United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: II Corinthians 3: 3: *Ye are the letters of Christ, written, not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God.*

Almighty God, who hast added this new day to our life, may we add to our trust in Thee, the virtues of faith, patience, self-control, and a great love and may we not miss the good, which we are privileged to do with this day.

Since we are to pass this way but once, let us strive to do all the good we can, in all the ways we can, and to all the people we can and may there never be any vain regrets or shattered ruins to lament over but only happy memories and the prospects and foretastes of a glorious future.

Grant that this day our lives may reveal some likeness to Him in whom Thou hast revealed Thyself and who went about doing good and proved Himself to be a friend and brother of all mankind.

We beseech Thee that His