotted by the Bonneville Power Administration from its gross revenues to the credit of this project are insufficient to meet payout requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I am not certain which agency of Government is responsible for monitoring the accuracy of such printed reports of governmental agencies. In my opinion, it is literally a crime to overtly publish statements whose only purpose must be to deceive the American public into thinking that the amortization of Federal costs of these power systems is something that it is not. Each General Accounting Office report on Department of the Interior power marketing activities, almost without exception, has stated that their accounts do not fairly reflect the financial status and operation of the power systems. How long can such a situation be tolerated? I am sure that any individuals responsible for making false reports of this nature in private business would long since have found themselves in jail. Isn't the American public entitled to the facts—all of them?

Perhaps this is a question which should be considered by the joint financial management improvement program team, made up of the Secretary of the Treasury, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General of the United States. This team, according to its report of "15 Years of Progress"—printed by the Government Printing Office in 1964—has as one of its major objectives the establishment of accounting systems to "provide full disclosure of assets, liabilities, income, and expenses." Another publication of the joint financial management improvement program team entitled "Highlights of Progress" printed earlier this year states:

> Under existing financial management, legislation—the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950—the head of each executive agency is responsible for establishing and maintaining systems of accounting and control that will provide full disclosure of financial results.

Any publication by the Bureau of Reclamation which gives only half the truth about this Federal Government program cannot be considered as providing "full disclosure of financial results."

I cannot help but feel the Bureau of the Budget has some responsibilities in this field. Assuring that the accounts of power operations utilize all the modern techniques of financial management are presented on an honest, complete, businesslike basis, would seem to me to be a fundamental obligation of the Budget—Treasury—GAO accounting team. If the Bureau of the Budget was really doing its job, the Bureau of Reclamation would be accounting to the public in meaningful terms of what is really happening rather than the pie-in-the-sky type of report contained in the glossy folder which camouflages the picture to hide the subsidies present in their power marketing operations.

Mr. Speaker, I fully realize this misleading Bureau of Reclamation folder does not purport to be a complete balance sheet of the Federal power program. I am not saying that the Bureau is engaged in outright lying to the American public about the shady bookkeeping practices which it is allowed to follow. Any person who is interested and takes the time can ferret out the facts as I have done by digging into the backup financial reports of the Bureau. I am saying that to deliberately publish and promote a folder such as this one in question which deceives the public on the true picture of costs and benefits of the Federal power program is a fraud on the taxpayers.

It is difficult to see how the power marketing program of Interior can be coordinated and controlled in accordance with law without complete and accurate financial statements which the GAO reports have repeatedly stated are not in existence and a preliminary form of which it had to contrive in order to get any indication of the status of power repayment.

The patience of the public for such shenanigans has a limit which I think is rapidly approaching. It would seem the better part of wisdom for the Department of the Interior to take steps to mend its ways on its own initiative rather than to let the wrath of the people explode.

U.S. ECONOMY NEEDS IMPROVED TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is in the best interest of and the result of my concern for the U.S. economy that I today join those who have introduced much-needed legislation to amend the Trade Expansion Act passed by the 87th Congress in October 1962.

That act has been in effect well over 2½ years and it has produced nothing that would recommend its continuance in its present form. It called for adjustment assistance to industries and workers that were hurt by tariff reductions, both past and prospective. To date no adjustment assistance application has gained approval by the Tariff Commission although 17 cases have been examined and disposed of by the Commission. Not one got past the Commission, all but one having been rejected by unanimous vote. Today there are no cases left before the Commission because the hopelessness of proceeding in that direction has no doubt been well established.

Also, the act was to be used to stimulate exportation of farm products, especially farm surplus commodities. Of special concern was the Common Market of Europe, which has adopted some measures and is by way of adopting others, involved in their common agricultural policy, that are expected to shrink our share of the principal European grain markets. While the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations has made some strong statements on the subject, including an unwillingness to enter into negotiations in industrial items unless certain guarantees were received on agricultural products, the firmness of his stand was breached when he agreed to pass the deadline last December and retreated. Now it is possible that the two negotiations will not go on simultaneously. If that is the course to be followed I fear that very little will be accomplished of the original intent, just as in the case of the adjustment assistance.

Because of the competitive standing of American industry and agriculture in relation to the rest of the world, I feel that further tariff reductions could not be justified until the competive disparity is overcome or greatly narrowed. Certainly we should not make the mistake of cutting our tariffs 50 percent as is now proposed, with only a few paltry exceptions.

I come from an agricultural area but I know that our agricultural exports have boomed only because of our subsidization in one form or another. In fiscal year 1964 our exports of farm products reached an alltime high of $6.1 billion, nearly $1 billion above a year earlier, the previous record. The Bulletin on Foreign Agricultural Trade of the Department of Agriculture for February 1965 said:

> Chief development in the increase was the relatively poor wheat harvest in Western Europe and the Soviet Union.

Such windfalls, of course, do not occur every year. This year exports of both wheat and cotton are expected to decline and our farm product exports will do well to meet the 1963 level despite our subsidization.

If we did not subsidize our agricultural exports these exports would decline by well over $2 billion. In 1963 our exports of wheat and wheat flour and of raw cotton amounted to $1.9 billion, and these were all subsidized some 30 percent of the world price in order to move them.

Here again we see evidence of our higher costs; but, it is said, these are farm products and the costs are high because of price supports. But for price supports, it is argued, we could sell overseas without subsidization.

This argument is supposed to prove that our industrial products are competitive because they are not beneficiaries of price supports. A little reflection will dispose of this reasoning. The farm prices are supported only to the extent of bringing them somewhere close to parity. Parity with what? The answer is, parity with the prices of industrial products. Most of these farm prices are below parity today, well below—mind you, below parity compared with the prices of industrial products. That can only mean that industrial products are on a higher level than wheat and cotton prices.

If we cannot sell wheat and cotton abroad without subsidizing them we will certainly find it difficult, as indeed we do, to sell industrial products that have higher prices than these farm crops.

No one can say that our agriculture is not efficient. We produce more per man hour in this country than do other countries—much more in many instances—because of the larger size of our farms, our more extensive use of fertilizers, our higher degree of mechanization, our highly developed crop breeding methods, use of insecticides, herbicides, and so forth. Yet we come out with higher costs. Again, the reason lies in much higher wages than those paid in other parts of the world. The proof of the pudding is in the eating of it. How can we then afford to set our industries against import competition that has as great a margin of advantage over our own as foreign agricultural products have over our farm products?

Evidence is pressing upon us from all sides, not yet recognized by our learned economists, showing unmistakably that American industry stands on a high-cost base in relation to much of the rest of the world. It shows in our balance of payment troubles. It shows in our shipbuilding and ship-operating subsidies. It shows in the recently recognized necessity of requiring foreign aid recipients to spend most of their dollars in this country for commodity purchases. It shows again in our law requiring that 50 percent of the cargoes of foreign aid shipments be carried in American bottoms. Without this requirement no doubt all or nearly all aid shipments would be carried in foreign bottoms.

The evidence is everywhere and yet we ignore it. How then can we expect to improve our position by increasing our exposure to competing imports? A further 50 percent tariff cut would double our plight. The trouble is that we insist on using the industries and farms of this country, the free enterprise system, to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for our diplomats; but this system is not suited to such use and manipulation. If we persist in this policy we will kill the system. Yet this is the system other countries all over the world outside of the Communist orbit, are adopting as fast as they can, especially the industrialized countries of Europe, and Japan.

Instead of misusing the system to its vast detriment, we should recognize its advantages and its inestimable value when it is given a chance. Why should the other countries recognize these advantages to the point of copying our system, while we treat it as something taken for granted, with carelessness and even with contempt? By this I mean to ask why we insist on exacting from our productive system all sorts of miracles while simultaneously abusing it at the same time to bear the burdens of our diplomacy.

We say that we must open our market to more imports both to help the underdeveloped countries and to keep Europe and Japan happy. This is what our foreign trade policy exacts without asking whether our industry and agriculture can bear the consequences. I repeat that the evidence on all sides points to the excesses of these exactions.

We expect our economy to grow and to provide jobs but confront it with competition from the outside that discourages expansion while at the same time it prods our industries into strenuous efforts to become more efficient by replacing existing machinery and equipment with the most modern available—all for the purpose of reducing the number of workers needed in the plants and mills; and then we have difficulty explaining our difficulties with unemployment.

In order to face up to this we legislate retraining programs, area redevelopment, and other measures, such as anti-poverty, etc. With the one hand we sustain policies that inevitably squeeze workers out of the production lines while with the other we try to solve the problem by actions that continue to aggravate it.

It is about time we reworked some of the rancid economic theory that has been found so sadly wanting in recent years. It was said that we could pay much higher wages than our foreign competitors and still outsell them because we were so much more productive. Therefore we really did not need a tariff. The tariff was obsolete; and we set about dismantling it, and have taken it down 80 percent from its high level. Now this song is no longer heard because it would sound very strange indeed today when many foreign industries have machinery and equipment as modern and productive as any in this country. Our higher wages are no longer offset by our higher productivity and we are in trouble.

Also it was urged that our dollars would all soon come back to us if they went abroad through foreign aid or for other reasons, such as foreign investments. Now that many billions of dollars have accumulated abroad, the economists who were so sure that the dollars would come back are badly confused. They ask, why do the foreign countries that are now flooded with dollars not use them to buy our goods, as good economic theory demands? Their blindness must be self-imposed, for anybody must know that in private international trade importers buy where in their judgment they can turn the best profit. Why do they not buy more extensively from us? The question answers itself.

In spite of all the evidence our trade policy still proceeds on assumptions that have been shattered beyond repair.

Who will say then that our wages should be reduced? Do not all speak at once. We must keep in mind that our high wages do sustain consumer purchasing power and that in any case we have this high level, for good or bad, and the gap between foreign and domestic wages is not closing very perceptibly.

Oh, yes, wages in Europe and Japan have risen by greater percentages in recent years than in this country, but in dollars and cents it is a different matter. When our wages in industry moved up from an average of $2.19 per hour in 1959 to $2.60 in 1965, the rise was only 19 percent, but in terms of cents per hour the increase was 41 cents. This is more than 100 percent of the average Japanese wages and in the order of 50 percent of the average European wage. So even if Japanese wages doubled they did nothing to close the gap and if European wages rose 50 percent they are still no closer to us in dollars and cents than they were. Actually wages have risen by different degrees among the European countries. The point is, the gap is still there, gapping widely; and meantime the productivity of our competitors continues to come up.

This is the situation, Mr. Speaker, and when we now propose to cut our tariffs, both industrial and agricultural, another 50 percent, I think we are courting trouble beyond anything we have seen. It would worsen our trade position by inviting more rapidly rising imports since we would be less competitive than before. More of our firms would look abroad for investments. More mechanization and automation would be forced on our industries in efforts to remain competitive or to avoid being put out of business. Our employment problem would become more difficult; and we would be moving backward.

I gladly join with others in offering amendments to the Trade Expansion Act, and urge that the Ways and Means Committee hold early hearings on this vital legislation.

IS MR. FORTAS QUALIFIED TO MAKE INDEPENDENT JUDGMENTS IN THE NATION'S HIGHEST COURT?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, although it was virtually smothered in the news surrounding the President's news conference on Vietnam yesterday, the President's nomination of a Mr. Abe Fortas to the Supreme Court deserves the most careful study and investigation by the U.S. Senate, which must advise and consent.

While it is sometimes sad and usually true that Presidents appoint men to the Supreme Court who are in accord with their own political philosophy, there is a historic tradition of separation of powers between the three branches of government, and this independence of action is just as important between the executive and judicial branches, as it is between the executive and legislative branches.

There is a serious question whether Mr. Fortas will be able to exercise this independence because of his intimate ties with the President, and because he has been a quiet participant in some of the more dubious transactions involving the Johnson administration.

A June 1965 story in Esquire magazine, inserted in the June 16, 1965, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Honorable H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, certainly should be must reading for all who share this concern over Mr. Fortas' appointment.

Among other things, the article points out that it was Mr. Fortas who tried to squelch the Walter Jenkins story by urging the Washington Star not to print it. It was Mr. Fortas who served as counsel for Bobby Baker, an arrangement which, even the most naive must admit, implies something more than the usual client-attorney relationship, considering the close ties which both men have, with the President. It was Mr. Fortas who supervised the establishment of the trust to administer the President's extensive television and radio properties, which have benefited so greatly from a number of FCC decisions. It was Mr. Fortas who provided the legal brainpower that enabled President Johnson to turn defeat into victory in the scandalous 1948 Senate election in Texas, by securing a ruling from Judge Hugo Black that stayed a district court injunction, and miraculously turned a 200-vote deficit into an 87-vote margin of victory.

It is interesting to note, according to the Esquire story, that Mr. Fortas' legal business has been almost entirely oriented to the Federal Government—cases involving taxes, antitrust suits, savings-and-loan regulations, proceedings before the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the like.

Just how much of this business has come to Mr. Fortas on the basis of his obvious influence with people in high places in the Government? How impartial will Mr. Fortas be in dealing with cases in which his former law firm is involved, recognizing that this firm has a magnetic attraction for those who seek to secure friendly Government treatment?

To quote the Esquire story:

> The reporter's attempt to link the absence of an anticigarette statement in the President's health message with Fortas' representation of Philip Morris illustrates the delicate position he occupies as a man with the President's ear, and a lawyer doing business with the Government.

> There are those who feel that Fortas could be a bit more like Caesar's wife, when he gets into such activities as, for example, his work for the cigarette makers who are wrestling with the Government over warnings against smoking on labels and in advertising.

There is another quote in the Esquire article that deserves attention. Referring to Abe Fortas, the reporter says:

> It was clear that he likes his life's present rewarding course and that it will take something very special—perhaps the Supreme Court appointment for which he is frequently mentioned—to tempt him to change it.

It is interesting to note that only a few days before Fortas was nominated he himself put out a story that he was not interested in any public office, perhaps intended to convey the impression, later, that only the famed "Texas arm twist" persuaded him to acept the offer. There is, at least in all this, a suggestion that the removal of Justice Goldberg from the Supreme Court and his appointment as U.N. Ambassador was as much intended to create a vacancy for Mr. Fortas, as it was to utilize Mr. Goldberg's talents at the U.N. I am not sure just who twisted who's arm in the Fortas appointment. Certainly, Abe Fortas' intimate knowledge of the Bobby Baker case, the Walter Jenkins involvement, the radio-TV trust arrangements, make it clear that he was in a position to have almost anything he might desire.

Thus far, Mr. Speaker, I have talked about the past. There is a current issue involving Mr. Abe Fortas, which has even more ominous implications concerning improper use of influence in the high councils of government. This incident should be investigated by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

A few weeks ago, a major oil company in the United States won a favorable decision from the Department of the Interior, which will result in a huge windfall for that company, and which has aroused the ire of every other major oil company in the Nation. As a result of the Interior Department's ruling, this oil company will be able to establish a refinery in our Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which will then permit it to treble its import quota by virtue of a special ruling. In the first half of 1965, this oil company imported under the quota 21,300 barrels of crude oil a day. Now, an additional 50,000 barrels will be permitted, meaning it will be able to ship by cheap transportation to the eastern United States around 25,000 barrels a day of refined gasoline. The oil will come from Venezuela, where it is worth about $1.25 a barrel, giving a great competitive price advantage over domestic oil.

Of the 73 major witnesses before the Interior Department, 71 were strongly opposed to permitting this special dispensation in favor of one firm. It has been estimated that the windfall will total anywhere from $11 to $30 million a year. Two men had a vital part in this decision. One of them was Mr. Abe Fortas, who acted as attorney for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. It is interesting also to note that the chairman of the board of this oil company is a member of President Johnson's $1,000 club.

Mr. Speaker, there is more information on this subject which I shall develop at a later time. But, I believe there is already sufficient evidence to indicate that there should be no hasty action on Mr. Fortas' confirmation. There are too many questions that need to be answered. The first is why, oh why, does our Commander in Chief stoop to further conquer when his sails are well set with a following sea and fair winds?

An article from the Chicago Tribune follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, July 29, 1965]

FIXER ON THE BENCH

Abe Fortas, the man President Johnson has appointed to the seat vacated by Arthur J. Goldberg on the Supreme Court, has been a political fixer around Washington since the earliest days of the New Deal more than 30 years ago. He has run some important errands for Mr. Johnson and has had a somewhat dizzying record defending loyalty and security risks.

When last October, at the height of the presidential campaign, Lyndon Johnson found himself deeply embarrassed, he turned instinctively to Fortas. The embarrassment was occasioned by the disclosure that Walter Jenkins, Mr. Johnson's most trusted White House assistant, had been arrested for a second time by Washington police on a morals charge.

Jenkins, aware of Fortas' close relationship with Johnson, anticipated the President by telephoning Fortas with the word, "I'm in terrible trouble." Fortas arranged for Jenkins to meet him at the Fortas home in Georgetown, where he poured out his story. The newspapers had got hold of the facts.

Fortas immediately called Clark Clifford, another lawyer with clout, an intimate of Presidents Truman and Johnson, and together they made the rounds of the Washington newspapers, seeking to get the story suppressed. But Mr. Johnson, in New York, learned that the story would shortly move on the wire services. He called Fortas at once and assigned him to go to the hospital where Jenkins had been put in storage and get his resignation. Fortas was able shortly to report that the mission had been accomplished, and Mr. Johnson was able to wash his hands of a scandal.

In previous time Fortas helped Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White, Soviet agents, to draft the United Nations Charter. He appeared as counsel for Owen Lattimore when that expert on the Orient had to rush home from Afghanistan to face charges by the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy that he had been promoting Communist objectives in Asia.

Lattimore termed Fortas a "solid rock" in helping him through his ordeal. Fortas' services did not, however, save Lattimore from being indicted on seven charges of perjury arising from his testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, nor did it prevent the committee from pronouncing that from around 1930 Lattimore had been "a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy."

Liberals, however, know their way around Washington, and a Federal judge of that persuasion was easily induced to get Lattimore off the hook by finding that the indictment lacked clarity. The Department of Justice had suggested that the judge disqualify himself for reasons of manifest bias, but the suggestion was spurned and the case never went to a jury to be heard on its merits. Fortas and his associates represented Lattimore.

The appointment of Fortas has two advantages in the eyes of the administration. It provides the White House with an astute and trusted agent with a sharp instinct for the political angles on the highest court in the land, and it perpetuates the liberal majority which holds forth under Chief Justice Earl Warren. If it also pays off a few political debts, who, among friends, is to cavil about that?

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for his statement on the subject of the nomination of Mr. Abe Fortas to the Supreme Court bench of the United States.

I say to the gentleman from Missouri that this nomination is inconceivable under the circumstances.

Fortas was the middleman in the Walter Jenkins case who did everything within his power to kill the story of the sex pervert Walter Jenkins, President Johnson's confidant, after he, Jenkins, had posted and forfeited bond at the police station as a result of his escapades at the YMCA in Washington, the last being only less than a year ago.

The gentleman from Missouri did not mention in his statement another attempt on the part of Abe Fortas to kill off the story by the Washington Star in connection with the famous stereo set that was made available to the Lyndon Johnson family by one Don Reynolds, who was told that it would be good business to provide a stereo set and, also, to buy advertising over the Lyndon Johnson radio-television combine in Austin, Tex.

This is the same Abe Fortas who intervened in both of these situations, both the Jenkins case and the gift of a stereo set, in an effort to suppress the news and deny the public right to know.

Much more needs to be said and I would hope that next week more will be said on the subject of this inconceivable nomination to the Supreme Court bench of the United States.

I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his comments.

I think there is little more that need be said, but I want to point out again that there is much more work to be done, much more research to be followed up and certainly there is much more to develop in the few days before the Committee on the Judiciary in the other body takes under advice and consent the confirmation of this appointment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

WHAT MEDICARE MEANS FOR YOU

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FARNUM). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the up-to-date official analysis of what the medicare and social security amendments will mean for beneficiaries of the social security program in the United States.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I have been extremely pleased to have a part in the development of this historic legislation. Almost one-fourth of my constituents of the 21st District of Ohio, who currently receive social security benefits, will become eligible for almost complete health insurance.

I hope that this analysis will be helpful in explaining exactly what can be expected from this great legislation. It is my hope that we can now develop plans for the construction of additional hospital and extended-care facilities and commence the training of the additional personnel who will be required in these new facilities. Every community has a great stake in the success of this program.

This analysis of the medicare and social security amendments of 1965 (H.R. 6675), as finally approved by the Congress, is in six parts—first, a description of the basic hospitalization program and the voluntary supplementary plan to cover physicians' fees and other medical costs; second, improvement of the Kerr-Mills law; third, amendments of the child health programs; fourth, public assistance amendments; fifth, social security benefits increases; sixth, financing provisions:

ANALYSIS OF MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

I. HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

A. Basic plan of hospital insurance financed through social security system

1. Eligibility: All persons age 65 and over except certain aliens, persons convicted of subversive crimes, and Federal employees eligible under Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959.

2. Enrollment: No enrollment necessary. Coverage is automatic.

3. Effective: July 1, 1966, except for services in extended care facilities which are effective January 1, 1967.

4. Benefits:

(a) Hospital inpatient services: Total of 90 days for each spell of illness—60 days with $40 deductible and additional 30 days with $10 a day deductible. (Lifetime limit of 190 days on psychiatric hospital services.)

(b) Posthospital extended care: At least 20 days and up to 100 days for each spell of illness following transfer from hospital in facility having an agreement with hospital; $5 a day deductible after first 20 days. (Excludes mental disease and tuberculosis facilities.)

(c) Outpatient hospital diagnostic services: Available as required with patient paying $20 deductible and 20 percent of remaining costs for such services during a 20-day period; $20 deductible can be credited against $50 annual deductible required under voluntary supplementary plan.

(d) Posthospital home health services: Up to 100 visits after discharge from hospital or extended care facility, and under care of a physician.

5. Financing:

(a) Payroll taxes to finance basic plan will be placed in separate hospital insurance trust fund.

(b) Same contribution rate will apply equally to employer, employee, self-employed: 1966, 0.35 percent; 1967–70, 0.50 percent; 1971–72, 0.50 percent; 1973–75, 0.55 percent; 1976–79, 0.60 percent; 1980–86, 0.70 percent; 1987 and after, 0.80 percent.

(c) Taxable earnings base: $6,600 in 1966.

(d) Cost of basic benefits to those not covered by social security or railroad retirement will be met from general revenues.

B. Voluntary supplementary plan covering physicians' fees and other medical services

1. Eligibility: All persons age 65 and over on a voluntary basis.

2. Enrollment: (a) Persons 65 or over before January 1, 1966, may enroll between the second month after enactment and March 31, 1966; (b) persons attaining age 65 after December 31, 1965, may enroll during a 7-month period beginning 3 months before attaining age 65.

3. Effective: Benefits effective July 1, 1966.

4. Benefits: $50 annual deductible; 80 percent of patient's bill will be covered for following services:

(a) Physicians' and surgical services, including certain dental surgeons' services, in hospital, clinic, office or home. Excludes chiropractors and podiatrists.

(b) Home health services, without requirement of prior hospitalization, for up to 100 visits a year.

(c) Other medical and health services in or out of medical institutions, including diagnostic X-ray and lab tests; ambulance services; surgical dressing; splints, casts; rental of certain medical equipment as iron lungs, oxygen tents; braces; artificial limbs; all services in field of radiology, pathology, psychiatry, anesthesiology.

(d) Limitation—on outside hospital treatment of mental, psychoneurotic and personality disorders. Payment limited to $250 or 50 percent of expenses, whichever is smaller.

5. Financing: Aged who choose to enroll will pay monthly premium of $3. If a person is receiving monthly social security benefit, $3 premium will be deducted from benefit. Government will match premium with $3 from general funds. Monthly premium subject to change after 1968.

C. Income tax provisions

1. For income tax purposes, medical expense deductions will be limited to amounts in excess of 3 percent of adjusted gross income for persons under 65 and for persons over 65. Ceilings on medical expense deductions removed.

2. Special deduction of one-half of premiums for medical care insurance is provided for all taxpayers who itemize deductions, but not to exceed $150 per year.

II. IMPROVEMENT OF KERR-MILLS

Establishes single medical assistance program providing medical care not only for needy aged (Kerr-Mills) but also to blind, disabled, families with dependent children and other medically needy children.

(a) Federal payments for medical assistance under existing public assistance programs will end upon adoption of new program by State, but no later than December 31, 1969.

(b) Sets forth certain medical services States must provide by July 1, 1967, to receive Federal financial participation.

(c) Requires States provide flexible income tests for needy aged. Provides assistance to needy aged in meeting deductibles required under new health insurance programs.

(d) Increases Federal financial share of medical assistance under new State plan.

III. CHILD HEALTH PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

(a) Maternal and child health, crippled children, child welfare: Increases current authorization by $5 million for fiscal year 1966 and $10 million in each succeeding fiscal year. ($45 million, fiscal year 1966; $50 million, fiscal year 1967; $55 million,

fiscal year 1968–69; $60 million, 1970 and after); goal: services available to all children by July 1, 1975.

(b) Crippled children training personnel: Authorizes $5 million for fiscal year 1967, $10 million for fiscal year 1968; $17.5 million in each succeeding fiscal year in grants to higher education institutions for training professional personnel for crippled children, especially mentally retarded children and those with multiple handicaps.

(c) Health care for needy children: Authorizes a 5-year program of special 75 percent project grants to provide comprehensive health care and services for needy school and preschool children.

(d) Mental retardation planning: Authorizes $2,750,000 in grants for each of fiscal years 1966 and 1967 to assist States to implement mental retardation plans.

IV. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS

Effective January 1966, Federal share under all State public assistance programs will be increased an average of $2.50 a month for needy aged, blind and disabled, and $1.25 for needy children.

V. SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

(a) Provides 7 percent across the board benefit increase (minimum increase of $4) to $20 million social security beneficiaries. Benefit increase retroactive to January 1 1965.

(b) Child's insurance benefits: Provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits to children attending school or college up to age 22; 295,000 children will benefit in September 1965.

(c) Widows' benefits: Provides option to widows of receiving actuarially reduced benefits at age 60. Full widows' benefits are now payable at age 62; 185,000 widows in 1966 will take advantage of provision.

(d) Disability program: Liberalizes disability insurance program to immediately benefit some 67,000 disabled workers and dependents.

(e) Age 72 and over: Liberalizes eligibility requiremnts by providing a basic benefit of $35 at age 72 or over to 355,000 persons with a minimum of three quarters of coverage.

(f) Retirement test: Liberalizes social security earned income limitation. Exempts first $1,500 a year, provides $1 reduction for $2 earnings between $1,500 and $2,700, and $1 above $2,700. Present law provides $1 for $2 between $1,200 and $1,700 and $1 for $1 over $1,700.

(g) Remarriage of widow: Continues widow/widower benefits at reduced rate (50 percent as compared to 82.5 percent) if widow age 60 or over or widower age 62 or over remarries.

(h) Other amendments: Authorizes benefits to certain women divorced after 20 years of marrigae; authorizes child benefits if father was supporting child regardless of status of child under State inheritance laws (20,000 children and mothers will benefit); clarifies payment of benefits to children adopted by retired worker. Makes other minor amendments affecting farmers with annual gross income of $2,400 or less; exempts members of certain religious sects; permits nonprofit organizations and employees to elect coverage retroactively for period up to 5 years (1 year presently); reopens period during which ministers may elect coverage.

(i) Coverage: Extends coverage to self-employed physicians, effective taxable year ending December 31, 1965, and to interns, effective January 1, 1966. Covers cash tips received after 1965. Employer not required to pay social security employer tax on tips. Tips totaling less than $20 a month not subject to withholding.

VI. FINANCING PROVISIONS

(a) Taxes will be paid on first $6,600 of annual earnings effective 1966. (Presently paid on $4,800 of annual income.)

Combined OASDI and HI (hospital insurance) tax rates

[In percent]

Year	Employer, employee, each		Self-employed	
	Rate	Maximum amount	Rate	Maximum amount
Present	3.62	$174.00	5.40	$259.20
1966	4.20	277.20	6.15	405.90
1967–68	4.40	290.40	6.40	422.40
1969–72	4.90	323.40	7.10	468.60
1973–75	5.40	356.40	7.55	498.30
1976–79	5.45	359.70	7.60	501.60
1980–86	5.55	366.30	7.70	508.20
1987 and after	5.65	372.90	7.80	514.80

WEATHER MODIFICATION REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, men who glean their livelihood from the land have always been acutely sensitive to sun and rain and wind. Now, in this summer of midwestern floods and devastating eastern drought, millions of metropolitan Americans are gaining a new consciousness of climatic conditions and quirks. Throughout America, the weather is more than a topic of polite conversation.

Yet it is no longer true that "everyone talks about the weather, but nobody does anything about it." While a variety of steps are being taken at all levels of government to fight the current water crisis, scientists of vision and imagination are working toward the distant day when it will be possible to control violent storms, and to bring rain to arid regions of the earth. According to the National Science Foundation's 1964 Annual Report on Weather Modification:

> It may be possible, with imaginative, long-term effort, to change the face of the earth itself by altering the large-scale features of the weather.

The science of weather modification is still in its infancy, but it is a very active youth. Public and private efforts in this field have expanded greatly in the past decade. Several Federal agencies, primarily the Department of Commerce, the National Science Foundation, NASA, and the Departments of Interior and Defense, have increased their support of atmospheric research to a total Federal investment of $3,529,683 in fiscal 1964. Recently the Federal Council for Science and Technology established the Interdepartmental Committee for the Atmospheric Sciences to encourage coordination of these Federal activities.

Although our reservoir of knowledge of basic weather processes increases almost daily, we still have only scanty knowledge of rain, cloud formations, and the effects of experiments. In some cases, enthusiasm has far outrun experience, producing understandable doubts, questions, and sometimes outright alarm about men's meddling with the elements. The legislature in my own State of Maryland, for example, has recently passed a law prohibiting cloudseeding in the State for 2 years. A similar measure has just been vetoed by the Governor of Pennsylvania.

It seems time to take stock of weather modification programs, progress, and problems. It is time to find out precisely who is doing what. It is time to study public and private efforts, here and abroad, to evaluate them and to develop clear guidelines for future work. Unless we do this, this young science faces the dangers of expensive duplication of efforts, and of crippling controversies.

I am today introducing a bill which would direct the President to submit to Congress, on or before June 30, 1966, a special report on the current status of research and practical application of the science of weather modification. This report would include an evaluation of the current ability of the United States and other nations to modify weather and climatic conditions. It would also include statements by the head of each executive department and agency, describing that department or agency's current programs and objectives in this field.

The central difficulty in developing such a report is a lack of information about private and non-Federal weather modification activities. Thus my bill would require that any person engaging in any form of weather modification activity in the United States shall file reports with the Secretary of Commerce both before and after undertaking such activities. The form and content of these reports shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, and all information so filed shall be considered confidential.

These reports, analyzed in conjunction with the weather information already available within the Department of Commerce, will augment the reports to be filed by Federal agencies, and will provide the President with the information necessary for a comprehensive evaluation of the overall status of this science in America.

To date weather modification has been of relatively low priority in the hierarchy of American research and development activities. The National Science Foundation, in the report to which I referred above, declared:

> If we are to evaluate and exploit the potential of weather modification in our lifetimes in order to help solve problems of resource management and world population before they become critical, the effort in atmospheric research, both fundamental and applied, must be accelerated.

In suggesting guidelines for such a high-priority effort, the report continued:

> It should be recognized that practical applications of weather modification in the broad sense may require an effort of scope and duration comparable to that in nuclear physics research and reactor technology development which led to the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy (although there is indication that the overall cost may be somewhat less).

Before committing this country to such a massive and sustained effort, we should know where we stand now. A comprehensive Presidential report such as the one required by my bill would give the Congress and the Nation the fundamental information which we need before attempting to evaluate expert recommendations on methods and goals. For, like nuclear physics, the science of weather modification has an infinite capacity for mischief or for good. We must be sure that man's efforts to tame the elements proceed along paths beneficial to mankind.

THE APPOINTMENT OF ABE FORTAS TO THE SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that this body, with its privileges and protections, has been used for the ill-chosen and ill-informed attack which has been made upon a great American citizen, a member of my hometown of Memphis, Tenn., Mr. Abe Fortas.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult on occasion for those not closely associated with the professions to understand the obligation that a professional man has to represent those who come to him.

For example, Mr. Speaker, I can hardly imagine a physician who would turn down a patient because the patient was unsavory, and I cannot imagine an attorney who would turn down a client for the same reason. I think to do so would be a gross mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD a telegram received today from the American Trial Lawyers Association:

> The American Trial Lawyers Association which is now in convention in Miami Beach, representing 20,000 of the country's most experienced trial lawyers, interrupted the proceedings of their convention on yesterday to adopt a resolution commending the President for appointing Abe Fortas as associate justice of the U.S. Supreme Court and reiterated the American Trial Lawyers' support of the Supreme Court and assuring the Court of its unqualified support.

Mr. Speaker, this is the message from people better qualified to know the qualifications of Mr. Fortas than those who have recently spoken against him.

This is a group of men who, as I am, are in a position to evaluate this great patriotic American citizen.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I believe if it were the business of this body to pass upon the qualifications of Mr. Fortas, it would be the sense of this body to overwhelmingly support him. I suggest that attacks that are not based upon anything deeper than articles in Esquire magazine are not the best source of information for this high office.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. I am certainly disappointed that my colleague from Missouri has elected to use this forum to launch an attack upon a distinguished American, a man whose ability and integrity as an attorney have never been previously challenged, to my knowledge.

There is no question about the fact that the qualifications of Mr. Fortas will be carefully reviewed in the Senate of the United States. I think the gentleman from Missouri, if he has evidence to submitt on the question of the qualifications of Mr. Fortas, should certainly present that evidence to the Senate of the United States; but to launch the type of attack that has been conducted here on the basis of an article appearing in Esquire magazine is, in my judgment, not in the best traditions of the House of Representatives in connection with an appointment of this importance.

There has been no question from either of the gentlemen who have spoken here today about the capacity or the ability or the intellect or the fidelity to his clients of the gentleman who has been nominated to the Supreme Court. There has been some criticism of certain clients whom he has represented, and some accusation that he has attempted to prevent sensational news treatment of matters that were before the Court. I think this is probably an accusation that could be made against any attorney attempting to see that his client got a fair deal in the courts.

I am particularly disturbed, as the Representative of a district in which the oil company has its headquarters that the gentleman has made reference to, over the classification of the contract in Puerto Rico as a dubious transaction, because there has been nothing secret, nothing below the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri made reference to the fact that 73 people had appeared and testified on the subject of the transaction in Puerto Rico, the project in Puerto Rico, under which the Phillips Petroleum Co. has contracted to invest approximately $100 million for the development of a petrochemical complex to give employment to the people of Puerto Rico, in exchange for the additional quota application. He has made reference to the fact there was a public hearing on this subject. The public hearing was held to afford to anybody who had anything to say against the proposition to appear and have their say.

To say that because a hearing was held at which opponents of the measure were invited to come in is not, in my estimation, a substantial reason to launch this attack on Mr. Fortas. Because a large number of opponents testified is not a reason for damning the proposal.

I would like to submit that this House reserve its judgment on the matter, as well as the matter of qualifications of an able attorney who has been appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the regular order of business and special orders previously entered into I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Tennessee that what I have said on this floor this afternoon I am perfectly willing to say any place, any time, on any platform or forum, and I resent the insinuation that I have sought refuge behind any sanctuary or immunity of the House of Representatives.

The gentleman speaks of loyalty to the President and ability on the part of Fortas. I agree, and I do not think anyone would contest the statement, that Bobby Baker had ability and that he was loyal to the then Senate majority leader, Lyndon Johnson, now President of the United States.

The mystery to me has always been: How could this man, Baker, indulge in the many activities that he did, building himself a personal fortune while on the public payroll and a protege of the then Senate majority leader, Lyndon Johnson, without the same Senate majority leader knowing what he was doing. Do you think you could have an employee in your office, carrying on the manipulations of a Bobby Baker, without knowing what he was doing? It would be utterly impossible.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is the gentleman contending that the man who was President of the United States during the time of the Teapot Dome scandals knew everything that the Secretary of Interior did when he was defrauding the public back in the Republican administration of the twenties?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is using the tactic of trying to make an odious comparison. You can get your own time to do all of that you want to.

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

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

Mr. HALL. I just say I want to join the gentleman in stating that any statement I have made here today stands exactly on what has been placed in the RECORD and as to what I have stated, I, too, will state it any place, anywhere, and at any time. This research, per happenstance, has been going on for some time and certainly that portion pertaining to the oil refinery in Puerto Rico, which was not named, will stand for the RECORD and the test and evaluation of time.

The facts as stated remain. The question at issue, inasmuch as this body has no function of advising and consenting

as personal representatives of the people, is placed in the geographical representatives of the States in the other body and it is a question in representing those people of cautioning that body to exercise its judgment not on the intellect or the capacity or the vivaciousness or all the other adjectives that might be used to describe this gentleman of Washington of the legal profession, who must now and then if assigned by a court take a dubious or odious case, but whether his judgment is worthwhile as an appointee or nominee to this greatest of judicial bodies. It is there that the question is raised and it is there so far as I am concerned that the question stands.

I am glad that we have raised the question. I think in this day and age when, as I said in the beginning, unfortunately appointments are made based on political patronage in the highest court in the world, with the long-range deficit resulting in the great triumvirate of our system of government that makes this Nation itself great, it is indeed time now as in other places throughout the Government that we question appointments rather than electees or nominees.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, some reference was made to the article in Esquire magazine. Let me say to any who may be interested that, so far as I know, there is nothing particularly new or startling about the information contained therein. This information has been carried at one time or another during the past year or year and a half by, I believe, every newspaper in Washington. Certainly, the newspapers of the country have carried all of this information. It simply has been brought together in one place in one well-written article.

Mr. Speaker, I am sick and tired of various manipulations in this little world of make believe in Washington being swept under the rug. So far as I am concerned, I do not intend to see any more of them swept under the rug if I, as one individual, can prevent it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

NOMINATION OF ABE FORTAS TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GRIDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say, in further pursuit of the matter of the nomination of Mr. Abe Fortas, that I have no doubt my colleagues who have risen and spoken against him here today would have the courage to make the same statements in public.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this element of courage is the very thing I most respect and admire in my friend the nominee for Associate Justice, Mr. Abe Fortas—the courage to take and espouse the unpopular cause; the courage to represent the man who, in the eyes of the public, is already condemned; the courage, on occasion, to represent without charge those who cannot afford to pay for representation and who are accused of heinous crimes.

This is in the finest tradition of the Americal legal system and the British legal system. Erskine, of England, was one of the great advocates of this system. Without it the judicial system would crumble in this country; and the same men who attack Abe Fortas today because he has had that courage might be the very people who would rely upon it in the future.

The members of the Supreme Court are often subjected to the pressures of having to take positions which are not in accord with the popular will. When that happens it takes men of courage as well as learning, dedication, and erudition. I am confident Mr. Fortas has that courage. I am confident that that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, he has achieved the high office he has today.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Abe Fortas in 1943 was the member of the President's Commission To Study Changes in the Organic Law of Puerto Rico. His friendship for that part of our land has been historic. It long preceded the election of the Democratic President, Mr. Kennedy. His representation in this appointment matter, in which innuendo has been made, was in the tradition of helping that commonwealth, as he has traditionally over two decades.

Mr. Speaker, my objection to the attack that was launched upon Mr. Fortas today is related to some degree to the willingness to those who made it to make it in public; that is, it was more a matter of innuendo than of hard fact. The statement that he enriched himself while on the public payroll insinuates many things but, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that sort of insinuation has gone out of style in this country in most circles, and I would like to hope that the day will come when it will go out of style in all circles. My objection to the attack is based upon that. This was a series of innuendoes a man could make safely anywhere because they contain no substance.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S VIET POLICY

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is clear from the decisions announced by the President concerning the turn of events in Vietnam that those decisions have been reached after one of the most careful and exhausting reviews undertaken by any Chief of State in the history of this Nation.

The President has restated that it is the Nation's position to be firm and resolute without being rash and bellicose. America will beckon the Communists toward a peaceful solution to Vietnam with one hand while holding U.S. armed might in the fist of the other hand.

The President has demonstrated to the entire Nation that the gravity of Vietnam deserves the resources of reason, not yielding to the temptations of frustration or temper. His actions demonstrate the leadership which every nation sees in America.

This Nation has a duty to greatness, and in Vietnam and elsewhere on this earth Americans will continue to walk free because they know the consequence of faltering footsteps.

The President's action will continue the consensus of America that freedom will be maintained.

DRUG ABUSE CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this session of the Congress has accomplished much in terms of legislative action, and stands as one of the most productive in the Nation's history although the first session is not yet completed.

Among the most outstanding accomplishments of this Congress is the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965, signed into law by the President July 15. With this new law we have erected a bulwark against a widespread menace to the public health, especially concerning the young people of America.

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, I was pleased to have participated in the formulation of this new law. The hearings conducted by the committee clearly showed that stronger legal machinery was needed to curb the illicit traffic or depressant and stimulant drugs. However, as a member of the committee, I was surprised to learn during hearings that the prescription drug industry itself had taken few if any significant measures toward self-regulation.

For example, the committee's House Report No. 130 reads:

> There is no level in the entire chain of distribution from manufacturer to consumer which does not today serve as a source of supply of depressant and stimulant drugs for the illicit trade.
>
> With the exception of the educational programs and the programs of cooperation with law-enforcement agencies and drug identification carried on by Smith Kline & French Laboratories of Philadelphia, Pa., to the committee's knowledge there has been little voluntary control activity on the part of those involved in the manufacture and distribution of these drugs to prevent or curtail this illicit traffic. Of course, many persons in the business of manufacture or distribution of these drugs check on the validity of their customers or proposed customers. However, there has been a virtual dearth of voluntary self-regulation or of attempts thereat by the industry at any level.

It was encouraging during the hearings to note that the drug industry itself was

trying to bring about approaches toward a solution to the problem of illegal drug traffic in depressant and stimulant drugs. In reference to the committee report above, it must be noted that much can be done by the industry such as the programs implemented by the firm cited in the committee report. Similar measures might well be considered by other companies in the field.

The disturbing misuse of such drugs as barbiturates and amphetamines has been linked to the rising toll of highway accidents as well as a factor in juvenile delinquency and crime. Only through the cooperation and assistance of the industry itself will the fullest benefits of this law lessen the problems linked to the illicit drug trade. Industry cooperation is held to carry out the intent of the Congress that this law be fully operative.

THE NEGRO VOTE IN DETROIT, MICH., AND WHAT IT MEANS IN RACE RELATIONS

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent report on Detroit's progress in race relations, by Stanley H. Brown, in the June issue of Fortune magazine, "Detroit: Slow Healing of a Fractured City."

DETROIT: SLOW HEALING OF A FRACTURED CITY

(By Stanley H. Brown)

"City fair,
Shining there,
In your place beneath the sun,
All the world is watching you.
Detroit is marching on."

Thus in their innocence sang the schoolchildren of Detroit a quarter of a century ago. Hardly anyone remembers, let alone sings, that song today, and few recall the emotions and events that made that piece of doggerel so patently false a picture of their city. In the 1920's a politically powerful Ku Klux Klan, said to be the biggest in the country, actually elected a mayor. In the 1930's the city's violent, depression-fanned insecurities produced the xenophobic, murderous Black Legion, while old Henry Ford was financing publication of an anti-Semitic tract called "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion" and Father Charles Coughlin preached "social justice" and railed against the evils of "international Jewry." In 1937, Ford Motor Co. guards beat bloody two young auto union organizers, Walter Reuther and Richard Frankensteen, in the notorious Battle of the Overpass at the gates of the spectacular River Rouge plant. At the end of the decade a woman's suicide started an investigation of gambling and prostitution that put Detroit's mayor, the county prosecuting attorney, and scores of police in prison. And in 1943 a series of racial incidents finally erupted into the great Detroit race riot, which killed at least 34 and wounded hundreds of Federal troops and armored cars occupied the city. The kids obviously didn't know what they were singing about.

Sometime after World War II, however, the dreary, angry factory town began its metamorphosis. Detroit may still be nothing more than a synonym for the auto industry to people who have never been there, and an epithet on the lips of the traveling salesman looking for a good time. The social conflicts, the physical drabness, and the cultural desolation have by no means vanished. Some aspects of the transformation may be nothing more than evanescent byproducts of the bounteous prosperity of the auto industry during the past 4 years. Others may be long overdue for any city the size and age of Detroit. And some of the brave plans and programs are based on unrealistic estimates of the resources and sophistication of the community. The avid boosters who talk of a renaissance are surely being dazzled by their own enthusiasm.

Still, a new consensus is abroad in the city. All the diverse elements that make up Detroit's power structure, once divided and pitted against itself, are being welded together in a remarkable synthesis. Every significant accomplishment in such major areas as race relations, urban renewal, and the arts—whether initiated by a single individual or by one special interest—has become the province of a board or committee that includes representatives of the United Auto Workers, one or more of the city's utilities, the clergy, ethnic groups, retailers, the auto companies, real estate interests, finance, the press, political groups, and any other relevant interests. And the achievement of the city is discernible as much in the almost palpable determination of its citizenry to confront its problems and attempt their solution as it is in the marked changes that these groups have already wrought.

Though the consensus may appear to encompass a breadth of forces unlikely to do much more than create an aura of civic virtue, in Detroit the synthesized power structure has surprising effect. It is true that in most instances the names of board or committee members are no more than names. The presence of an auto executive or a banker on a board offers no assurance that his employer will supply anything more than good wishes. Nevertheless, sufficient support from diverse and even conflicting interests—particularly from the UAW and the automobile industry—can generally be counted on to elicit enough lipservice, manpower, and money to achieve an objective. Few of the city's leaders are willing to stand in open opposition to the consensus.

Of all the accomplishments in the recent history of the city, the most significant is the progress Detroit has made in race relations. The grim specter of the 1943 riots never quite fades from the minds of the city's leaders. As much as anything else, that specter has enabled the power structure to overcome tenacious prejudice and give the Negro community a role in the consensus probably unparalleled in any major American city. So widespread is Detroit's understanding that the Negro's cry for equality must be heard that in 1963, when Walter Reuther initiated the Citizens Committee for Equal Opportunity to relieve mounting tensions over Negro efforts for civil rights, every business, labor, social, religious, ethnic, financial, and political group of consequence in the city sent its top man. Joseph Ross, president of Federal Department Stores, a chain that finds most of its customers among the city's industrial workers, has been a store executive in New York, Newark, Dallas, Atlanta, and Denver, and he says, "Detroit is more sophisticated in race relations than any other city I know."

THE PRIDE OF CITY HALL

Any effort to attribute the city's awakening to a particular event or individual would be an oversimplification. It would ignore the broad changes in our national life and Federal policy that have affected every city in the last three decades, and would overlook the reaction inevitably generated in Detroit by shame over past neglect. But the new consensus has found itself a most appropriate image in the city's 37-year-old mayor, Jerome Patrick Cavanagh. His record in office and his ability to engender pride and enthusiasm among as disparate a group of supporters as ever a political official is likely to acquire are impressive. And they take on more luster in the light of the fact that during the campaign 4 years ago Cavanagh was virtually unknown, a struggling lawyer with nothing to lose and almost no support from any part of the established leadership. He was opposed then by both newspapers, both political parties, all the business leaders, and by the AFL–CIO.

Cavanagh came to power on a wave of Negro votes. The Negro community had a major grievance against his opponent, the incumbent mayor, and it evidently gave Cavanagh its almost total support. His upset election was, as much as anything, the product of Negro concern that egregious bungling of some recent problems could thwart racial progress in the city. But the margin of Cavanagh's victory (40,000 of 360,000 votes cast) indicated more than that. By electing Cavanagh so resoundingly, the community was expressing a decision that it would not extend the string of mayors who were at best lackluster bureaucrats, that it wanted its change of mood and direction to go all the way to the top. Cavanagh obviously sensed Detroit's new spirit and based his campaign on the city's needs and problems, vigorously countering the city fathers' adamant insistence that everything was dandy.

Once in office, the mayor quickly seized the opportunity to establish himself as the symbol of the city's aspirations. Abjuring the stolid postures of his predecessors, Cavanagh from the outset projected energy, wit, charm, candor, and even intellect. The books on his desk may have their titles deliberately turned toward the visitor, but the mayor reads them, and they include works of St. Thomas Aquinas, Kennedy-Johnson braintruster Walt W. Rostow, liberal cartoonist Herblock, and Dag Hammarskjöld. Heavily Roman Catholic, predominantly liberal Democratic (though municipal elections are nonpartisan), and eagerly seeking modernity and culture, Detroit has found just the man to embody its collective yearning to remake itself into an authentic metropolis. Significantly, the mayor's first executive order called for equal opportunity for Negroes in city jobs.

THE VOICE WILL BE HEARD

Having been instrumental in the election of Cavanagh, the Negro community was assured that its voice would be heard. Although the Detroit Negro has no single leader who acts as his spokesman, many Negroes have long had access to the power structure and, in fact, several are part of it. Horace Sheffield, a staff employee of the UAW, also happens to be the founder of the Trade Union Leadership Council. Created in 1957 as a protest organization to get more jobs for Negroes in union-controlled skilled trades, the TULC is now active in other aspects of community life as well. Discussing Negro participation in the city's consensus of power, he reflected, "Where else could you arrange to meet with people like Joe Hudson [head of J. L. Hudson Co., after Macy's the country's biggest department store] or the head of the Detroit Bank & Trust Co., or the personnel director of General Motors on 3 or 4 hours' notice?"

Now that it is represented, the Negro community intends to play an increasingly important role in the life of the city. For as long as most white people can remember, Negroes have had access to Detroit's hotels, restaurants, and other public accommodations without incident. But it is only since

the days of World War II that the Negro has been able fully to share in the prosperity of the auto industry, largely as a result of UAW insistence that all production jobs in the plants be open to Negroes at pay equal to that of whites. So the Negroes have begun to move out of their once clearly defined ghettos into the middle-class white neighborhoods that increasing numbers of them can afford. Often their way has been marked by a good deal of resistance. Many neighborhoods were finally yielded up to them completely by whites, who fled to the suburbs. Other sections, though, including some choice ones, have arrived at and maintained a fairly stable integrated composition.

Negroes in Detroit have deep roots in the community, compared with the more transient populations of Negro ghettos in Harlem and elsewhere in the North. Homeownership is high; roughly 65,000 families—more than 40 percent of the Negro population—own their own houses. Negroes are sufficiently well organized socially and politically to have elected a member to the Detroit Common Council in a citywide election. They have also lected 3 local judges, 10 State legislators, and 2 Congressmen (Michigan's is the only congressional delegation in Washington with 2 Negroes). Federal District Judge Wade H. McCree, Jr., is a Negro who, before his Federal appointment, sat as a county circuit judge. Mayor Cavanagh's first appointment went to a Negro, Alfred Pelham, a fiscal expert on the staff of Wayne State University.

HANDS ACROSS THE BARGAINING TABLE

Detroit's achievements reach beyond the inclusion on decent terms of the Negro segment of the population. The consensus has also established a profitable stability in the community's industrial relations. Virulent labor hating is now considered bad taste and—in view of the UAW's pervasive social and political power—bad tactics as well. Despite harsh pronouncements from both sides during contract negotiations, once bitterly fought wars have now become hard-played games for high stakes at the bargaining table, with the limits worked out in advance by technicians, UAW Vice President Leonard Woodcock thinks this development took much impetus from contract negotiations in the 1940's between the union's President Walter Reuther and the late Charles E. Wilson of General Motors. It produced what Woodcock terms "a close personal relationship between two prime antagonists" that may have dissipated tensions throughout the community.

Partly as a result, labor relations in the community are, in the words of a Ford spokesman, "more mature" than elsewhere. Therefore the trend of the industry to locate new installations far away from Detroit has begun to reverse. Ford has decided to put a big new stamping plant near Detroit instead of in the Cleveland area, where that kind of work traditionally goes. Last year General Motors began a $100 million expansion program in the Detroit area. Other auto makers and suppliers are also increasing operations there.

AWARD-WINNING BOMBSITE

Urban renewal came relatively late to Detroit, but when it arrived there was no stopping the bulldozers. A broad belt encircling the downtown area and extending east, north, and west is in a constant state of flux as old buildings are vacated, then demolished, gradually to be replaced by new apartments, townhouses, hotels, motels, and small plants, and office buildings. Eventually, according to plans that go back a decade or more, the entire blighted core of the city will be a vast panoply of new middle-class housing, hospitals, museums, parks, schools, as well as civic, cultural, and commercial structures. This spring Detroit's master plan won the American Institute of Architects' first citation for excellence in community architecture. At present, though, the area bears more resemblance to Berlin after World War II than it does to the plan. Detroit's timetable of accomplishment is still some distance behind that of cities like Boston and Philadelphia. But City Planning Director Charles Blessing takes the cheerful view that Detroit's tardiness "gives us a chance to avoid their mistakes."

The new synthesis also finds an expression in Detroit's zeal for things cultural. The city that once symbolized a cultural wasteland is building two new wings on its art musuem, which is making some fine new acquisitions. The city also boasts a symphony orchestra whose deficit is made up largely by annual contributions from almost every major corporation in the city. After years of flying ignominiously to Cleveland to see the Metropolitan Opera Co., Detroit's opera lovers can now see the Met at home for a week each spring. Through two of the city's legitimate theaters have been converted to Cinerama movies, the surviving Fisher Theater—a handsome converted movie house—has been running 52 weeks a year, showing pre-Broadway tryouts and post-Broadway road shows. And a semiprofessional university repertory theater has just completed 5 months of creditable productions of Shakespeare, Brecht, Sophocles, and Molière before big audiences.

HOW DEEP IS A CONSENSUS?

But the good intentions of Walter Reuther and the others who constitute the consensus have not yet bitten deep into the tangle of Detroits' problems and tensions. Some 60 years ago the almost accidental location of the automobile industry in Detroit destroyed the homogeneous, mid-American town that had grown up in the 19th century on the burned-out ruins of a French trading post. About all that is left of the French are street names like Gratiot, St. Antoine, Beaubien, Riopelle, and Dequindre, which Detroit pronounces in ways that no Frenchman would recognize. The old families with money from lake shipping, upstate lumbering, and pre-auto manufacturing mostly took refuge in Grosse Pointe or farther away from the big, brutal auto factories and their laborers. When Henry Ford offered $5 a day in 1914, immigrants flooded into the city. Irish, Italians, Poles, Belgians, Hungarians, Maltese, Armenians, Jews, Lebanese, and French Canadians as well as Negroes and white southerners swelled the ranks. It was once said that Detroit and the politically separate enclave of Hamtramck had more Poles than any city but Warsaw, and more Belgians than any city outside of Belgium.

The three biggest groups—Poles, Negroes, and white southerners—have been the source of much of the city's racial tension. White southerners, even within the liberalizing atmosphere of the UAW, excluded Negroes from office in local unions that they controlled. The Poles, discontented with bearing the burden of being low on the social scale, often found outlets for their hostilities in their attitude toward Negroes.

Negroes had an inordinately difficult time in Detroit's earlier years. The first major immigration of Negroes was sponsored by Henry Ford in the 1920's, in the hope that they would remain loyal to him despite early union-organizing drives. Ford's Negroes were decently taken care of in the model town call Inkster that he built for them, and though they generally got the bottom jobs as sweepers and foundry workers, some were permitted to work their way into skilled jobs—almost the only Negroes in the industry to hold them until fairly recently. True to old Henry, they were among the last holdouts against the union—thus heightening anti-Negro feeling in Detroit in the early 1940's.

A REFUGE IN THE SUBURBS

While the Negroes were still in their ghettos, the managers of the auto companies moved away from the grime and turmoil into the refined homogeneity of the suburbs, first Grosse Pointe, and later Birmingham and Bloomfield Hills. In keeping with the old tradition of putting the office in front of the factory, Ford's headquarters remained near the Rouge plant in Dearborn, just across the western city limit of Detroit, and Chrysler's has stayed at the plant in Highland Park, another independent enclave surrounded by the city. GM set its corporate offices apart from its factories, but it chose a site about 3 miles north of downtown. With their homes in the suburbs and their offices separated from the mainstream of urban life, it was quite natural that the industry's leaders should lose almost all contact with the physical as well as the moral and psychological entity of Detroit.

The loss to the city was severe. It had to function without benefit of the considerable talents of the managers of three of the top six industrial corporations in the United States. Without their headquarters buildings, and without the presence of their major suppliers, Detroit's downtown ceased to be the heart of the city. It became instead a symbol of cultural voids, and civic deficiencies: crowded yet somehow empty, too.

The end of World War II marked the start of another costly exodus from Detroit. Negroes with a little money in the bank began making tentative inroads into better neighborhoods. In their turn, many more white families, including a lot of production workers with wartime savings, crossed the frontiers into Dearborn and a string of new suburbs. Facilitating the emigration were the city's first two freeways, which served as funnels to the new areas. Between 1950 and 1960 the city's population fell by nearly 200,000, while the metropolitan area gained nearly three-quarters of a million. Housing vacancies within the city limits climbed, since it became possible to live almost anywhere in the suburbs and drive to work in a half hour.

THE LONG VOYAGE HOME

Driving through a city is not like belonging to it. Today a man who lives in the northwestern suburb of Southfield, for example, can get to and from his downtown office without seeing either the city's few beauties or its considerable troubles. Leaving his office, he may walk a block or two to his car. A drive of another few blocks will carry him onto the John C. Lodge Freeway, a depressed highway that runs north and then northwest through Southfield. Visible, but probably unnoticed, are the rooftops of some high-rise buildings in a housing development. If he is driving during the rush hour, he will run into bumper-to-bumper traffic—giving him a moment to read a garish sign's assurance that "gas is best." As he approaches the spectacular intersection with the east-west Edsel Ford Freeway, he will learn about a television program from its tire-company sponsor, and if he is stuck long enough, the sign will change and urge him to "keep Detroit beautiful." Another short stretch and he will observe the neon legend, "General Motors," atop a many-cornered, 15-story building. The golden spire of the Fisher Building rises across the street. A billboard pitches the advantages of a Ford. The traffic will move a little faster—and he may go swiftly by a sign inquiring if he wouldn't really rather have a Buick? The next thing he is apt to recognize, after he is permitted to increase his speed to 70, from 55, is the sign heralding the Southfield exit.

Much of the city thus goes unseen. Drivers rarely observe the Detroit River, with

its heavy freight traffic, which forms the hypotenuse of the rough, lumpy 140-square-mile triangle that defines the city of Detroit. The area suffers from remarkably flat topography, making the occasional towers and the factory and power-station smokestacks, by sheer contrast, significant landmarks. Most factories, houses, and the string of small buildings for insurance offices, manufacturers' agents, restaurants, builders, plumbers, and real estate brokers are one- or two-story structures that hug the flat terrain.

At the point on Lake St. Clair where Wayne County begins sits a huge gray-stone mansion. But it turns out to be only the gatehouse of the Edsel Ford estate. Beyond it, along the shore of the lake just outside the city limits, lie the affluent lands: the communities that make up Grosse Pointe. Jade lawns measured in acres still front some of the great old houses, but much of the land has been sold off for bright new housing for bright young middle management. On the lakefront the shore gives way to yacht clubs and then to the great iron-fenced estates.

A MANSE ALONG THE RIVER

Just across the city line another world begins. There seedy stores and old lower-middle-class houses lead to the big Chrysler-Jefferson plant. Along the river now, old mansions have become funeral homes, new and old high-rise apartments promise splendid river views, and a gate and drive lead to solidarity house, the modern, air-conditioned headquarters of the UAW. Across a bridge lies Belle Isle, the island park with a network of canals for canoeing, a zoo, a marine museum, delicate willows, a carillon tower, refreshment stands, bridle paths, and hundreds of places for small boys to fish and catch nothing. Once the goal of thousands of families on nights too hot to sleep, the park was also the scene of incidents that precipitated the 1943 riots. Now largely the province of the Negro community, Belle Isle has been called a "safety valve" against the pressures of a long, hot summer.

With its history so checkered and its social cleavages so deep, Detroit cannot easily be remade. But the historic aloofness of the auto industry from the city proper is clearly giving way to at least limited involvement. "In the past," concedes Allen Merrell, president of the Greater Detroit Board of Commerce and Ford Motors' vice president for civic and governmental affairs, "the industry was a little negative concerning city problems." In the last decade, however, Henry Ford II and Ford executives like Merrell, improving on old Henry's image, have joined actively in civic affairs. At Chrysler, the city's largest private employer and biggest taxpayer, the management that took over in 1961 has increased substantially its employment and promotion of Negroes, "probably doing more than all the demonstrations have accomplished," says one observer. President Lynn Townsend now sits on several cultural and civic boards.

But for the most part auto-industry participation in the life of the city consists of contributions of money and names rather than aggressive leadership. General Motors, says a spokesman, takes this passive attitude: "We sell cars all over the country, and we get requests for contributions from all over. If there's broad support for something in Detroit, we'll probably go along. The first thing we ask is what are Ford and Chrysler doing?" Even so, the corporation's sheer weight makes it a kind of leader in fund drives. "When General Motors is for something, it tends to have great influence," says an executive of another auto company. "There's a formula of relationships between General Motors and the others, and the banks follow. The National Bank of Detroit is GM's bank. If the corporation supports something, the National Bank supports it, and this lines up the other banks." Rank counts, too, he says. "If the chairman of the drive is chairman or president of one of the auto companies, you'd better contribute. If he's just a vice president, then it would be nice but not necessary. Lower than that, a contribution is strictly optional."

Most active of all the auto companies in Detroit's civic affairs has been American Motors. Before George Romney moved from the company's presidency into active politics, he helped organize Citizens for Michigan to bail the State out of a major fiscal crisis. He was chairman of a committee to investigate Detroit's school problems, and was prominent at the convention that wrote a new State constitution. The climate for Romney's move from business to politics was largely created by American Motors' vice president, Edward Cushman. A former Wayne State University professor, Cushman moves freely in political, academic, and even labor union circles; he is the rare auto executive with social consciousness that goes beyond the usual formal manifestations of corporate good citizenship. He concedes that the auto industry's commitment has been less venturesome than it might be in view of Detroit's problems. As an instance, he cites company contributions to Junior Achievement, Inc., the teenage business organization. Though he grants its value for training middle-class youth, he feels that the organization "is not necessarily the best place to put your money, considering the problems of the disadvantaged kids in this town."

NAILS CAN WORK LOOSE

In view of Detroit's volatile past, no present accomplishments can be thought of as nailed in place forever. Even the greatest achievement of the consensus—the progress in racial integration—is not secure. Last year William Patrick, the city's first Negro councilman in modern times, resigned from the council to take a job with Michigan Bell Telephone Co. His official reason was that the offer was too good to pass up. Some observers, however, conjecture that Patrick had become the bearer of most of the Negro community's grievances to city hall, and it became too much of a load. The special election to replace him pitted a Negro against a white lawyer named Thomas Poindexter, who ran with the support of a coalition of homeowners' organizations in the city's principal white neighborhoods. Poindexter won easily on a moderately racist platform. He now purports to "represent the white people of the city."

The expensive suburbs still resist Negro incursions. Grosse Pointe was once briefly faced with the prospect of a Negro homeowner; its attitude, generously interpreted, was resigned, and the community was perceptibly relieved when the Negro family never came. Other white neighborhoods can be openly violent when Negroes arrive. In Dearborn, a city of over 100,000—only 144 of whom were nonwhite in 1960—a group of citizens brutally attacked 2 Negroes moving furniture from a van into a house, to discover later that the Negroes were movers employed by the new white occupant of the house.

The Negro community is pleased with the attempts of Mayor Cavanagh and his first police commissioner, a former UAW official and State supreme court justice named George Edwards, to improve the attitudes of Detroit's police toward Negroes. But lots of people who remember the past are keeping their fingers crossed. One Negro recently said, "Some hotheaded white cop this summer can undo everything." Cavanagh admits that, but he is also realistic enough to know that the relations between the police and the Negroes cannot be corrected by a few pep talks, or a few promotions among the handful of Negroes on the force. Improvement will require a substantial increase in the number of Negroes on the force—now only about 3 percent, in a city where Negroes make up more than 30 percent of the population.

Unemployment among young Negroes also presents the consensus with a difficult challenge. In March 1965, Detroit's total recorded unemployment stood at the very low figure of 45,000—only 3.1 percent of the labor force. But the Michigan Employment Security Commission adds the qualification that it has no meaningful figure on Negro high school dropouts who never find work and who inevitably become alienated from the community, even the Negro community. The magnitude of the problem shows up in a personal survey conducted by Federal Judge Wade McCree. Considering only the top 20 percent of the graduating class of a high school in a Negro neighborhood, McCree found that a mere 41 graduates located jobs or went on to college or the Armed Forces. The rest of the top bracket—51 high school graduates—could find nothing to do. The remaining 80 percent almost certainly fared worse.

Thousands of young Negroes therefore pour into the city's streets each year. To do something for a few of them, Joe Ross, of Federal Department Stores, ran an experiment in his organization for 16 youths judged unemployable by a standard test. Ross' staff, working with Federal and city funds, developed them all into better-than-average workers, at $1,000 a head, compared with the great financial and social cost of the unemployed. But too many other unemployed young people are disregarded. Some Detroiters, however, hope the conscience of the consensus may soon lead to action. William Day, president of the telephone company and a most active participant in the power structure, replied to a question about what was being done by saying "Nothing." And when asked how it would all turn out, he replied with what sounded like the voice of the new Detroit: "One of these days, Jerry Cavanagh will get a few guys together and come up with a program."

A CARPET MERCHANT'S AVOCATION

With youth of a different sort, however, Detroit and Cavanagh have had their successes. For Detroit can still attract young blood, even though so many of the auto industry's people are removed from the heart of the city's life. When Mayor Cavanagh sought a man to head the city's arts commission, ruling body of the Detroit Institute of Arts, he found a young carpet merchant and real estate promoter named Lawrence Fleischman. Fleischman's distinguished collection of American art and his role as a founder of Detroit's Archives of American Art (a national collection of art documents) gave him adequate credentials. But as the son of a Russian-Jewish immigrant he hardly seemed the man to take over the museum, which long had been the unquestioned province of the Grosse Pointe elite. Though Fleischman has his critics, he has managed to win support from the old guard, and to broaden popular participation in museum activity. When the institute's south wing opens next year it will house, among other acquisitions, a gallery of African art financed largely by Detroit Negroes.

Donald H. Parsons is a different kind of immigrant to the city. When he came out of law school 10 years ago and looked around for an easy place to make a lot of money, he picked Detroit, because he felt that a bright young man would show up well in its stodgy environment. After a few years of law practice, he discovered a rich mine of untapped capital: the savings and option profits of the young, middle-level auto executives. With the financial support of

about 100 of these young managers, he acquired a string of small banks and last year, in a brilliantly executed tender-and-proxy fight, the group took over the moribund Bank of the Commonwealth, fourth-largest bank in Detroit, with $600 million in assets. This year Parsons—who is just 35—and his partners, most of whom are not much older, are taking over American Metal Products Co., a venerable auto-parts manufacturer, and he is sure there are many other companies ripe for the picking.

Three miles north of Parsons' bank stand three old houses linked together by rickety outdoor staircases and a sign reading "Hitsville, U.S.A." Behind this unprepossessing facade, Berry Gordy, Jr., runs the company that is the Nation's second-largest producer of popular single records. Nobody outside his family knows for sure how much money Motown Record Corp. is making. But industry estimates for its gross sales in 1965 run as high as $15 million, and the profits of a successful company in this field can be extremely high. The 35-year-old son of a Negro plastering contractor, Gordy has created a company aimed almost entirely at the teenage market. Few adults have ever heard of the Supremes, three girls who sing, but after the Beatles they are among the hottest properties in the industry. And the foremost bright young man in town, of course, is Jerry Cavanagh.

THE DANGER OF BUOYANCY

Cavanagh has his work cut out for him in urban redevelopment. The breakneck pace of the demolition phase of Detroit's urban redevelopment has frequently displaced families and idled land long before capital and developers' commitments were assured. For the city's first postwar renewal program—to replace a dismal slum along Gratiot Avenue just east of downtown with low-rent housing—the first of the old dwellings was vacated in 1950. But as a result of a series of lawsuits, a lot of behind-the-scenes politicking, and several changes of concept, plans, and developers, the land was left vacant for years. In 1954 a citizens' committee proded into existence by Walter Reuther finally began untangling the mess. Even so, it was not until 1958 that the first tenants moved into the new buildings, and it required several years more to fill these first structures, by then medium- and high-rent units. Other redevelopment programs have also encountered troubles: The riverfront civic center, begun in the 1950's, cost the local government and philanthropic organizations over $100 million, but was expected to attract vast private investment to the riverfront. A decade later the only important private additions to the civic center area are the Pontchartrain Hotel, which required a big loan from the Federal Government, and the handsome office tower of Michigan Consolidated Gas Co.

Despite these painful experiences, the city continues to lay grandiose plans and to clear land for them with only a casual regard for their economic feasibility. The west edge of downtown, now a desolate plain, was cleared to make way for something called International Village. A kind of adult Disneyland, the project was to have housed the city's foreign restaurants, quaint shops, art galleries, nightclubs, and sidewalk cafes. A group of the city's leading citizens lent their names to the project, and provided enough front money to land a sizable loan from the Federal Area Redevelopment Administration. But this spring the promoters finally gave up, because they could not locate either the tenants or the private capital the project required.

The city's plans for redevelopment are based on the theory that people have avoided downtown Detroit because there has been nothing much there besides Hudson's and the city's two first-rate restaurants. If the community invests in downtown culture, entertainment, and apartments—so runs the rationale—its citizens will move back into town. For proof, the planners point to the fact that more than 20 percent of the tenants in the Gratiot redevelopment area came back from the suburbs. In the end the theory may prove sound, but it has not yet managed to capture the imagination of Detroit's conservative bankers. And without them, Detroit may never get a magnetic, new downtown.

LOOK WHO DIPS PORK FROM THE BARREL

To help the city's poor, Mayor Cavanagh has launched an antipoverty campaign. Detroit got the first major grant under the Federal Antipoverty Act, and the mayor created his TAP (total action against poverty) program with it. Some people have reservations about the power of this program to penetrate through the bureaucracy and reach the poor. But Cavanagh's skill at getting Federal money for such purposes is praised by some surprising people in Detroit. The city's traditional spokesmen against Federal aid seem to be giving this effort of Cavanagh's their blessing. Allen Merrell of Ford says, "The money is there, and we might as well bring some of it back to Detroit." Another auto executive goes even further: "Without Government renewal programs, we could never afford to put together big enough plantsites in the city."

Besides looking to Washington, Cavanagh is also engaged in some realistic assessments of what Detroit can do for itself. The Mayor's Committee on Economic Growth is at work on a thoroughgoing study of city fiscal resources and requirements. Its chairman, Walker L. Cisler, board chairman of Detroit Edison, has an international reputation dating from 1944, when he brought public utilities into Paris with the first Allied troops. Since coming to Detroit in 1945, Cisler has served in just about every civic organization from the board of trustees of the art musuem to the Citizens Committee for Equal Opportunity. "Things are accomplished by means of money," Cisler bluntly states, and the mayor's committee will not be permitted to forget that. The group's first project is an inventory of city finances under the direction of former City Controller Alfred Pelham. Cisler hopes that this will "stimulate the board of commerce to do more to encourage support of city programs."

THE SUPPORT FROM ODD QUARTERS

Conservative business executives like Cisler have given strong backing to liberal Democrat Cavanagh because they feel the image of the city he projects is good for business. Last February, Cisler, Allen Merrell, and Walter Reuther, among others, jointly sponsored a $50-a-plate dinner for the mayor. The banquet hall held just about every important figure in the city, including most of those who had opposed Cavanagh in 1961. Since then the mayor has cut real estate taxes slightly, and successfully backed a statewide exemption of tools, dies, jigs, and fixtures from property taxes. These factors helped Chrysler decide to locate its new foundry within the city limits. Cavanagh has also wiped out the deficit he inherited by instituting a city income tax. At least two other companies besides Chrysler have decided to move some of their operations into the city. As a result of all this, real estate assessments have begun to rise after an almost continuous decline over the past decade.

The affection of Detroit's business community for the mayor, caused by such eminently practical considerations, is clearly stated. Allen Merrell reflects the mood of Detroit businessmen when he says that Cavanagh is "the best thing Detroit has had for many years."

DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL CEMETERIES

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. WALKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I realize that since World War II proposals that sought to designate cemeteries as national cemeteries have been in opposition to Executive policy. During the past 20 years there have been 20 to 50 such proposals introduced in Congress each year, and, with one exception, these requests have been refused. I feel, however, that I have a very worthy proposal and one which, because of its unusual nature, does deserve the consideration and approval of Congress. Today I am introducing a bill which asks that the cemetery located at the Fort Bayard Veterans' Hospital be designated as a national cemetery.

The Veterans' Administration has ordered the closing of the hospital effective August 31. Adjacent to the hospital is a cemetery which has been in existence since the early days when the Army established Fort Bayard in August of 1866. Soldiers and veterans now interred in this cemetery cover a large span of years and reflect many different phases of our history. With the closing of the hospital, the Veterans' Administration has agreed to assume responsibility for the present area comprising this cemetery. With this assumption, however, they have ordered that no further burials be made.

At the present time there are 16.2 acres of land in the cemetery. Boundaries for the cemetery are yet to be established by the Veterans' Administration. The property was originally public domain; it was then transferred to the Army, then transferred to the Public Health Service, and, lastly, to the Veterans' Administration. Facilities to be included in the cemetery, as designated by the Veterans' Administration, are the rights for 20,000 gallons of water, a structure for equipment and offices, and an approach road. In the present cemetery there are 1,600 graves, with space for an additional 1,400 burials. Since the cemetery is adjacent to Federal forest lands, once the facility was declared a national cemetery 100 additional acres could be acquired from the Park Service.

There are other factors to be considered, including the geographical placement of the present cemetery. No national cemetery is readily available for veterans' burials in the vicinity. To designate this as a national cemetery, therefore, would be a great service to the veterans of this area. The entire southwestern portion of New Mexico, as well as the eastern portion of Arizona, would be served by such a facility.

As most of you know, there was great controversy over the closing of this hospital. Since it has been determined that the closing will be accomplished, how-

ever, the designation of this cemetery at Fort Bayard to a national cemetery would be a noble gesture as well as an act of immeasurable service to the people of my State. I respectfully urge that you pass this legislation which would designate the establishment of Fort Bayard National Cemetery.

CELEBREZZE NAMED TO FEDERAL JUDGESHIP

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has named Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony J. Celebrezze for a Federal appellate judgeship, and I, along with millions of Americans throughout the Nation, share both the President's "feeling of pride" and "reluctance in seeing him depart from the Department he has guided so skillfully."

I want to take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude for the outstanding contribution that Mr. Celebrezze has made to American education and health by his guidance of this important Department with dedication, foresight, and single-minded purpose.

Mr. Celebrezze typifies the contributions that immigrants have made to the American way of life. Men of his stature represent the continuation of the American legion—a legion which inspired this young Italian immigrant of Italian birth to reach positions of respect and dignity. From humble beginnings, he raised himself by his own bootstraps, by his own initiative, and by his own efforts to graduate from Ohio Northern University with a degree in law.

From the earliest days of his public service, when he was a member of the Ohio State Legislature, and later, as mayor of Cleveland, Mr. Celebrezze made a distinguished record for himself. In 1962 President Kennedy appointed him to the Cabinet as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. During this time he has skillfully welded the Department's vast array of agencies into a single coherent unit. With untiring effort and wise guidance, Mr. Celebrezze has helped to formulate and pass the greatest and most far-reaching legislation in the field of education and health this country has ever known.

As he takes on the responsibilities of his new position within the Federal judicial system, Mr. Celebrezze personifies the image and respect of judicial law. I know he will continue to use the knowledge, the foresight, and the dedication to duty which have always been the guideposts of his successful career in public service.

I congratulate Anthony Celebrezze and the members of his family on this new appointment and wish him Godspeed in the years of public service which lie ahead.

AMENDING THE NORTHERN PACIFIC HALIBUT ACT

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which amends the Northern Pacific Halibut Act of 1924.

My measure is a companion bill to that of S. 1975 introduced by Senator MAGNUSON and passed by the Senate. Our purpose is to authorize $500,000 to construct facilities badly needed by the International Pacific Halibut Commission. Since 1925 the Commission has been situated at the University of Washington in Seattle; however, their lease is due to expire in the fall of 1966.

The Commission is located in a decrepit structure of 1917 vintage. Moreover, the University of Washington is erecting a building to house their new fisheries research institute. Through seminars and lectures the Commission contributes to the program offered by the College of Fisheries. Likewise, the university benefits through association with a policymaking body of the United States and Canada. I believe that passage of this legislation will enable a joint effort to supplement the quality of the university and to augment conservation of our fisheries resources.

We should recognize that while $500,000 is the maximum authorization, university officials have estimated the probable cost to be only $300,000.

To underline the necessity for sustaining the Commission we have only to examine halibut production figures since 1924, the year in which the Commission was established. By the early 1920's our halibut resources had been severely depleted. In 1924 only 40 million pounds were harvested. Today, after 40 years of arduous conservation efforts undertaken by the Commission, the halibut yield has risen to 70 million pounds.

But these figures indicating the prosperity of our fishermen must be qualified by knowledge of recent developments. The 1964 halibut season was one of the worst in modern years. It is universally conceded that American and Canadian fishermen, who have long sacrificed to conserve our fisheries resources, suffered financial disaster because of Japanese overfishing in the Bering Sea halibut grounds.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this measure will help the International Pacific Halibut Commission to underwrite more strenuous efforts toward an understanding with the Japanese. In addition, of course, the Commission will be able to expand its program of conserving our fisheries resources. Recognition of the Commission's outstanding performance is but one feature of a necessary and overall design to protect our fisheries. I strongly urge the House to approve this timely legislation.

NEED HIM

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I know that all the Members of this House of Representatives will be delighted to know that our beloved colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, HERBERT BONNER, after having undergone a very serious operation, is now on the road to recovery. After the operation, the surgeon issued a statement to the effect that, "He could hardly have responded better." Within a short time, our friend will be "back in the saddle again."

I have cherished and valued HERBERT BONNER's friendship for more than a quarter of a century. When he became a Member of the House more than 25 years ago, he was exceptionally well qualified by background, training, and experience. He served for many years as Secretary to his predecessor, the Honorable Lindsay Warren, who upon retiring from Congress became Comptroller General of the United States. At the end of Mr. Warren's term in Congress, HERBERT BONNER, his secretary, was elected to the House. HERBERT BONNER is now and for many years has been, chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, an assignment which is of great importance not only to the people of his district, but to all of the people of the Nation. His committee handles all legislation affecting our merchant marine, our sailing ships that sail the bosoms of the seven seas in the prosecution of a peaceful commerce. HERBERT BONNER is a devoted and dedicated public servant. He has served his country both in war and in peace and has proven himself to be worthy of the confidence of the people who have elected him to Congress and whom he has so ably represented.

Mr. Speaker, on July 23 a short editorial appeared in the News & Observer, published in Raleigh, N.C., and I herewith submit the editorial:

NEED HIM

The people of North Carolina, and especially those in the northeastern part of the State, will hope for a quick and full recovery of Congressman HERBERT BONNER.

Mr. BONNER is 74 years old and has represented the First Congressional District for more than 25 years. He has spent his energies unflaggingly for his people; indeed for the whole country, for as chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee he has applied wise and diligent effort to bolstering America's means for ocean commerce.

It is good news to hear the surgeon's report following the difficult operation Mr. BONNER underwent: "He could hardly have responded better."

The people in his district will feel greater relief, however, when he is fully recovered. They and all of us need him back on the job.

HAWAII SERVICE AWARD GOES TO ANGIE CONNOR, M.D.

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, too often our dedicated public servants at the State level go unrecognized and unrewarded. I am pleased to note, however, that Dr. Angie Connor, a physician who formerly was with the Hawaii State Department of Health, has been given well-deserved recognition for her outstanding work as a public administrator.

Dr. Angie Connor was recently presented the 1965 Public Administration Award for her service as director of the State's program to help the mentally retarded and for her work as superintendent of the Waimano Training School and Hospital, in Hawaii.

The Hawaii chapter of the American Society for public Administration made the award at its annual meeting at the Hilton Hawaiian Village Hotel, at Waikiki.

Now professor of public health at the University of Hawaii, Dr. Connor was nominated for the award for her service to the State as "physician, scholar, administrator, and humanitarian."

The award praised her work with the mental health program and at the Waimano facility, adding that "she has really accomplished alone the work of two men."

A Hawaii resident since 1948, she was a pediatrician and chief of the bureau of maternal and child health and crippled children prior to her work with the mental retardation program.

It was the fourth consecutive year the award went to a member of the university's ranks. Previous winners were Norman Meller, political science professor; Richard S. Takasaki, university vice president for business affairs; Thomas H. Hamilton, university president; Dr. Richard K. C. Lee, former president of the State board of health and now director of public health and medical activities at the University of Hawaii.

Hawaii is justifiably proud of these outstanding public administrators.

AIR FORCE PERSONNEL CENTER, RANDOLPH AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in these days of crisis and uncertainty in foreign affairs I believe everyone will agree that it is absolutely essential for our defense system to operate on a high level of efficiency. Last Friday, July 23, 1965, I was privileged to play a small part in the dedication ceremonies of a military personnel center which will make a substantial contribution toward a more careful and professional handling of the largest organization in the United States, the U.S. Air Force.

The new $2 million personnel center at Randolph Air Force Base, Tex., will take care of the personnel management activities for the Air Force's 850,000 enlisted men and officers. The location of this center at Randolph Air Force Base 1,700 miles away from the Nation's Capital, is deeply significant. For in addition to the great defense complex already located in the San Antonio area, the location of this center reflects the confidence of the Air Force in the people of the 20th Congressional District. I am confident that the people of San Antonio will continue to earn their well deserved reputation for cooperation with the Air Force and will help make the new Air Force personnel center a valuable addition to the Air Force control system.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD the remarks of Lt. Gen. William S. Stone, Deputy Chief of Staff, Randolph Air Force Base; the remarks of Mr. John Lang, Special Assistant for Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve Forces, made at the dedication ceremonies July 23; and a story from the San Antonio Light, July 24:

REMARKS OF LT. GEN. WILLIAM S. STONE

Thank you, General Greene. Distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, the dedication of this facility here today is the culmination of the hopes and dreams and aspirations and tremendously hard work of a multitude of different people. It marks a great milestone, in my estimation, in the management of the personnel system of the Air Force.

It's deeply regretful that Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert could not be here to participate in this function because he, too, is tremendously devoted to the men and women who serve our country in the Air Force. But in his place we have a very able representative, Mr. John Lang, who is his special assistant for manpower, personnel, and reserve forces. Mr. Lang has been a devoted friend of the Air Force for many years. He started out his career in the Air Force as a private and he is now occupying a position in the reserve forces of a brigadier general, so he knows the picture from all sides; as well as from the civilian side he knows it from the military side.

In addition to thanking all of the many people who are responsible for this dedication and this facility today, I want to take this opportunity to introduce with great pleasure our friend, Mr. John Lang, from the Secretary's Office.

REMARKS OF JOHN A. LANG, JR.

Congressman GONZALEZ, Mayor pro tempore Gatti, General Stone, General Greene, distinguished guests, fellow members, and friends of the U.S. Air Force, Mr. Zuckert desired very much to be here on this very important occasion and to take part in this program which marks a great milestone in the personnel development of the U.S. Air Force. However, as you no doubt have read in the press and heard over the radio and television, his presence in Washington at this time is very much required and, therefore, he is not privileged to be with us on this fine occasion. I feel privileged to represent the Secretary and to bring you his personal message on this program. He regards the opening of this center as an advanced step forward in improving and modernizing our Air Force personnel procedures and joins with all of you in rejoicing over this accomplishment.

Under the leadership of Secretary Zuckert, General Stone, General Greene, and his fine staff here, we today are able to officially open this personnel center as an effective instrument toward a more careful and professional handling of the greatest number of people used by any single organization in the United States—the U.S. Air Force—1,200,000 people, some 850,000 of whom are military and over 300,000 civilians. In addition, there is access through here to over 300,000 Reserve and National Guard records.

We have reached the point in the utilization and management of our people that we can no longer allow room for too much error. We cannot guess, we cannot estimate, we must call the shots on the target and today we stand in front of the new building which houses the great organization that will enable us to call our personnel shots more accurately and thereby assure the taxpayers, and the people of this country, that we are utilizing and conserving our human resources to the fullest.

We can no longer run the chance of wasting our human resources and having square pegs in round holes. Today our national defense capability must be based more than ever on capable and exact measurements. It used to be true in many, many instances that if you had a strong back, good physique, a resolute will and could wield a broad sword, you were very much in demand in our armed services. In addition to these fine qualities that we still need, we're looking today for people who also have skills, mental capacity and with professional abilities which will outmatch those of our Communist adversaries.

We must, ladies and gentlemen, out-think, out-work, and excel our adversaries in every area. We must be better, and in the words of old Bedford Forrest, we must be there firstest and with the mostest people who are ready and prepared.

Locating the personnel center here at Randolph is more than just a practical solution to a hard problem. It is a meaningful and symbolic move. There were many at first who wondered if we could have this very important development more than 1,200 miles away from the nerve center of our Air Force control system, and I think today to visit this center and to see what this center can do is to receive reassurance that this bears out our hopes, our ambitions and our goals in saying that we're ready now with a competent personnel management system here at Randolph.

We indeed are here in the midst of people who appreciate the Air Force, as your Congressman and your mayor and your officials can so wonderfully attest to today. Randolph is in the area long historically noted for Air Force accomplishments and here today we are starting off with this great personnel center in the midst of a large family of friends and well-wishers. Randolph is rich in history and glory of Air Force people. Here have walked and worked the great men whose names are synonymous with progress, accomplishments, skills, bravery and victory, and from here will come other names to be associated with space, innovation, and with victory.

A most favorable element in the Randolph area is the community spirit and cooperation. The people of greater San Antonio and the adjoining communities are for what we're trying to do in the Air Force. Since the establishment of this base here in 1930, these Texans have earned for themselves a reputation of unsurpassed hospitality. They have helped to make this, the newest acquisition, the personnel center, possible and by your continued acceptance of the Air Force

and its people in this community, we will have in this center a most successful record of achievement.

We thank you, Mr. Mayor; we thank you, Mr. Congressman. We thank all of those of you who represent the sturdy people of this area in helping us on with this project for the defense of our country.

And so with pride in our past achievements in the U.S. Air Force and in this community, and with confidence in our march toward further goals in the future, and on behalf of the Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene M. Zuckert, I hereby dedicate the Air Force personnel center, this structure, this great organization, to the thousands of Air Force people who now so nobly serve the United States of America and in this dedication may we assure the freedom and the hopes of the generations in the years to come.

Now, it is my privilege to present your esteemed Congressman from this area, Hon. HENRY GONZALEZ, a great friend of the Air Force, who will address you. Congressman GONZALEZ.

[Mr. GONZALEZ' address not included.]

[From the San Antonio Light, July 24, 1965]

AIR FORCE PERSONNEL CENTER HAILED

(By Barry Browne)

A $2.1 million military personnel center—hailed as a "milestone in the development of Air Force personnel management"—was officially dedicated Friday afternoon in ceremonies at Randolph Air Force Base.

More than 500 persons at the dedication ceremonies heard John A. Lang, administrative assistant to Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert, describe the new structure as "a vital step in more efficient handling of Air Force personnel."

Lang was substituting at the ceremony for Zuckert, who notified base officials late Thursday that developments in the Vietnam situation would force him to remain in Washington.

The new Randolph facilities will handle personnel management activities for the Air Force's 900,000 enlisted men and officers.

ITS FUNCTIONS

Functions include direction of Air Force assignments, promotions, separations, and retirements. Direction of Air Force recruiting and aid in post-retirement employment are also functions of the new center.

Official opening of the facilities culminates a move of operational military personnel activities from Washington, D.C. Certain divisions of the center were moved to Randolph in 1963, but the transfer was not completed until this month.

Head of the center is Lt. Gen. William S. Stone, U.S. Air Force Headquarters Deputy Chief of Staff in Charge of Personnel. Second in command is Maj. Gen. G. B. Greene, Jr.

The center's activities employ more than 1,400 persons. Included are 600 civilians, 300 officers, and 300 airmen. Heart of operations is a computer complex that has a memory of records of more than 1 million Air Force personnel, active and retired.

Supervisor of the computer section—which will handle some 57,000 reports daily—is Lt. Col. Marvin Becker.

OTHERS PRESENT

Other participants in Friday's ceremonies included Stone, Greene, Representative GONZALEZ, San Antonio Mayor pro tempore John Gatti, and Brig. Gen. John R. Dyas.

At the ceremony, Lang stated, "We have to be very, very careful when working with our Air Force's human resources—the men and women now on duty throughout the world."

He added that "because of this center and the people staffing it, our job of allocating our human resources becomes much easier."

TWO TREES

Included in Friday's activities were two tree plantings in front of the new center. Lang and GONZALEZ combined efforts to turn a spade of dirt for one of two evergreen planted in front of the facilities.

Gatti and Stone jointly handled the shovel for the second planting.

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, President John F. Kennedy appointed Eugene Zuckert as his Secretary of the Air Force in 1961 and he has served that post with distinction and honor from that day to this. In fact, he has now served as Secretary of the Air Force longer than any other person in the history of the Air Force. Earlier this month, Mr. Zuckert announced his intention to resign his office, effective in September.

The length of his tenure, longer than any other Secretary of the Air Force, is some indication of the valuable role he has played in the conduct of the Defense Department generally, and the Air Force in particular, over the past 4 years. They have been 4 exceedingly trying years, filled with crises in Berlin, in Cuba, in southeast Asia, and in other places. The Air Force, on each occasion that it was called upon, did the job that needed to be done. This, in my opinion, is a tribute to Gene Zuckert.

From the point of view of an individual Congressman, there is an equally important tribute that can be paid to Gene Zuckert. In order to adequately represent his district, a Congressman must have the cooperation and at times the assistance of other members of the Government. It is true that the Federal Government is composed of 3 separate and coequal branches. But it is necessary at times for these branches to work together. Thus, I have had occasion to call upon Gene Zuckert for advice and information in connection with problems relating to Air Force facilities in San Antonio, my home district, and in behalf of individual constituents.

The Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene Zuckert, although burdened with numerous and weighty responsibilities has never failed to be courteous, responsive, and helpful to my requests for assistance. This is a fine thing to say about a high Government official. It attests to the fact that Gene Zuckert has remained a public servant in the great tradition of this Nation.

HEMISFAIR 1968

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, HemisFair 1968, an international exposition with a regional theme based on the coming together of peoples and the rise of civilization in the Western Hemisphere will take place in San Antonio, Tex., in 1968. This fair will coincide with the celebration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio, and it will also coincide with the holding of the 1968 Olympic games in Mexico City.

The people of San Antonio are building this great exposition from the ground up. First, private subscriptions from local businessmen and groups were obtained in the amount of $7.5 million. Second, a $30 million local bond issue was approved in a popular referendum. Third, the Texas Legislature, this spring, appropriated $4.5 million for a permanent State exhibit. The city of San Antonio intends to build a permanent convention and cultural center on the fair site. In fact, all of the major improvements built for HemisFair will be of a permanent nature.

As the current issue of the magazine, Texas Parade, states:

HemisFair will give due reverence to history, inspire hemispheric good will, and provide a cultural uplift.

President Lyndon Johnson has aptly termed HemisFair 1968 a "fair of the Americas." It will be the first of its kind and will demonstrate the living partnership of the peoples of North, Central, and South America.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of an editorial that appears in the July issue of Texas Parade:

HEMISFAIR 1968

One of the 2,000-odd measures before the late 59th Texas Legislature was House bill No. 16 and its counterpart known as Senate bill No. 166. As adopted by both bodies of the legislature and signed by the governor, it sets up $4.5 million for a building to house Texas State exhibits for HemisFair. The structure is to be used for State government purposes after the fair. It will occupy a site of some 3½ acres out of the 90 acres being acquired for HemisFair and the site is to be deeded to the State of Texas without cost.

Actually the $4.5 million of State funds is a mere token of State approval for a project which is international in scope. So far $54.5 million is committeed for the 1968 celebration in San Antonio which backers believe will eclipse the Texas Centennial of 1936, the Seattle World's Fair of 1964, and will avoid some of the objectionable features of the 1964–65 New York World's Fair.

A generation earlier—in 1932—Texans voted an amendment to the constitution directing the legislature to arrange a celebration for 1936, observing the first 100 years since the Republic was created. Dallas, which anted up some $10 million, was chosen as the central city for the centennial celebration. Among the numerous State supported activities incident to the 1936 affair was at least one monument in each of the 254 counties. The towering San Jacinto Monument near Houston was one of several major memorials erected at historic points over Texas under the same authority.

The magnificent Hall of State at Dallas was also a part of the same project. Dominating the grounds of the State fair, it today thrills a new generation just as it did the one past and will inspire those to follow, an eloquent reminder of the Texas heritage.

Such a building is assured at San Antonio for this generation of HemisFair 1968, their children, grandchildren, and all posterity. Though not spelled out in the law, the implied intent of the Legislature is to build a structure that will be beautiful and enduring.

San Antonio has already put $37.5 million of strictly local funds on the line to celebrate the Mission City's 250th birthday in 1968. There was $7.5 million in private subscriptions and a $30 million local bond issue making up this amount. Uncle Sam has since come along with a $12.5 million urban renewal grant for buying land which, with the permanent building by the State, adds up to $54.5 million committed for HemisFair to date.

At last report most of the 90-acre site in downtown San Antonio had been acquired and existing buildings had been removed from much of it. December is the target date for the entire site to be cleared.

HemisFair 1968 will be riding the crest of a great resurgence of interest in history; it will fill a vacuum which would never have occurred had not World War II diverted the attention of Texans in the late 1930's and early 1940's from the appreciation of history to the making of history. Today world events allow Texans to contemplate things of the recent years (World War II et seq.) and the distant past—such as the founding of San Antonio 250 years ago.

HemisFair will give due reverence to history, inspire hemispheric good will, and provide a cultural uplift. But more practical considerations have changed a dream into a $54.5 million project. Economic experts have it figured out that no less than 5.5 million people will visit HemisFair during 1968. This seems a very conservative figure considering the 2 million nose-count for the Dallas State Fair lasting only a month and a half. The experts figure around 3.5 million of the visitors will be from States other than Texas and would not have come here except for HemisFair. In an involved projection which has proven amazingly accurate in the past, the direct and indirect injection of new money into the Texas economy as a result of these visitors is more than $500 million which would be subject to sundry and various State taxes amounting to $23 plus million. The State treasury needs more such investments working all the time.

HemisFair officials are now bucking for a commitment from the U.S. Department of Commerce to make approval unanimous from city hall to National Capitol. They also seek an endorsement from the Bureau of International Expositions in Paris. When these recognitions are in hand, the worldwide stature of HemisFair 1968 will be assured. And with a staggering amount of work, such as San Antonians have proven capable of doing, 1968 will find HemisFair a fantastic dream-come-true in the Southwest—a dream that puts Texas and San Antonio in the bright spotlight of the entire world.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CXLVI

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the last of five articles on New York's education problems.

It is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on June 11, 1965, and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: THE WHIPPING BOY WHO'S MOVING MOUNTAINS

(NOTE.—Are the city's schools headed for a bleak future of inadequate education and continuing turmoil? Or will they be improved with more money, better planning and increased citizen support? In this, the last of five articles on "New York City in Crisis: The Schools," education editor, Terry Ferrer, and education writer, Joseph Michalak, discuss long-range board of education blueprints for good schools—whose success will depend on the whole city and all of its residents.)

(By Terry Ferrer and Joseph Michalak)

The city's schools are every citizen's whipping boy.

Tenements cannot all be torn down with bare hands and replaced over night with model communities. Racial ghettos cannot be broken up easily and their populations divided around the city for a better population mix. Rises in taxes and the imposition of new taxes cannot be stopped or even successfully resisted by the city dweller via the voting booth.

But everybody can jump on the schools—and everybody does. The whipping boy can—and is—beaten regularly as the symbol of everything that is wrong with the city—delinquency, serious crime, de facto segregation, out-of-school and out-of-work youth, the flight of the whites to the suburbs.

Yet a large part of the reason the schools bear such a heavy load of public criticism is that they have taken on a variety of functions that go far beyond the teaching of the three R's.

Acting School Superintendent Bernard E. Donovan recalled recently that when he came into the city system 30 years ago "the schools were not responsible for such social issues as integration. There was, for example, no school-lunch program. A child who didn't succeed was cast by the wayside. The high schools used to be oriented toward academic studies and success, and for preparation for college. We had no general course for those not suited to college. Now, the schools have taken on more and more social problems and their solutions."

MOVED MOUNTAINS

Dropout programs, special "600" schools for the disruptive and delinquent child, job training, prekindergarten schooling to replace a lack of home preparation for school, and integration plans are only a few of the added tasks the schools have taken on.

If the city's schools have not always done these tasks well, at least they have attempted to mitigate gigantic school ills. The highly critical State Education Department report of 1962 gave the city system poor grades in pupil achievement, but the massive study did point out:

The city schools "have moved mountains, because there are mountains to be moved. The fact that they have not moved them far enough or fast enough is a measure of the staggering problems they face, not of ineptitude, dereliction, or irresponsibility on the part of teachers, principals, and officials.

"There are thousands upon thousands of devoted hard-working professionals in the New York City system. They are struggling against incredible odds to provide education of high quality to children in their care. They need help, and they need it now, not 10 years from now, because the problems are growing, not receding.

"In many ways, possibly in most ways, the future of the metropolis is being written in its classrooms today. Unless what is being done now is done better, and unless much more is done than is now being done, that future will be a bleak one in many respects."

More is being done than ever before. Dr. Walter S. Crewson, associate commissioner of education who directed the State study, urged a $90 million increase each year for 5 years in the schools' operating budget, which stood at $564 million then. That's $450 million more by 1967; but the schools, in 1965–66, will be operating on a billion-dollar-plus budget—1 year ahead of schedule. The per-pupil expenditure has risen from $644 in 1961–62 to almost $752 this school year.

Dr. Crewson also had said that 5,300 additional teachers should be hired. In 1961, there were 39,531 teachers; at present, there are 46,502—more than the increase recommended by the State.

The State investigators put extra stress on the paucity of specialists—in reading, art, science, music, health education and library work—to aid the elementary classroom teacher. Since the Crewson report, the system has tripled the number of these specialists—to 2,900. For example, 547 art, health, music and science specialists were sent for the first time last year into the troubled special-service schools in slum areas.

The associate commissioner also called for a "multimillion dollar" construction program for new city schools to relieve overcrowding. At the time, the city laid out only $76.7 million of new construction money for the schools. This year, the schools are spending two and a half times as much—$182 million. This week Dr. Donovan outlined for 1966–67 the most massive program in history—calling for $243.8 million.

Since the board hired a new construction chief in the wake of the 1961 scandals—the tireless and effective Eugene E. Hult—75 new schools have been completed, two-thirds of them elementary schools that were most overcrowded then. Twenty-five additions also have been made to existing schools for a record 100 new projects in 3 years.

In addition, 19 junior high schools and six senior highs will be in service by the time school reopens in September. Mr. Hult is putting up the buildings at breakneck speed—construction of an elementary school, for example, has been cut from a year and a half to a year.

Improvements in the instructional program are harder to pinpoint. The 1962 State survey said city's elementary and junior high pupils ranked below those of the State in 30 of 32 test scores reported in such subjects as reading and mathematics. But even then, the city's high schools outdistanced the State's in academic achievement.

MORE MONEY NEEDED

No such comparable testing has been done since, but on national tests city children rank on the average or above it. Hopefully—with the funds being poured into more teachers, smaller classes, more full-time instruction for elementary pupils and more prekindergarten programs—future tests will show a pronounced achievement rise.

But the educational product, as well as the buildings that house it, still will require millions and millions of dollars. As State Commissioner of Education James E. Allen, Jr., said recently, "The whole problem of financing education in our large cities is a major national concern * * *. While it is true that money alone will not do the job, it is equally true that the job cannot be done without money—and lots of it."

And, at long last, both the State and Federal Governments are beginning to pour more funds into the beleagured urban areas. New York City will get $54 million more in State aid for its schools this year, and the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of

1965 will add another $50 million after Congress appropriates the money. Thus the city will have an extra $100 million in school funds next year.

And that's not counting about $5 billion that the antipoverty program has provided here for Project Head-Start, a new summer program designed to give 5-year-olds from the slums a better chance to succeed in school. The Office of Economic Opportunity estimates that such children, because of the lack of learning in the home, start the first grade half a year behind children of middle-class families; by the fourth or fifth grade, they are 2 years behind, then keep losing ground. This summer, the program will provide for more than 25,000 children at 288 centers, including 148 schools.

James B. Donovan, outgoing president of the board of education, still believes that the Federal Government must give the city $1.5 billion of antipoverty funds in the next 5 years because the immigration of Puerto Ricans and southern Negroes to this city are a Federal—not an urban responsibility. Mr. Donovan made the proposal last October. So far, the antipoverty office has not agreed.

But, as Dr. Allen pointed out, money alone will not do the job. Intelligent and long-range planning is essential. The confidence of the public, the morale of the teaching staff, and the determination of the board and the superintendent must all be strengthened.

UFT 10-YEAR PLAN

The board already is working on a plan to obviate its endless quarrels with the United Federation of Teachers. The UFT also has agreed to explore the blueprint.

As outlined to the Herald Tribune, the plan proposes that the board and the union set 10-year priorities and goals for the improvement of the school system. The UFT, for example, would set its goal on the average teacher's salary 10 years from now. The board might set a goal of numbers of teachers, school building priorities, and textbook allocations.

As described by a board member, "the board would agree to increase teacher salaries to the level agreed on by the union over the 10-year period. We would find ways to get the money together. At the end of a 2- or 3-year contract with the UFT, the board would consult the union on what lump-sum budget we should ask from the city. We would agree—the union and the board—and it would be the first time that we could say that this was what we both want.

"The priorities would, of course, be flexible," the board member continued. "After all, we did not know a few years ago that we should back early childhood education. To determine what the goals and priorities should be, we would seek the help of an impartial citizens' committee, headed by such a man as David L. Cole (nationally known arbitrator and mediator). The committee would not arbitrate, just advise and mediate."

Asked whether such an arrangement might mean that the union would complain it was losing its bargaining power, the board member said no. "Let us say we ask city hall for $2 billion, and we get $1.6 billion," the board member explained. "Then the percentage of that $1.6 billion to be devoted to each priority, including teachers' salaries, would become a subject of bargaining with the union. The issue could be resolved with the help of the Cole committee."

COLLEGES TO HELP

Such a plan would divorce the UFT-board negotiations from political interventions by the mayor or the Governor, and, hopefully, would give the board a fixed sum of money to bargain with rather than the old "soap coupons" with which it has had to make financial promises in the past.

The board also is banking for the first time on concerted help from the colleges and universities in the city, which virtually have ignored school problems to date. Early this year, a Center for Urban Education (CUE) was created by a "consortium" of eight major institutions to help develop new curriculums and to devise a wide range of research and experimentation.

The center has set up shop at 33 West 42d Street, and is expected momentarily to receive a $4 million grant from the U.S. Office of Education to put it in business. The center, dedicated to improving urban education throughout the State, is headed by Dr. Albert Hosmer Bowker, widely respected chancellor of the City University. One of its members is the Bank Street College of Education, which this year set up a separate Educational Resources Center in the middle of Harlem to help provide teachers in slum areas with model programs and to create new, effective teaching materials. Such action research will be divorced from the board, but welcomed by it.

Dr. Donovan, a director of the new CUE, and the board want to see most research done outside of the system. And they attach equal importance to involving more citizens in studying such educational problems as teacher training, reading, savings in the ever-growing budget, and how best to build schools. As a board member said, "we based our integration plan on the State blueprint drawn up by Dr. John Fischer of Teachers College, Kenneth Clark (the prominent psychologist), and Rabbi Judah Cahn. We must try to get more experts like these, as well as the average citizen, to help us find the ways to make our schools excellent."

Confidence and morale will return to the city system only if such excellence is assured. Dr. Donovan said that "if every citizen, Negro, white, and Puerto Rican, can get the best for their children, they will have confidence in the schools."

THE WHOLE CITY

Providing the best will not be easy—and it may not even be possible without a renewal of the whole city.

As Dr. Fischer said recently, "you can't deal with the New York City school problem unless you deal with the whole New York City problem. People—the power people in this city—haven't seen this connection, and that is why the schools have done so badly in finance and in their other problems. Among the power people, there is still a deplorable tendency to see public education as charity. These people do not think in terms of the whole city."

The whole city, of course, also means all of its citizens. It is one thing for civil rights leaders, white parents, teachers, and citizens' groups to criticize everything that the board of education and the superintendent do. It is another for these attackers, once they have won their points or at least sparked some reforms, to stand behind the board and administration and aid them in carrying out new programs. So far the critics have shown no inclination for such constructive action.

However, June Shagaloff, education specialist for the NAACP, in a recent interview pledged far more extensive NAACP support for the board than ever. The NAACP, she said, intends to be "very involved in school financing as a complement to the board's commitment to school reorganization. We intend not only to press for substantial improvement of the board's policy, but to be involved in all factors such as school budgeting and the fight for more funds from the city, State and Federal Governments."

Dr. Henry T. Heald, president of the Ford Foundation, said in 1960 that this city "lacks a first-class system because its people do not want it badly enough."

The challenge still holds. The major policy decisions that can lead to excellent schools seem now to have been made. How they are carried out, and how soon the day will come when people ask "How good are New York City's schools?" instead of how bad, depends not just on the board, the superintendent, the teachers' union, and the new district superintendent—although it depends on them a great deal. Primarily, excellent city schools depend on how much every citizen is willing to help.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CXLVII

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns a report on crime in New York for 1964.

The article is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on June 14, 1965 and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: MURPHY'S FINAL REPORT—"WITH PARDONABLE PRIDE"

(By Maurice C. Carroll)

"With pardonable pride," Michael J. Murphy made public yesterday his final report as New York City's police commissioner.

This was the statistical accounting to the mayor on police operations for 1964, and the news release that accompanied the 40-page report bore the name of Commissioner Vincent Broderick, who was sworn in as Mr. Murphy's successor last week.

In the final full year under Mr. Murphy's command, the report showed, the department had experienced:

More crime, a rise that New York shared with the Nation, and statistically more effective law enforcement.

Improved communications with the public—including the new 440-1234 telephone number to speed police reception of calls for help.

"Progress through education" a favorite Murphy theme.

Statistical reinforcement of the claim that a policeman's life is often not a popular one. There were increases over 1963 figures in every form of assault upon policemen.

Mr. Murphy, summing up, wrote:

"Each year law enforcement in this great and varied city finds its duties and powers surrounded by greater complexities. The rise in crime has been accompanied by a vastly increased attention to the rights of the accused. The surge of agitation for civil rights has been attended by demonstrations, often of a violent nature, which have proven costly in police manpower * * *.

"I respectfully submit this annual report with pardonable pride in the improvements indicated in it, with appreciation for the support of the city's administration and with the belief that continued progress will bring a more peaceful and harmonious city."

The crime rise, previously reported, showed 173,406 instances of major crime reported to the FBI in 1964, up 9 percent from the 1963 total of 159,099.

"The effectiveness of law enforcement increased at a swifter rate than complaints," Mr. Murphy reported. "There were 52,626 persons arrested for felony grade crimes in 1964 as against 45,937 in 1963, a rise of 14.6 percent."

Besides the 440-1234 number to speed police receipt of telephone calls for help, the report noted, an electronic delayed-answer

system was adopted to prevent calls from being overlooked during peak periods. Street signal boxes for calls to police rose during the year from 2,677 to 2,966.

"At the close of the year, planning had been completed for a centralized communications headquarters for the entire city, a step that will further modernize police communications and speed response to public emergencies."

Mr. Murphy called the formation in 1964 of the College of Police Science, as part of the city university, a "great stride forward."

Buried amid the pages of statistics was a disturbing table. Lost-time injuries from assaults upon police rose to 478 from 353, it showed, and every category of assault was up—gunshot wounds, cuts from stabbing, bites, punches, kicks, injuries from being struck by an object, and an overall item, "resisting arrest."

DR. JOHN W. GARDNER

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the editors of the Nation have strongly endorsed President Johnson's recent nomination of Dr. John W. Gardner as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Once again President Johnson has canvassed the possibilities and picked what clearly seems to be the best man to serve in Government.

The New York Times of July 28 said this about the President's choice:

The surprise appointment of John W. Gardner as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is another demonstration of President Johnson's new-found ability to look in unconventional places to find the indisputably right man for an important job at the moment that job most needs doing right.

The Christian Science Monitor of July 28 also echoed approval of the President's choice by saying:

President Johnson pulled another rabbit from the hat when he named John W. Gardner as the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—HEW.

The appointment, replacing Anthony J. Celebrezze who is resigning to take a Federal court position, is considered one of the best the President has made in his 20 months in office.

Dr. Gardner brings a vast experience and notable reputation as an innovator and leader in education. It is a tribute to our democratic way of life that such men as Dr. Gardner are willing to make personal sacrifices for the public good.

Anthony Celebrezze deserves our plaudits for doing an outstanding job leading this often difficult and diverse Department. I know Dr. Gardner will add luster to that fine record.

I am certain the Senate will concur with President Johnson's choice and speedily confirm these appointments. I agree with the sentiments expressed in the editorials from the New York Herald Tribune of July 28, 1965, and the Washington Daily News of July 28, 1965, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, July 28, 1965]

EXCELLENT CHOICE TO BUILD EXCELLENCE

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, often called the Department of Headaches, is getting its sixth Secretary in a dozen years. President Johnson designated John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corporation, to succeed Anthony J. Celebrezze, the former 5-term Cleveland Mayor who leaves bureaucratic puzzlements for the serenity of a U.S. Court of Appeals judgeship.

Secretary Celebrezze, for all his talents and diligence in a complicated job, had been reported less than happy. Some of his predecessors felt equally frustrated. He was in departmental charge for 2 years in an unfolding era of great future changes for American education and health, and leaves with the customary high praises. But Celerbezze's departure is hardly surprising.

The Gardner selection is superb. As the President put it, "he is regarded by his peers as one of the most knowledgeable men in the field of U.S. education." Not only that, but Gardner has been long recognized as a prime mover in the educational field. The phrase "pursuit of excellence," title of a Gardner report, is a slogan imbedded in language and thought. He is a man of action, an original thinker and a thorough independent. Probably no one person is more important in American education. It's a piquant detail that Gardner is a lifelong Republican, but this wasn't a political choice. In a world where declining quality and the counterweight of excellence are great issues, the President said: "I know of no one who is better suited by temperament, experience and commonsense intellectualism to confront these issues and bend them to the national desire."

To pick individual excellence for high cabinet rank in the development of national excellence is obviously logical. The stimulus and the promise of fulfilled goals must hearten every citizen. For excellence is a matter of practice. President Johnson is to be congratulated for putting an outstanding example of excellence in charge at Health, Education, and Welfare.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 28, 1965]

GARDNER FOR CELEBREZZE

Anthony J. Celebrezze, on balance, has performed ably in one of the most difficult and frustrating posts in Government.

The Health, Education, and Welfare Department, as its name implies, is not a cohesive organization but a hodgepodge of separate agencies with little in common except that they deal with the problems of people. And each has been growing so fast even the experts have been hard-pressed to spend all the money they were handed.

In these circumstances, Mr. Celebrezze has presided about as well as any layman could over the divergent programs in his charge. President Johnson, as he named Mr. Celebrezze to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, particularly praised his tolerance, energy, and single-minded purpose.

John W. Gardner, who succeeds Mr. Celebrezze at HEW, will face the same problems and complexities. He has, however, the advantage of being one of the Nation's acknowledged leaders in the field of education. Besides teaching and writing, he has headed the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and President Johnson's Task Force on Education.

This is an important asset at a time when the Federal Government is expanding by billions of dollars its activities in every area of education.

LEGISLATION NEEDED TO EXPAND AND EXTEND THE WORK OF THE U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, last week Senator JAVITS introduced in the other body a measure which I believe warrants the attention and consideration of the House. The bill, S. 2305, is designed to expand and extend the work of the U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce. The Senator's proposal would amend the International Travel Act of 1961 to accelerate and advance the promotion of travel in the United States.

During the latter part of 1963 and through all of 1964, I was privileged to serve on a Special Subcommittee on Tourism and Its Relationship to the Balance of Payments Deficit, which functioned under the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Repesentatives. Out of the inquiries and hearings conducted by Chairman CLAUDE PEPPER and participated in by Representative WILLIAM WIDNALL, of New Jersey, and myself, there developed a report printed on December 1, 1964. I commend to the persons interested in this subject matter the substance of that report.

The documented result of our hearings make these impressive main points: First, that tourism, including domestic and foreign travel within the United States with all its secondary effects is one of the really giant industries of our country. Testimony developed that this industry accounts for $30 billion of our gross national product. It should be noted that this is largely in the service segment of the total goods and services encompassed in GNP. The Federal Government earns from $3 to $4 billion in tax revenues from the industry. Some 3 million people are employed and earn their livings in this activity and contribute an estimated $9 billion in purchasing power within the consumer sector of our economy. Only in the last 4 years has a real understanding of the potential of this sleeping giant blossomed out. The activity of travel and tourism has been much longer appreciated, cultivated and studied by States like Florida and California. These States through a combination of local government bodies, private groups and private concerns have turned money and talent to the task of luring tourists. There is no need for the Federal Government to preempt the fine work that can and is being done on these levels. However, when we strike out for a foreign market, there are demands that outstrip the resources of such groups and there are obvious benefits that justify a Federal program and a Federal expenditure.

Second, tourism is an industry with a dynamic future. The growth of leisure time with the increase of automation is inevitable. The rising level of

incomes both at home and abroad each year adds hundreds of thousands of new prospects capable of financing travel. Although America has been referred to as a "nation on wheels"—a tribute to our supposed marked mobility, our hearings divulged some astounding figures. Fifty-two percent of our people have never traveled more than 200 miles from their homes. Sixty percent of our people have never spent a night in a hotel. Approximately 75 percent of Americans have never been in an airplane. Only 65 percent of our population took a vacation in 1963. These are just a few eye opening and though provoking facts which show the great potential that lies in this sleeping giant of tourism and travel.

When we look abroad we explode some further myths. Actually in certain countries the people of all walks of life are far more vacation and travel conscious than are U.S. citizens. The bulk of the population of Paris, for instance, makes a mass exodus from that city in August. The Englishman's commitment to his "oliday" is well known. The pattern of this travel is quite different than that which has developed in the United States, and we need to know more about the motivations and expectations of the European before we are going to make important inroads on the European travel market. We should have a program for doing that right now.

Third, tourism is an industry with great national significance. Aside from the economic size it has already achieved, the encouragement for growth and development serves these Federal goals. The job classifications in this largely service industry include great opportunity for the low-skilled workers and for the new and young entries into the labor force with little experience. Chambermaids, busboys, dishwashers, janitors, bellhops, pressers, cleaners, and so forth, and so forth, all these and many others give opportunities for those either unqualified or yet untrained for the more sophisticated demands of manufacturing industries. Tourism and travel by Americans abroad and foreigners here tends to create the understanding and respect that only the people-to-people mixing of culture can achieve. Travel within America by Americans can give a citizen a greater knowledge and respect for his land and develop a sense of cohesion in a diverse and widely dispersed population. Also, travel is an investment by the individual in broader understanding, challenging and developing new vistas, new motivations, and greater opportunities. Surely we are justified in making some commitment of national resources for such goals.

Finally, tourism and travel needs to have recognition as an identified and respected activity with its own integrity and important interrelationships which make a sensible and increasingly interdependent whole. Its segments are important, but the whole has now become more than the sum of its parts. The financial world, the rest of the business world, and especially the Congress should recognize and acknowledge this fact. The proliferation of agencies and committees which this industry must pursue to serve its total and paramount interest is frustrating, demeaning, and destructive. It cannot go on without coordination and some centralization. Mr. Speaker, we would do our Nation a great service, our various districts and several States a unique favor, if we diligently pursue the course suggested in Mr. JAVITS' legislation.

I am today introducing a companion bill and invite others to seriously consider doing likewise.

COOPERSTOWN BASEBALL HALL OF FAME INDUCTS JAMES F. "PUD" GALVIN INTO MEMBERSHIP—BREAKS GROUND FOR NEW LIBRARY—YANKS BEAT PHILLIES 7 TO 4 IN ANNUAL HALL OF FAME CLASSIC

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 26, the annual National Baseball Hall of Fame ceremonies were held in my district in Cooperstown, N.Y. At that time the late James F. "Pud" Galvin was formally inducted as the 102d member of the famed diamond shrine. Also at that time ground was broken for the construction of a new Baseball Hall of Fame Library, which will be erected in the rear of the present Hall of Fame and Museum Building. In the afternoon the traditional Hall of Fame game was played, with the New York Yankees defeating the Philadelphia Phillies 7 to 4.

More living members of the Baseball Hall of Fame were on hand for that occasion than has ever occurred in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that this great national institution is located in my congressional district, and I know the interest that attaches to these annual ceremonies. I have made it a tradition to be on hand for this occasion myself, but this year because of the very important legislative schedule which faced us here in the House on Monday, it was impossible for me to be on hand.

To advise Members of the House more fully of these activities, I include here a clipping from the Coopertown Freeman's Journal of Wednesday, July 28, describing the ceremonies and the game, and also two clippings from the Oneonta Star of July 27, dealing with the same subject:

[From the Cooperstown Freeman's Journal, July 28, 1965]

HALL OF FAME PLANS LIBRARY BUILDING: YANKS BEAT PHILLIES 7 TO 4

(NOTE.—Twenty-two of the thirty-one living members of the Baseball Hall of Fame were in Cooperstown on Monday to take part in annual Hall of Fame Day ceremonies and to watch the 23d annual Hall of Fame game at Doubleday Field between the Yankees and Phillies. Those here included Luke Appling, Max Carey, Joe Cronin, Dizzy Dean, Bill Dickey, Bob Feller, Jimmy Foxx, Frank Frisch, Charles Gehringer, Hank Greenberg, Burleigh Grimes, Lefty Grove, Gabby Hartnett, Carl Hubbell, Ted Lyons, Heinie Manush, Bill McKechnie, Sam Rice, Edd Roush, Bill Terry, Paul Waner, and Zach Wheat. Joe McCarthy, long a regular at Hall of Fame Day festivities, was unable to attend this year on account of his wife's illness. Others unable to be present included Ray Schalk, Sam Crawford, Elmer Flick, Urban Faber, George Sisler, Pie Traynor, Joe DiMaggio, and Jackie Robinson.)

The New York Yankees beat the Philadelphia Phillies, 7 to 4, in the 23d renewal of the annual Hall of Fame game at Doubleday Field Monday afternoon before a crowd of 9,850 fans, including 22 of the 30 living members of the diamond pantheon.

It was the second win in three Hall of Fame game appearances for the Yankees, and the way they turned the trick was reminiscent of the days of yore when the New Yorkers were known as the Bronx Bombers. Four home runs accounted for six of the Yankee runs. Clete Boyer banged one over the left field fence in the fifth with Roger Repoz on base. The following inning, Jake Gibbs, who replaced Elston Howard behind the plate in the bottom of the fourth, clouted one over the right field bleachers. After Tom Tresh walked, Joe Pepitone hit one into a Susquehanna backyard in the same general direction over the right field bleachers as the Gibbs homer. Hector Lopez hit the longest one of the day leading off the top of the eighth. It just missed the flagpole as it sailed over the fence near the end of the outfield bleachers in center field.

The only other Yankee run came in the third. Boyer was safe at first after a throwing error by Phillies starter Lew Burdette. Gil Blanco, the young left-handed bonus hurler who started on the mound for the Yanks, sacrificed Boyer to second. Boyer scored a moment later on Phil Linz' sliced double down the right field line.

The Phils were behind 3–0 after Boyer's homer in the fifth, but one swipe of the bat by Bobby Wine, their shortstop, knotted the count. Wes Covington led off the bottom of the fifth with a single. Dick Stuart and Pat Corrales also singled to load the bases. Wine cleared them with a shot over Repoz' head in center, good for two bases. The Phils' only other run was John Herrnstein's solo homer over the left center field fence off Jim Brenneman in the bottom of the ninth.

Blanco, a 19-year-old lefthander who is on the Yanks' roster as a bonus player, hurled the first 4⅔ innings. He was the victim of Wine's bases-clearing double in the fifth, but then got Alex Johnson, batting for Burdette, on a fly to center and Tony Gonzales on an infield out before giving way to Brenneman who finished and received credit for the victory. Blanco gave up eight of the Phils' nine hits. The only safety off Brenneman was Herrnstein's homer with one out in the ninth.

Blanco fanned three and didn't give up a walk. Three double plays bailed him out of potentially dangerous spots. The Yanks made a fourth double play in the sixth. This came after Brenneman gave up successive walks to John Briggs and Covington leading off. Brenneman walked a total of three, and didn't strike out anyone.

Burdette hurled the first five innings for the Phils and gave up five hits and five runs. He fanned one, and issued no walks. Ed Roebuck pitched and sixth and wound up the losing pitcher. He started by fanning Ross Moschitto, who had replaced Mickey Mantle in left field in the bottom of the third. Then Gibbs hit his homer. Tresh walked, and Pepitone homered. Repoz and Boyer singled, and Brenneman was safe on a throwing error by Roebuck. This loaded

the bases, but Bobby Richardson banged into a double play to end further scoring off the veteran.

The colorful lefty, Bo Belinsky took over in the seventh and hurled the last three innings. He fanned the side in order in the seventh—Linz, Moschitto, and Gibbs. The only big hit off the Bo was Lopez' homer. Later on in the eighth, Repoz singled, but was doubled off first after Ray Barker had flied out to right.

Manager Johnny Keane of the Yankees and Gene Mauch of the Phils started their regular lineups to the great delight of the huge crowd. Mantle, who has played the last several years on badly aching legs, was in his spot in left field and played the first two and a half innings. He came to bat twice. In the first, batting left-handed, he sliced a double into left field, and went to third on a wild pitch by Burdette. A moment later, Burdette cut loose with another wild pitch, but Mantle understandably held third despite the fact the ball went nearly into the Phils' dougout. A sound Mantle would have scored easily. Mick's only other time at bat resulted in a routine inning-ending infield out in the third. Moschitto took over for him in the bottom of the third.

Eiston Howard started behind the plate for the Yanks, but after striking out in the first and hitting a single in the top of the fourth, made way for young Jake Gibbs. Howard was injured in spring training and was out of the lineup for several weeks.

Richardson, Linz, Pepitone, and Repoz played the entire game for the Yanks.

Richie Allen, National League rookie of the year in 1964, started at his regular third-base spot for the Phils, and played four innings during which he had little luck at bat. He grounded out in the first and hit into a double play in the fourth. Gonzalez, Covington, and Wine were the only Phils to play the entire game.

Belinsky provided one of the game's bigger laughs in the seventh when he missed a pitch while batting against Brenneman. He landed on his back, hesitated, and finally accepted a helping hand from National League Umpire Doug Harvey who was working behind the plate.

Both infielders and outfielders had trouble judging fly balls in the early innings as a strong wind was playing havoc with the flight of the ball. In the second, Pepitone had the crowd on its feet as he appeared to have hit a certain homer into the center field stands. But the wind held up the ball, and Gonzales caught it with room to spare. Pepitone just shook his head and made up for it with his blast over those same seats in the sixth.

The weather, except for the wind, was ideal for baseball with the temperature in the mid-70's.

The Yanks' second win in a Hall of Fame game was also the 12th by an American League team. The National League has won 10. The 1959 game between the Pittsburgh Pirates and Kansas City Athletics ended in a 5–5 tie when rain washed it out after six innings.

The Yankees beat the Cincinnati Reds, 10 to 9, in the 1954 game for their only other Hall of Fame victory. In their initial appearance here in 1947, they lost a 10-inning, 4 to 3 decision to the old Boston Braves. Their scheduled appearance against the Milwaukee Braves in 1962 was rained out. This was one of only two cancellations suffered by the Hall of Fame game since its inception in 1940. In 1944, the New York Giants and Detroit Tigers were rained out of their scheduled appearance at Doubleday Field.

In pre-game ceremonies, 21 of the 30 living members of the Hall of Fame—the largest group ever assembled here for Hall of Fame Day—were introduced at home plate by Joe McGuff, baseball writer for the Kansas City Star, and president of the Baseball Writers Association of America. Jimmy Foxx, who was delayed in reaching Cooperstown, arrived in mid-game and was introduced from the grandstand over the public address system.

Also in pre-game ceremonies, Rollie Fingers was honored as American Legion Player of the Year for 1964. He received a scroll from George Rulon, director of the American Legion's junior baseball program. Fingers played on the Upland (Calif.) Legion team last year. This year, he is a pitcher with Leesburg in the Florida State League.

New York

	AB	R	H	BI
Richardson, 2b	4	0	0	0
Linz, ss	5	0	1	1
Mantle, lf	2	0	1	0
Moschitto, lf	3	0	0	0
Howard, c	2	0	1	0
Gibbs, c	2	1	1	1
Tresh, rf	2	1	0	0
Lopez, rf	1	1	1	1
Pepitone, 1b	4	1	1	2
Repoz, cf	4	1	3	0
Boyer, 3b	3	2	2	2
Barker, 3b	1	0	0	0
Blanco, p	1	0	0	0
Brenneman, p	1	0	0	0
Total	35	7	11	7

Philadelphia

	AB	R	H	BI
Gonzales, cf	3	0	0	0
Rojas, 2b	4	0	2	0
Callison, rf	2	0	0	0
Briggs, rf	1	0	0	0
Allen, 3b	2	0	0	0
Amaro, 3b	1	0	0	0
Covington, lf	4	1	1	0
Stuart, 1b	2	1	2	0
Herrnstein, 1b	2	1	1	1
Corrales, c	2	1	1	0
Dalrymple, c	2	0	0	0
Wine, ss	4	0	2	3
Burdette, p	1	0	0	0
Johnson, ph	1	0	0	0
Roebuck, p	0	0	0	0
Belinsky, p	1	0	0	0
Total	32	4	9	4

New York	001	023	010	7	11 0
Philadelphia	000	030	001	4	9 3

E—Burdette, Stuart, Roebuck. DP—New York 4, Philadelphia 2. LOB—New York 5, Philadelphia 4. 2B—Mantle, Linz, Wine. HR—Boyer, Gibbs, Pepitone, Lopez, Herrnstein. S—Brenneman, Blanco.

	IP	H	R	ER	BB	SO
Blanco	4⅔	8	3	3	0	1
Brenneman (W)	4⅓	1	1	1	3	1
Burdette	5	5	3	2	0	1
Roebuck (L)	1	4	3	3	1	1
Belinsky	3	2	1	1	1	3

WP—Brenneman, Burdette. T—2:19. A—9,850.

Plans for a new library building for the National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum were announced Monday morning during the annual Hall of Fame ceremonies at which James F. (Pud) Galvin was formally inducted as the 102d member of the diamond shrine.

Baseball Commissioner Ford C. Frick made the announcement during the course of a brief speech at the ceremonies.

The new building will be erected in the rear of the present Hall of Fame and Museum building on Main Street. Working plans for the structure have not yet been completed, nor has a date been set for start of the project.

A delegation of baseball dignitaries, led by Commissioner Frick and Hall of Fame President Paul S. Kerr, participated in a brief ground-breaking rite on the site of the new building immediately after the regular Hall of Fame morning ceremonies.

Mr. Frick was participating in his last Hall of Fame ceremony in his role as Commissioner of Baseball. He plans to retire later this year.

An oil portrait of the Commissioner, the gift to the Hall of Fame of the American and National Leagues, was unveiled by National League President Warren C. Giles and American League President Joseph Cronin. Mr. Kerr presided at the unveiling.

Commissioner Frick presided at the unveiling of the Galvin plaque. The latter's family was represented by his two surviving children, a son, Walter Galvin of Geneva, Ohio, and a daughter, Mrs. Marie Wentzel of Amarillo, Tex.

James Francis Galvin was born in St. Louis, Mo. on Christmas Day, 1856, and died March 7, 1902, in Pittsburgh, Pa. He was elected to the Hall of Fame last January by the committee on veterans.

During a 16-year major league career, he won 365 games and lost 311 for a percentage of .540. He participated in 687 games, and hurled 649 complete games, including 57 shut-outs.

The only pitchers with more victories than Galvin were Cy Young, Walter Johnson, Grover Alexander, and Christy Mathewson, all members of the Hall of Fame.

Presiding over Monday morning's ceremonies was Joe McGuff, baseball writer for the Kansas City Star, and president of the Baseball Writers Association of America. He had been introduced to the more than 3,000 fans present by R. D. Spraker, a vice president of the Hall of Fame.

On the platform along with other dignitaries from the world of baseball were 21 of the 31 living members of the Hall of Fame, the largest group ever to assemble here and probably the greatest number ever to get together for a single event anywhere.

Following a short speech of welcome by Cooperstown's mayor, William D. Clark, the J. G. Taylor Spink Award for 1964 was awarded by Mr. McGuff to Hugh Fullerton, the late great sportswriter. The citation was accepted by his son, Hugh S. Fullerton, Jr., himself a sportswriter.

A. E. Staley, Jr., president of the A. E. Staley Manufacturing Co., of Decatur, Ill., formally presented the famed McGinnity Cup to the Hall of Fame. It was accepted by Hall of Fame Director Ken Smith.

A unique trophy from major league baseball's earliest days, the silver punch bowl originally was awarded to the Brooklyn team for winning the 1900 world's championship," then given by the players to Pitcher "Iron Man" Joe McGinnity. Twenty-five years later, McGinnity gave it to A. E. Staley, Sr., as a token of their friendship and of Mr. Staley's contributions to baseball.

The cup had been on display at the Staley company's Decatur headquarters for the past 40 years. It will now rest among other mementoes of the great events in the history of baseball at the Hall of Fame and Museum here, Mr. Smith said.

In making the presentation Monday, Mr. Staley, Jr., traced the colorful history of the immortal McGinnity and his cup.

In announcing the forthcoming construction of the Hall of Fame Library Building, Commissioner Frick said it would be dedicated to the men and women in the communications field—writers, photographers, radio and television people—who have done so much to make baseball the great game that it is. He said that it is his hope that it will be the finest sports library anywhere, and that it eventually would contain communications' own Legion of Honor, similar to the Hall of Fame which honors the great players of baseball.

Mr. Frick noted that it was just 26 years ago that representatives of organized baseball gathered in Cooperstown to dedicate the original building of the Hall of Fame and Museum. He said that to meet the need of more floor space for the display of baseball's mementoes, an addition, doubling the size of the original building, was dedicated in 1950. Then, on August 4, 1958, the third unit of the shrine—the distinctive Hall of Fame for the display of bronze plaques of members—was dedicated.

Speaking on behalf of the communications industry, Mr. McGuff told Commissioner Frick and fans that he felt humble in accepting this new honor on behalf of his colleagues, past and present.

In presiding at the unveiling of the Frick portrait, Mr. Kerr cited Mr. Frick's many contributions to the game. He said that the idea for the Hall of Fame for baseball originally had come from Mr. Frick in the mid-1930's when the latter was president of the National League.

The idea for a baseball museum to be situated in Cooperstown came from the late Stephen C. Clark, its founder. Mr. Clark's representative, the late Alexander Cleland, conferred with Mr. Frick on the museum idea, and the latter suggested the Hall of Fame as an important part of the project.

Mr. Kerr traced Mr. Frick's long career which began in his native Indiana where he was a schoolteacher who soon took up advertising and sportswriting before going on to become one of the Nation's leading radio news and sports commentators. He was elected president of the National League in 1934, and in 1951 was named Commissioner of Baseball.

"No one has done more for baseball," Mr. Kerr stated.

Since that day in the mid-1930's when he was approached about the baseball museum concept, and his suggestion for a Hall of Fame, he has been intimately connected with the baseball shrine. He had no official connection with it, however, until he was elected a director in 1947. He has been reelected each year since that time.

Following the ceremonies in front of the Hall of Fame, Mr. Frick, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Giles, Mr. Cronin, Mr. McGuff, Stephen C. Clark, Jr., a director of the Hall of Fame, and Hy Hurwitz, secretary of the BBWAA, headed for the plot in the rear of the building, accompanied by fans and other dignitaries. Leading off with Mr. Frick, each took a spadeful of earth and turned it to mark the official beginning of the library project.

Dignitaries at the ceremonies and game, besides members of the Hall of Fame, included what Mr. McGuff termed "the First Ladies of Baseball," the widows of five members of the Hall of Fame. They were Mrs. Christy Mathewson, Mrs. Babe Ruth, Mrs. Lou Gehrig, Mrs. Eddie Collins, and Mrs. Mel Ott. They were introduced from the platform along with William Harridge, chairman of the American League; Bob Carpenter, president, and John Quinn, general manager of the Phils; Ralph Houck, general manager of the Yankees.

[From the Oneonta Star, July 27, 1965]

MEMORIES HAUNT YANKS, PHILS

(By Jan Sturdevant)

COOPERSTOWN.—The Cooperstown air was heavy with nostalgia Monday as baseball's living legends assembled for the annual Hall of Fame game and ceremonies.

But despite the presence of the game's all-time greats—Dizzy Dean, Jimmy Foxx, and Bob Feller, to mention a few—much of the grandstand reminiscence centered about the present-day players wearing Philadelphia and New York uniforms.

The Yankees won the game, 7–4, thanks to home runs by Clete Boyer, Jake Gibbs, Joe Pepitone and Hector Lopez, and a one-hit relief job by rookie pitcher Jim Brenneman, who came on in the fifth inning after the Phillies had scored three runs.

But it was the memory of past World Series games—and of sure-shot series opponents who faltered in the stretch—which gave the game its flavor.

Lew Burdette, a shadow of his former self, started for the Phils and lasted 5 innings. But fans still remembered the World Series of 1957 when the lanky righthander, then a Milwaukee mainstay, stopped the Yankees cold in three games.

They remembered how the Phils and Yanks had been headed for a series showdown last fall until Philadelphia stumbled and the St. Louis Cardinals came out of nowhere to take the National League flag.

And they recalled how the same two clubs had been tabbed as likely series rivals this year. But a glance at yesterday's standings showed the Yanks struggling to reach the .500 mark and the Phillies limping along in fifth place, seven games off the National League pace.

Typical of the Yankee gloom was a pregame remark addressed to Yankee publicity director Bob Fishel, asking if the contest was supposed to be a series preview. Before Fishel could respond, a press-box cynic said, "Yeah, maybe for 1970."

And Len Koppett, who covers the Yanks for the New York Times, left Doubleday Field after the third inning. "I've seen Phil Linz in the Hall of Fame," Koppett cracked. "That's enough for 1 day."

Despite the four homers, the Yanks weren't the Bronx Bombers of old. Rookie Roger Repoz played the entire game in center field. Though he contributed 3 singles to the 11-hit New York attack, Repoz didn't look qualified to carry the glove of the ailing Mickey Mantle.

Mantle, who played three innings in left field, was still the favorite of the fans, though few knew he had asked manager Johnny Keane for the entire day off. Mantle drew the game's biggest ovation when he came to bat in the first inning.

Mick doubled against the left-field fence on Burdette's third pitch to him and limped to third on a wild pitch. When a second low Burdette toss got by catcher Pat Corrales, Mantle hobbled halfway down the line but didn't try to score. With good legs under him, Mantle could have walked across the plate.

Most productive Yankee was third baseman Boyer, who started double plays in three consecutive innings, scored the game's first run and drove in two more runs with a home run over the left-field fence.

Boyer hit the ball well, but most Doubleday veterans were surprised that his home run—and a later blow to the same spot by Lopez—were not scored as ground-rule doubles. Both were well to the left of the pole in left center field which in past years has marked the end of home run territory.

Even Hall of Fame Director Ken Smith was confused by the ruling which allowed Boyer and Lopez to come around. "It must be," he suggested, "that nobody explained the rule to the umpires. Either that or they decided among themselves to change the rule for this game."

Phillie favorites with the grandstand crowd were first baseman Dick Stuart, whose "Dr. Strangeglove" reputation caused shudders every time a ball was thrown to first, and playboy pitcher Bo Belinsky, who worked the last three innings.

Belinsky, last man off the field, was still the first player to reach the dressing room, where beer and cold cuts were laid out for the two squads. While Belinsky sipped a beer and talked to reporters, his teammates kept begging him to hurry up and shower so they could leave on schedule.

Belinsky was his carefree self after the game, but most players on both teams seemed preoccupied with their surprisingly low places in the standings.

Yankee players admitted they'll now settle for a place in the first division, while most Phillies foresaw a tight five team race in the National League.

Happiest Yank was pitcher Bulldog Jim Bouton, who took his first trip through the baseball shrine.

A sore arm has made this a sad 5–11 season for Bouton, but the chunky hurler came back grinning after a tour through the museum.

"Did you see my wing in the museum?" he asked teammates, referring to the plaque where the American League's longest game is recorded. Bouton pitched in the 22-inning Yankee victory over Detroit.

YANKEES SLUG FOUR HOMERS IN POWER EXHIBITION

(By Chuck Fierson)

COOPERSTOWN.—Yankee power—dormant in recent months—erupted Monday as the American League champions downed the Philadelphia Phillies 7 to 4 in the 23d annual hall of fame game.

The game had the atmosphere of the world's series.

In fact, some dubbed it the "world's series that never was," referring, of course, to the 1964 season when the Phillies blew the National League pennant.

If they had won they would have met the Yankees in the series. As it turned out, the St. Louis Cardinals took the flag and beat the Yanks in the postseason classic.

But Monday the Yanks looked like the Bronx Bombers of old as they slammed four homers. The blasts came off the bats of Clete Boyer, Jake Gibbs, Joe Pepitone, and Hector Lopez.

On top of the power, Jim Brenneman put in a fine relief stint of 4⅓ innings as he took the win.

Brenneman, recently called up from Toledo, gave up only one hit—a ninth-inning homer by John Herrnstein.

Ex-Dodger Ed Roebuck took the loss as the Yanks put the game away with three runs in the sixth inning.

The Yankees got only one hit in the first inning—a double by superstar Mickey Mantle down the left field line.

Mantle went to third on a wild pitch, but was stranded when Ellie Howard was fanned by starter Lew Burdette.

Cookie Rojas countered with a looping fly ball to center in the bottom of the inning that fell in front of Center Fielder Roger Repoz.

Burdette retired the side in order in the second inning.

In the bottom of the second with one out Dick Stuart singled to center. Pat Corrales then hit a ground ball to Clete Boyer at third.

Boyer took the grounder that started a neat 6–4–3 double play. The double play was the first of four for the Yankees—three of them started by the third baseman.

The Yankees scored in the third as Boyer reached first on a comebacker, to Burdette that the ex-Brave threw wild to first.

After starter Gil Blanco sacrificed Boyer to second, Bobby Richardson moved him to third. Boyer scored on Phil Linz' double down the first base line.

YOUNGSTER GETS BALL

The hit was a ground rule double as a youngster jumped from the stands and snagged the ball.

Blanco retired the Phillies in order in the bottom of the third, although Bobby Wine singled up the middle.

But Burdette lined sharply to Boyer, whose throw to First Baseman Joe Pepitone caught Wine off the bag.

In the New York fourth Howard led off with a single up the middle off Burdette's glove.

But he was taken off the basepaths as Tom Tresh hit into a double play. Pepitone then lined to Stuart to end the inning.

The Phillies threatened in the fourth when Rojas singled down the third base line. He was taken out as Johnny Callison hit to Richardson at second, who then threw to Linz covering.

Allen then hit to Boyer, who started his third double play in as many innings.

In the Yankee fifth the Bombers scored twice to take a temporary 3 to 0 lead.

BOYER UNLOADS

Repoz singled to left and went to second as the throw-in got by Stuart at first. Boyer then uncorked a long homer over the left-field fence.

Burdette settled down to get the next three men, and the Phillies tied it in the bottom of the inning.

Wes Covington led off with a single between Richardson and Pepitone. Stuart followed suit with a single into left center.

With Herrnstein running for Stuart, Corrales singled to left to load the bases.

With still no outs Wine doubled deep to center to clear the bases. After pinch-hitter Alex Johnson flied out and Tony Gonzalez grounded out, Brenneman came in to get Rojas.

But the Yankees were not to be outdone.

They let loose for three runs in the sixth, including two homers.

GIBBS GETS HOMER

With one out, Gibbs, who had replaced Howard behind the plate, blasted a round-tripper deep over the right field stands.

After Tresh walked—the first pass in the game—Pepitone hit one almost in the same spot as Gibbs—only deeper.

Repoz and Boyer followed with singles, Brenneman tried a sacrifice bunt, but Roebuck, who was now in the game, threw wild to load the bases again.

Richardson then hit to Wine at short, who started an inning-ending double play. The double play was one of the three for the Phillies.

In the Phillies sixth, Brenneman walked two, but was taken out of trouble as the Yanks came up with their fourth double play.

Bo Belinsky, who sometimes calls Philadelphia "Mudville" because of the lack of nightlife, came in to pitch in the seventh and struck out Ross Moschitto, Gibbs and Hector Lopez in order.

The Phillies went down in order in the bottom of the seventh on three infield outs.

BELINSKY TOUCHED

Belinsky was touched for a run in the eighth to put the Yanks ahead 7 to 3.

The final run came on Lopez' leadoff homer over the left field fence—the fourth and final homer for the Yanks.

Gonzalez led off with a walk in the bottom of the eighth and went to second on a wild pitch.

But Brenneman settled down to get the next three men out.

The Yanks sent four men to the plate in the final inning, but did not threaten to score as men got on with a walk and a fielder's choice.

The Phillies finally got their first hit off Brenneman in the bottom of the ninth when Hernnstein homered a good 360 feet to center field after Covington had grounded out.

Brenneman then got Clay Dalrymple to fly out and Wine grounded to Richardson to end the game.

New York (AL)

	AB	R	H	BI
Richardson, 2b	4	0	0	0
Linz, ss	5	0	1	1
Mantle, lf	2	0	1	0
Moschitto, lf	3	0	0	0
Gibbs, c	2	1	1	1
Howard, c	2	0	1	0
Tresh, rf	2	1	0	0
Lopez, rf	1	1	1	1
Pepitone, 1b	4	1	1	2
Repoz, cf	4	1	3	0
Boyer, 3b	3	2	2	2
Barker, 3b	1	0	0	0
Blanco, p	1	0	0	0
Brenneman, p	1	0	0	0
Total	35	7	11	7

Philadelphia (NL)

	AB	R	H	BI
Gonzales, cf	3	0	0	0
Rojas, 2b	4	0	2	0
Callison, rf	2	0	0	0
Briggs, rf	1	0	0	0
Allen, 3b	2	0	0	0
Amaro, 3b	1	0	0	0
Covington, lf	4	1	1	0
Stuart, 1b	2	1	2	0
Herrnstein, 1b	2	1	1	1
Corrales, c	2	1	1	0
Dalrymple, c	2	0	0	0
Wine, ss	4	0	2	3
Burdette, p	1	0	0	0
Johnson, p	1	0	0	0
Belinsky, p	1	0	0	0
Total	32	4	9	4

New York 001 023 010—7 11 0
Philadelphia 000 030 001—4 9 3

E—Burdette, Stuart, Roebuck. DP—New York 4, Philadelphia 2. LOB—New York 5, Philadelphia 4. 2b—Mantle, Linz, Wine. HR—Boyer, Gibbs, Pepitone, Lopez, Herrnstein. S—Brenneham.

	IP	H	R	ER	BB	SO
Blanco	4⅔	8	3	3	0	0
Brenneman (W)	4⅓	1	1	1	3	1
Burdette	5	5	3	2	0	1
Roebuck (L)	1	4	3	3	1	1
Belinsky	3	2	1	1	1	3

WP—Brenneman, Burdette. T—2:19. A—9,850.

CHALLENGE TO THE MISSISSIPPI DELEGATION UNNECESSARILY DELAYED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk of the House has informed me that he has transmitted to the Speaker printed depositions filed in connection with the challenge to the Mississippi congressional delegation. This record has been referred to the House Administration Committee.

Resolution of the challenge has already been delayed unnecessarily. Under rule XI, section 24, of the House, the committee was to report its findings by July 4—6 months after the convening of the House. The delay in the printing of the record made it impossible for the committee to act by July 4. Now that the record is before the House Administration Committee it is time to act.

I am impatient with those who call for additional study and committee investigation. Who among us can deny the systematic exclusion of Negroes from Mississippi polls? Who among us has not been convinced by the debate on the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 of Mississippi's deliberate violation of the Constitution? Have we not been shown the subtle and the not so subtle techniques used to deny the Mississippi Negro his right to vote? Who can deny the fact that the white power structure of that State has perpetuated itself by trapping the Negro in a poverty of power? Never before, Mr. Speaker, has any issue been so thoroughly documented prior to a committee hearing.

According to the Congressional Quarterly of 1961, the following were the figures for nonwhite registration in each of the five Mississippi congressional districts: First District, 1.3 percent of the nonwhites of voting age registered to vote; Second District, 6.8 percent of the nonwhites of voting age registered to vote; Third District, 9.1 percent of the nonwhites of voting age registered to vote; Fourth District, 5.1 percent of the nonwhites of voting age registered to vote; Fifth District, 12.3 percent of the nonwhites registered to vote.

The exclusion of Negroes from the Mississippi polls is not an accident. As early as 1870 U.S. Senator George, of Mississippi, explained that the purpose of Mississippi voting laws is "to devise such measures, consistent with the Constitution of the United States, as will enable us to maintain a home government under the control of the white people of the State."

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the terror, violence, and murder perpetrated last summer upon those who attempted to help their fellow citizens exercise their right to vote. Mississippi tramples upon the U.S. Constitution by denying citizens the right to vote.

I have made this argument on the opening day of Congress when I objected to the seating of the Members-elect from Mississippi. I have listened to those who ask for additional study. But the issue, Mr. Speaker, will not be resolved by statistics. The issues, frankly, are moral and political. They are stark and simple. They involve matters of dedication and commitment to the Constitution of the United States by those who hold high office in the Federal Government.

My plea, Mr. Speaker, is for prompt review and prompt resolution. It is easy to tiptoe through this session of Congress keeping away from sharp corners. But if we do so, we will adjourn without exercising our solemn obligation to the Constitution. We will have forfeited a confidence in this Congress, a confidence which depends on the courage to act on this most fundamental issue.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I wish to read from a message written by Mr. and Mrs. Robert Goodman after the murder of their son, Andrew, in Philadelphia, Miss.:

In Washington 4 weeks ago, my wife and I in a sense made a pilgrimage to the Lincoln Memorial in the evening and stood in that great shrine looking down past the Washington Monument toward the soft glow of the light around the White House. Full of

the awe of a great nation that surrounded us, we turned to read, emblazoned in black letters on white marble: "It is for us the living to dedicate ourselves that these dead shall not have died in vain."

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson was sober and realistic at his press conference yesterday. He announced that we were increasing our military commitment in order to meet the increasing aggressive activities directed by North Vietnam. He made clear that we were increasing our diplomatic efforts, that we were willing to discuss Hanoi's proposals or the proposals of any other nation, and that we were once again asking the United Nations to take a larger and more active role in achieving an early and peaceful settlement. He also, for the present at least, rejected the cries of the "war hawks" for a major callup of the Reserves and the use of 200,000 American troops or more.

Let me make it clear initially, Mr. Speaker, that I support the President in his decision to resist the terror and aggression that denies independence of choice and self-determination to the people of South Vietnam.

But let us emphasize that the real issue in Vietnam is not our "honor" or our "word." We did not begin our program of aid and support in 1954 as a test of national honor. Then and now the real test is whether terror and violence are to triumph over the ballot and free choice; of whether so-called wars of national liberation, controlled and directed externally, will supplant peaceful decisions and orderly change arrived at internally.

Our proper goal has and should continue to be to help in every way we reasonably can to insure that the people of South Vietnam will be able to participate freely in the determination of their own future; not that they would have it decided for them, as is the Communist goal today.

But our policy has raised serious questions in the minds of many Americans. When I was at home a week ago, many constituents whose opinions I value and respect, were deeply troubled. They asked many questions which I feel should be publicly discussed and which I have asked both the White House and the State Department to discuss. They wanted to know:

First. What did the 1954 Geneva accords provide with respect to the future government of North and South Vietnam?

Second. Why did the United States not sign the Geneva accords? Did the United States state that it would follow the Geneva accords?

Third. Was a "government" representing South Vietnam a party to the Geneva accords? How did the first South Vietnamese Government come into power? Has there been any government in South Vietnam chosen to any extent by a democratic process? If so, when and how?

Fourth. What happened to prevent the 1956 "free election" contemplated by the 1954 Geneva accords? Did the United States oppose such election?

Fifth. To what extent has there been objective verification of interference by the North Vietnam Government—as distinguished from participation by individual North Vietnamese—in the affairs of South Vietnam?

Sixth. In terms of international law, what is the basis for our present activity in South Vietnam?

Seventh. Is there a legal basis for asking the U.N. to take action in relation to Vietnam? If so, are there practical reasons for our not having made this request up to this time?

Eighth. What efforts have been made by the United States to substitute negotiation for military action?

Ninth. It is often said that we must stay in South Vietnam to prevent the spread of communism in southeast Asia. Is the main purpose of our policy to forestall a Communist government in South Vietnam? Or is it to enable the people of South Vietnam to establish whatever kind of government they want?

Tenth. Assuming that what we are doing in Vietnam is morally and legally justified, is it wise and sound from the viewpoint of effectiveness? Can we, within reasonable and practicable cost considerations, achieve a military victory or are we in effect repeating Napoleon's disastrous march to Moscow? Would we be more likely to achieve the ends we desire if we were to let the people of South Vietnam struggle with this problem by themselves and in the process perhaps develop enough nationalism to resist control by China?

Eleventh. President Kennedy stated on numerous occasions that the war in Vietnam was a Vietnamese war; that it must be won or lost by the people of South Vietnam themselves. Does our increasing commitment of troops, planes and supporting material mean that we have abandoned this policy?

Mr. Speaker, many of these same questions have troubled me and I intend to place the replies in the RECORD.

But even when these questions are considered, and I think there are reasonable answers to most, if not all of them, I do not believe, considering the alternatives and their implications, that there is any reasonable alternative to our present course of action.

Major escalation on our part could only invite increased efforts by Hanoi and Peiping. It could mean introduction of thousands more troops from North Vietnam, and quite possibly divisions or even armies from China. It could mean stepped up U.S. air attacks. It could mean expansion of these attacks to centers of population and industry in North Vietnam, and it could mean the commitment on the ground of many more American forces and lives.

Leaders of the Republican Party in the House it is true, have argued that "total victory" is possible; that the war, in fact, can be "won" if only we were willing. But it should be noted that this war could be "won" in this way only at a cost far in excess of our goals and our requirements. Such a "victory" in the wake of the destruction, the devastation and the countless maimings and deaths would mark it a hollow triumph at best.

On the other hand, unconditional withdrawal by American forces, as the Communists have demanded, is equally unconscionable. Independence would not only be doomed in South Vietnam, it would be jeopardized from Thailand to Australia, from India to the Philippines.

It would be unconscionable, as the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations stated in his thoughtful speech of June 15, "because such action would betray our obligation to people we have promised to defend, because it would weaken or destroy the credibility of American guarantees to other countries, and because such a withdrawal would encourage the view in Peiping and elsewhere that guerrilla wars supported from outside are a relatively safe and inexpensive way of expanding Communist power."

It would be unconscionable, for if independence is as vital as this country has maintained for nearly 200 years, then it should be the right of all who truly want it and not just of the few who are capable of defending it.

Where then do we go? If both major escalation into a much larger war and the abandonment of independence are intolerable choices, what path should we pursue?

The only reasonable course, it seems to me, was outlined yesterday by the President. First, we must provide sufficient arms to convince Hanoi and Peiping, and Moscow as well, that wars of "national liberation" based on terror and intimidation and naked force will not succeed. Our arms should be used in sufficient force to persuade the adversaries of open societies that discussions and negotiations, not bombs and bullets, are the only sensible way to settle problems. Our arms should be available for as long as they are necessary but for no longer than they are necessary and in no greater strength than they are necessary.

Second, we must continue to follow every path and pursue every opportunity that can lead to negotiations, to a cease-fire and to a diplomatic settlement that can guarantee the people of South Vietnam independence of choice in any future government and any future way of life, free of outside intimidation or intervention.

We should have no quarrel with this choice so long as it is free. We should have no vested interest save that of independence and a better life for our fellow men.

There can be no question that the Communists, whether they be in South Vietnam, North Vietnam, or Communist China, have been deaf to all offers of negotiation which have been made to date.

Not only have they rejected our repeated bids for "unconditional discussions." They have refused the plea of 17 nonalined chiefs of state for negotiations, the French suggestion of a new Geneva conference without preconditions, the Soviet and American endorsement of a Cambodian conference, U.N. Secretary General U Thant's offer of exploration, India's proposal for a cease-fire monitored by an Afro-Asian force, the invitation of the U.N. Security Council for a complete review and discussion, the peace mission of the British Commonwealth Prime Minister, and others.

This record of intransigence is without exception. But it should not and it must not deter our continued and persistent efforts, and our support of the efforts of others, to bring together all of the parties who are involved in the conflict in Vietnam. The so-called National Liberation Front is certainly no more than what its name implies, a front. But surely there is no reason why North Vietnam could not include its members, the Vietcong, or any other parties it desires, on any team of representatives it sends to the negotiation table. And we should negotiate with that team, whomever it contains.

A much larger presence and a greater role of participation should be encouraged for the United Nations, the world organization which has performed so valiantly and successfully in many trouble spots of the world for the last 20 years. I am particularly pleased that the President is calling on this resource, as I have been urging for some time, and that he has sent a special message with Ambassador Goldberg to U.N. Secretary General U Thant. He is to be strongly commended for this effort and we can only fervently hope that the Secretary General will be able to utilize his offices to good effect. Certainly we should support him in any constructive efforts he is able to initiate. Certainly the United Nations should be encouraged in every way possible to provide the machinery for bringing this matter to the international conference table, for policing a cease-fire, and for insuring free elections.

It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that Hanoi and Vietcong have no intention of lessening their aggression at the present time. This makes two requirements on our policy, as was suggested last month by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and which was stressed by the President yesterday.

First, we must sustain the Government and the Army of South Vietnam. We must persuade the Communists that Saigon cannot be crushed and that the forces of the free world will not be driven out by force.

Second, we must practice patience and restraint. We must continue to offer the Communists a reasonable alternative to war, and we must continue to press for a peaceful settlement at the earliest possible time.

Mr. Speaker, several leading Republican policymakers have suggested that our country would accept a continued American presence in Vietnam, including any necessary troop buildup, if and only if our objective was total victory; not if it were a negotiated settlement.

I reject this suggestion. I believe it misinterprets and misrepresents the true feeling of the American people. This feeling, I believe, is one of rightful anxiety. It is one of willingness to contribute and to sacrifice; to pay the cost of freedom; to be a leader of the free world. But it is one also which seeks independence and the other legitimate aspirations of men through peaceful means. Our policy and our efforts should be directed at no lesser goal.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I include two editorials from this morning's Washington Post, one by the distinguished columnist Chalmers Roberts, which speak directly and thoughtfully to the points I have discussed:

[From the Washington Post, July 29, 1965]

THE VIETNAM POLICY

In typically Johnsonian fashion, the President supplemented his announcement of intensified American participation in the Vietnamese war with an escalation of his peace efforts. Draft calls are to be doubled in the months ahead, and there will be a rapid buildup of American fighting men in the besieged southeast Asian country. But the aim of protecting freedom and independence from Communist aggression without resort to general war remains the same.

The President made another graceful appeal to the United Nations to exert whatever influence it can to halt the aggression in Vietnam. At the same time, he offered to discuss Hanoi's proposals along with our own and those of any other interested nation that may care to sit down at a conference table. His sincere desire to substitute the conference table for the battlefield took away any suggestion of belligerence that might otherwise have been read into the announcement of expanding military operations.

The gist of what the President had to say is that the United States places such a high value on peace that it is willing to fight for it. The spread of Asian communism by terror and slaughter is the antithesis of both peace and freedom. The United States has attempted to provide a shield against this menace. It is now called upon to demonstrate that this shield is not an illusion.

We do not see how President Johnson could have explained the necessity of the U.S. course in Vietnam more effectively than he did:

"If we are driven from the fields in Vietnam, then no nation can ever again have the same confidence in our promise of protection. In each land the forces of independence would be weakened. An Asia so threatened by Communist domination would imperil the security of the United States itself. * * *

"We just cannot now dishonor our word or abandon our commitment or leave those who believed us and who trusted us to the terror and repression and murder that would follow. This, then, my fellow Americans, is why we are in Vietnam."

The President's reference to Asian communism doubtless holds special significance. His exclusion of the Russians from his comments was an indirect appeal for Moscow's understanding of why we must do what we are doing. The Soviet Union shares at least some of the alarm in the West over the openly belligerent and recklessly aggressive course of Communist China and the Hanoi government. President Johnson seemed to be saying to Moscow that the United States is doing everything possible to avoid a general war and that the two major nuclear powers have a common interest in not allowing this Asian Communist brushfire to get out of hand for want of a rational confrontation at a conference table.

Within the United States, we surmise that the response to the President's speech will be overwhelmingly favorable. Despite the innate hatred of war, most of the people are aware of the kind of world we live in. They appear to be reconciled to a hard struggle in a faraway land because of the close relation it has to the preservation of our own freedom. Many of those who are committed to the general policy, however, retain some concern over the way it is being carried out.

One would hope that much of the discussion in the White House conferences of the last week has been given to effective employment of the additional manpower and equipment that are flowing to Vietnam. It is not enough merely to build up larger forces and the volume of supplies. With the extension of military might in Vietnam, there will be increasing need for wise decisions and sound strategy. This perceptive statement on the part of the President also greatly strengthens confidence that he will be as firm in pushing for a rational settlement as he has been in trying to teach the Communists that peace cannot be bought with terror and aggression.

[From the Washington Post, July 29, 1965]

GUARDIAN AT THE GATE: WORLD SEES A DETERMINED JOHNSON

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

It was not a happy President Johnson the Nation saw yesterday. But it was a determined President.

"We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate," he said, "but there is no one else." That single sentence explains a lot about the man and his approach to the war in Vietnam.

Because of what he said last fall in the presidential campaign against Barry Goldwater, a lot of people concluded that he wanted to liquidate the war as quickly as possible. Indeed, it is clear that a number of Communist diplomats here told their governments just that.

That conclusion was based on a misunderstanding of Lyndon Johnson. He did want to liquidate the war—he does want to liquidate it now—but not on terms of surrender.

For a long time Mr. Johnson resisted saying out loud that the conflict in Vietnam was a crucial one between communism and democracy or between China and the United States. Only slowly and reluctantly did he come to do so.

Like most Americans, as he emotionally made evident yesterday, he would prefer to concentrate on improving our domestic life. But history caught up with him, and he is determined to face history.

The Vietcong attacks on American personnel, the hard words from North Vietnam and the shrill language from China all drove him, however reluctantly, to conclude that here was a place that the United States had to make a stand.

If the Communists had offered to sit down at the conference table, the fighting could have stopped long ago. It is quite likely, too, that the result would have been a gain in the Communist position in southeast Asia. But in rejecting the conference table, the Communists gave Mr. Johnson no option except to fight.

Slowly, then, a rationale for American military activity has been developed. As John F. Kennedy did in the Cuban missile crisis, Mr. Johnson yesterday referred to the appeasement of Hitler in the 1930's and the lesson to be drawn from it.

The furious Communist offensive in Vietnam, coupled with the Chinese demands to

smash the United States in that corner of Asia, left him, he felt, no choice but to send in more Americans to act as "the guardians of the gate."

Lyndon Johnson is both a coolly calculating man and an emotionally patriotic man. Both these sides of his personality were evident yesterday.

His new military steps are calculated to deny the Communists a military victory; his diplomatic steps are designed to ease the path to the conference table. But he doubtless has no illusions that the Communists will agree to negotiate until they are convinced that American power is fully committed to the war and that it can be decisive.

Slowly, as he has sought a way out of Vietnam, Mr. Johnson has come to describe the stakes in sharper terms. Now he has reached the point of saying that the United States cannot escape the role of guardian at the gate in this "remote and distant place."

Those who have viewed the President as a reckless plunger should be reassured by his efforts to avoid a rupture with the Soviet Union. Certainly he meant it when he said that "I don't think I have any right to commit the whole world to world war III."

Those who believe he has been too cautious in his application of military force may not be wholly satisfied with the new decisions he outlined yesterday. But they can find satisfaction in the firm determination, now that the United States is so fully committed, to see it through to the end.

Lyndon Johnson yesterday was not a happy guardian at the gate. But he certainly was determined.

The purpose of yesterday's public appearance before the Nation was to show that determination. He succeeded.

A second purpose was to answer the question of the mother who had written to ask "why" her son had to fight in Vietnam. Here, at least, he made a convincing case.

Finally, he sought to show that the United States carries an olive branch as well as thunderbolts. Here he is willing to talk about even the Communist demand that all Americans be withdrawn. It is hard to see how critics could ask for more, unless they would have the United States accept surrender.

LAG IN FEDERAL FUNDS CURTAILS STATE HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULL], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, Missouri is in the forefront of States in this Nation in developing modern roads for its citizens.

Planning and early construction of interstate highway routes in Missouri were under the direction of the Honorable Rex M. Whitton, then chief engineer of the Missouri Highway Department and now Federal Highway Administrator.

Mr. Whitton's work has been carried on by our present extremely able chief engineer, Marvin J. Snider, resulting in continued progress in building Missouri highways.

In a recent speech to the Ozark Chapter of the Missouri Society of Professional Engineers in Springfield, Mo., Mr. Snider outlined the programs and the problems of highway builders in Missouri.

Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Snider's speech:

LAG IN FEDERAL FUNDS CURTAILS STATE HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

It is a sincere pleasure for me to have the opportunity to meet with your organization this evening to discuss the progress of Missouri's State highway program.

From the outset I would say that State highway progress in Missouri is relatively good. I use the term "relatively good" because, due to a constant lack of sufficient highway funds, our rate of roadbuilding improvements certainly is not what it should be in order to provide an adequate State road system for motorists.

However, the historical shortage of highway funds is a story in itself and I will not go into it further during this meeting.

My remarks this evening will be devoted to a twofold discussion of Missouri's highway progress.

First, I will report briefly on the progress being made by the State highway department with the funds that are available.

Second, and most importantly, I want to explain about a financial difficulty which has arisen at the Federal level in the last few months, and which is causing a curtailment in State highway construction in Missouri this year.

It is a curtailment that we can ill afford because of the extreme importance of building and improving highways as rapidly as possible to serve the constantly growing demands of traffic. Nevertheless, the cutback in highway work is with us, resulting in delays in awarding a number of construction contracts in many areas of the State. I believe it is important for Missourians to know about this situation and understand why it is happening.

PROGRESS IN 1964

As to progress made in calendar 1964, it pleases me to report that last year saw the greatest single surge of State roadbuilding in Missouri's history.

During 1964 the State highway department carried on a construction and right-of-way program amounting to about $192,500,000. This was some $17 million larger than the previous high recorded in 1963.

I don't want to confuse you with a lot of figures, but I believe it will be helpful to point out how the $192,500,000 which made up the 1964 construction and right-of-way program was used:

For actual highway construction, $156,700,000 was spent or obligated; $33,600,000 was spent to acquire right-of-way; $2,100,000 was obligated for the 1965 secondary (farm to market) system road oiling program, work which now is going on since this is a warm weather operation; and $115,000 was spent to install flashing light signals at railroad crossings.

Even more meaningful than money figures is the fact that 924 miles of highway construction projects were awarded to contract last year. They included:

One hundred and seventy miles of work on the Interstate System, the nationwide superhighway network now under construction throughout America, and which is made up of highways like Interstate Routes 44 and 70.

Four hundred and thirty-one miles of improvements were contracted on the primary system, which consists of conventional trunkline highways like U.S. Routes 54, 63, 65, and 71.

Two hundred and ninety-seven miles of construction on the secondary system, made up mainly of lettered State highways providing local service such as Routes M, FF, C, or TT.

Twenty-six miles of improvements were placed under contract on the urban system of highways, which are extensions of primary and secondary system routes into urban areas.

In addition, about 1,200 miles of secondary system roads now are receiving an oil surface treatment to make them dust free under the oiling program authorized last year.

So by all previous standards, 1964 was a banner roadbuilding year for the State of Missouri. And another substantial year, although not scheduled to be as impressive as the one just passed, was in prospect for 1965.

At the beginning of the present calendar year, the State highway department estimated that it would have a construction and right-of-way program amounting to about $165,500,000 during 1965. This was to include $131,600,000 in construction work to be awarded to contract; $26,300,000 for the purchase of right-of-way; and $7,600,000 for preliminary engineering, the obligation of funds for the 1966 secondary system road oiling program and the installation of flashing light signals at railroad crossings.

The estimate for 1965 was considerably under accomplishments of 1964 mainly for two reasons. In the first place, it was purposely on the conservative side and represented a figure the department felt certain could be attained. Secondly, we knew there would not be as much money available in 1965. In 1964 the department was anticipating later reimbursement by the Federal Government of several millions of dollars which had been tied up in right of way purchases for a number of years, and therefore was able to obligate against these funds.

LAG IN FEDERAL FUNDS BEGINS

At any rate, the department began the 1965 calendar year on a note of optimism, with an anticipated minimum construction and right of way program of about $165,500,000.

But then along in late February the Federal funds situation which I mentioned earlier began to develop, and it has worsened gradually ever since.

In beginning an explanation of what has been and still is happening, I want to point out that the financing of State highway construction is a very complicated matter. However, I will try to keep my remarks as simple as possible in order to get this message across.

Missouri's State highways are built with money received from taxes levied by the State and Federal Governments on highway users.

Taxes levied by the State of Missouri include the motor vehicle fuel tax, commonly called the gasoline tax; license fees for motor vehicles; drivers license fees; and the motor vehicle use tax, which is equivalent to a sales tax on vehicle purchases made by Missourians in other States.

Highway user taxes levied by the Federal Government are those on gasoline and other motor vehicle fuel, on tires and inner tubes, on heavy trucks and on new trucks, buses and trailers at the time of manufacture.

The Federal Government provides a very substantial share of the funds used in the construction and purchase of right-of-way for highways in Missouri, with the State providing the remaining share.

Under Federal law, the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of building Interstate System highways, leaving the State with 10 percent of the cost to pay. Naturally, a State would be foolish to finance an Interstate System project entirely out of its own funds, since the Federal Government offers a ratio of 9 to 1 aid for this work.

Most primary, secondary and urban system highways are constructed on the basis of

50 percent Federal and 50 percent State funds. Missouri must match dollar for dollar all of the Federal aid available for building these three categories of highways.

With whatever construction funds the State still has available, after matching all Federal funds, it finances projects on the primary, secondary, and urban systems with 100 percent State money. The wisdom of using all available 100 percent State construction funds in this manner is readily apparent, since the Federal Government offers so much more aid in the building of Interstate routes than it does for the other three systems of highways.

That gives a fairly complete summary, I believe, on where the money comes from to finance the acquisition of right-of-way and the construction of State highways. Now let's look at how the Federal aid funds actually are made available for use to the States.

One thing which is important for the public to understand is this: The Federal Government does not pay any Federal-aid road funds to the State before the State buys right-of-way for a project or constructs a highway. The State pays for the work out of its own pocket, and later is reimbursed a share of the costs by the Federal Government on Federal-aid highway projects. But you will see how the system works as we proceed in this explanation.

There are three key words at the Federal level in the process of providing Federal-aid road funds to the States. Those words are "appropriation," "apportionment," and "release."

Federal funds for highway work are appropriated by Congress. Right now those funds are totaling about $3.8 billion a year. This money goes into the Highway Trust Fund in Washington, D.C., the fund through which all Federal aid road money is administered. Under Federal law, the Highway Trust Fund must at all times be solvent—no deficit financing is permitted.

The next step in the process is apportionment of each fiscal year's Federal highway funds to the 50 States. This is done on a formula basis and is handled by the Secretary of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads. Apportionment merely is the announcement of each State's share of Federal road funds for a particular fiscal year between July 1 and June 30.

Neither the appropriation of funds nor the apportionment of funds allow the States to award a single dollar of a Federal-aid highway construction contract or buy one piece of right-of-way.

The award of a contract or purchase of right-of-way for a Federal-aid job can come only after the release for obligation of the previously appropriated and apportioned Federal money. This release of the funds to States also is done by the Secretary of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads. It is the step in which the States are, in effect, told: "You may proceed to obligate Federal-aid funds for highway projects because we now can guarantee that there will be enough money in the Highway Trust Fund to reimburse you the Federal share of the cost when you present a bill for payment at a later date for completed work."

Release of a year's apportionment of funds is done on a quarterly basis during the fiscal year. If a normal procedure was being followed, this would mean the release of one-fourth of a year's money to the States on each of these dates: July 1, October 1, January 1, and April 1.

Release of the Federal money for obligation is done on a quarterly basis to insure the future solvency of the Highway Trust Fund. In other words, if a full year's apportionment was released all at once, the States would obligate so heavily against it in just a few months that the trust fund would be unable to meet all payments when bills for reimbursement on completed work were presented later. Such a situation would be in violation of the Federal law requiring the trust fund to be solvent at all times.

That sets the stage so far as background is concerned. Now let me explain what has been happening at the Federal level which is causing a curtailment in State highway construction in Missouri.

In a nutshell, it can be summed up as a delay in the release of quarterly Federal funds to the States for obligation—a delay which has lengthened in the last few months until we now are behind a full quarter, or 3 months. Each quarter for Missouri, under the present apportionment, represents about $24,425,000.

A year ago today—or on July 1, 1964—Missouri and the other States should have received release of the first quarter funds, if things were going according to schedule. However, the release did not come until last August 20. Second quarter funds, due for release October 1, were not made available for obligation until November 16.

Although both these releases of money were some 6 weeks late, no real serious damage resulted since the delay in getting projects under contract was not particularly great.

But the situation certainly has had an effect during the first 6 months of the present calendar year.

The third quarter release of Federal funds, scheduled for January 1, did not come until March 15, or 2½ months late. And fourth quarter funds, due April 1, were not released until yesterday (June 30), a full 3 months behind schedule.

The delay in releasing the funds has been due to a shortage of money in the highway trust fund. Because of this shortage, the Secretary of Commerce has had to stretch out the release times.

You will recall that I earlier said the State highway department expected to have a construction and right-of-way program of about $165,500,000 during calendar 1965.

Right now we are considerably behind schedule in trying to reach that figure.

For the first 6 months of this year, our construction and right of way program totals only about $63 million. This reflects the delay in receiving release of the Federal funds.

Many projects, particularly Interstate System work, are being held up from being placed under contract.

Work awarded to contract in the late winter and early spring months allows a contractor to have a full construction season ahead. However, it is not only in those months that delays in contracting a job have a retarding effect. Even a 1-month delay at anytime in the year often can cause a delay of 6 or 7 months in completing a project.

For example, if a contractor has only 1 more month to go on a project before it is ready for traffic when construction is shut down in November for the winter, it means the highway probably will not be put in use for the public until the following May or June.

As of now, we are in the position of being able to foresee the letting of only one major Interstate System construction project in the immediate future. That is for a job in Jefferson County on Interstate Route 55, and it will be financed from the Federal funds which were released for obligation only yesterday.

Should this delay in receiving release of Federal funds continue, it is entirely possible that the State highway department will not be able to have any additional major Interstate System projects up for bids until October.

Similar delays also are occurring in getting a number of primary system projects under contract.

There is only one reason why the State highway department has been able to maintain as respectable a showing as it has in its construction and right-of-way program so far this year. We have financed much primary, secondary, and urban system work with 100 percent State funds. But there is a limit as to how long this can go on because that source of money is limited too.

One thing we have been able to do so far is to keep up fairly well with right-of-way acquisition. Of course, this has had to be done at the expense of awarding fewer construction contracts. But we have felt it absolutely necessary to keep the purchase of right-of-way as much on schedule as possible because there has to be right-of-way ready on which to build a highway when funds for construction do become available. However, our right-of-way buying also will face a slowdown in the near future if the lag in Federal funds continues.

I might explain here that Missouri is being hurt by this situation because we are one of the leaders among all the States in obligating all available Federal funds. I think it is a tribute to the employees of the Missouri State Highway Department that they are prosecuting the work with dispatch and efficiency to the extent that our State is near the top in the Nation in this regard. There are many, many States that still are obligating Federal funds which were made available 1, 2 or even 3 years ago.

So because Missouri has made such fine progress in using its Federal aid highway funds, we now are feeling the effects when the screws are tightened in Washington. Of course, I do not know how long this condition will exist, but I would hope not for long.

Apportionments for another fiscal year and the release of the first quarter of funds are due today—July 1—but I personally believe it will be quite awhile before announcements are made on either.

In addition to the fact that the highway trust fund already is short of money, Congress is facing another knotty problem of highway finances.

Last January the States submitted new cost estimates for completing the 41,000-mile nationwide Interstate Highway System. The estimate showed that it is going to cost $5.8 billion more to finish the system by 1972—the target date—than had been counted on.

So if Congress wants the Interstate System to be financed adequately for completion in 1972, then additional revenue is going to have to be provided. The problem of where to obtain that revenue presently is being considered.

Until this dilemma of financing is solved in Washington, it would appear to me improbable that apportionments or the release of funds for obligation would be made. I would be delighted to be wrong, but in my opinion the situation could get worse before it gets better. This is not being pessimistic—just realistic.

To me it is a very disheartening thing to witness the slowdown in State highway construction now occurring in Missouri. Delays such as these are detrimental to the public interest because, with the demands of traffic what they are today, every new road and every highway improvement is vital to the safety and well being of motorists. Delays can mean loss of lives, injuries, and accidents.

We already are far behind in trying to meet the highway needs of Missouri because the public never has seen fit to provide enough money to build an adequate State highway

network. The curtailment we now are experiencing is only antagonizing the matter.

I am sorry I was unable to bring you better news this evening concerning Missouri's State highway program. But the picture I have given you is the one that presently prevails, and I thought it was important to explain it. Again I want to say it has been a real pleasure to meet with your group, and I now will attempt to answer any questions you may have.

Thank you.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MORTON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today through August 2, 1965, on account of official business to attend Puerto Rican Status Commission hearings at San Juan, P.R.

Mr. TAYLOR, on account of official business, July 29 through August 6, 1965.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska, on account of official business, July 29 through August 9, 1965.

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. TUNNEY, on August 2, for 10 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. LANGEN, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. HALL, for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. MATHIAS (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. EDMONDSON, for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRIDER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CALLAN) to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RYAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COHELAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROOSEVELT, for 60 minutes, on Tuesday, August 10.

Mr. ROOSEVELT, for 60 minutes, on Tuesday, August 17.

Mr. ROOSEVELT, for 60 minutes, on Tuesday, August 24.

Mr. ROOSEVELT, for 60 minutes, on Tuesday, August 31.

Mr. VANIK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HULL, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ADAIR to include a chart in his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 9026.

Mr. ROYBAL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. TUPPER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CALLAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington.

Mr. SICKLES in two instances.

Mr. RANDALL in two instances.

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. 625. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1771. An act to establish a 5-day workweek for postmasters, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6622. An act to exempt the postal field service from section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952; and

H.R. 6675. An act to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary medical benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1771. An act to establish a 5-day workweek for postmasters, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2984. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2985. An act to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6622. An act to exempt the postal field service from section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1932;

H.R. 6675. An act to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary medical benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7984. An act to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities; and

H.J. Res. 591. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 2, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1395. A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a reply to the report (B–146984) of the Comptroller General on economic assistance provided to the Republic of the Philippines for development purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1396. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay of members of the uniformed services to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1397. A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a reply to the report of the Comptroller General, dated April 29, 1965 (B–146849) on follow-up examination on certain aspects of U.S. assistance to the Central Treaty Organization for a rail link between Turkey and Iran; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7327. A bill to repeal section 7043 of title 10, United States Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 692). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3041. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to exempt certain contracts with foreign contractors from the requirement for an examination-of-records clause; with amendment (Rept. No. 693). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6964. A bill to amend section 4082 of title 18, United States Code, to facilitate the rehabilitation of persons convicted of offenses against the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8027. A bill to provide assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and other personnel, and in improving capabilities, techniques, and practices in State and local law enforcement and prevention and control of crime, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House of the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5984. A bill to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to certain lands granted to the States; with amendment (Rept. No. 696). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. 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; with amendment (Rept. No. 697). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 494. Resolution for consideration of S. 1742, an act to authorize the U.S. Governor to agree to amendments to the articles of agreements of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 698). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 495. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7843, a bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize the survivors of a member of the Armed Forces who dies while on active duty to be paid for his unused accrued leave; without amendment (Rept. No. 699). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 6007. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the promotion of qualified Reserve officers of the Air Force to the Reserve grades of brigadier general and major general; with amendment (Rept. No. 700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 10158. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf", approved September 2, 1958, as amended, in order to further provide for a loan service of educational media for the deaf, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10159. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10160. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $3,063,500 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 10161. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10162. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 10163. A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 10164. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 10165. A bill to include the holders of star route and certain other contracts for the carrying of mail under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 10166. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 10167. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 10168. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 10169. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Bayard, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 10170. A bill to permit a State to elect to use funds from the highway trust fund for purposes of urban mass transportation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 10171. A bill to permit a State to elect to use funds from the highway trust fund for purposes of urban mass transportation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 10172. A bill to permit a State to elect to use funds from the highway trust fund for purposes of urban mass transportation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10173. A bill to require a special report to the Congress by the President of the current status of research and application techniques in the field of weather modification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 10174. A bill to amend the Northern Pacific Halibut Act in order to provide certain facilities for the International Pacific Halibut Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 10175. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 10176. A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 10177. A bill to establish a contiguous fishery zone beyond the territorial sea of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 10178. A bill to amend the Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 10179. A bill to encourage an increase in the standard of living, level of wages and an improvement of the working conditions in foreign countries which export agricultural commodities into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 10180. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research, study and surveys, documentation, and description of the natural environmental systems of the United States for the purpose of understanding and evaluating the condition of these systems and to provide information to those concerned with natural resources management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 10181. A bill to authorize wartime benefits under certain circumstances for peacetime veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 10182. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 10183. A bill to establish a contiguous fishery zone beyond the territorial sea of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 10184. 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, to provide for uniform, and equitable relocation procedures under Federal and Federal grant-in-aid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 10185. A bill amending certain estate tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.J. Res. 592. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.J. Res. 593. Joint resolution designating the month of May in the year 1966 as "National Latin American Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Res. 493. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 10186. A bill for the relief of Robert D. Anson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 10187. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louise P. Higginbotham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10188. A bill for the relief of Ying Tang Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 10189. A bill for the relief of Samuel Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 10190. A bill to provide for the granting of patents with respect to certain desert land entries; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 10191. A bill for the relief of Juan Maldonado-Velasquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 29, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who committeth to us the swift and solemn trust of life, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. In this hallowed moment we turn to Thee for refuge from the noise and hurry of the world without and from the tyranny of feverish moods and peacewrecking fears within. May there be fulfilled in our individual lives Thy assurance that in quietness and confidence we shall find our strength.

Make us keenly aware of those whose lives touch ours and whose skies take their color from what we give or withhold—remembering there are those whose cheerful moods our frowns may darken. Make us mindful especially of children whose gleam or gloom so largely reflects our tempers and of the aged whose unfulfilled dreams are mournfully back of them and who with waning powers are dependent upon our courtesy and consideration. With resources unequal to the calls of these terrific days which are shaping the future, send us forth strengthened with Thy might to front tasks that tax our utmost, with the glad assurance, "He restoreth my soul."

We ask it in the name of the Good Shepherd. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 28, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably sundry nominations in the Public Health Service. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

James P. Shortal, and sundry other persons, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service; and

Nicholas V. Scorzelli, and sundry other persons, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George C. Trevorrow, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY, AUTOMATION, AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas J. Watson, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the National Science Foundation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.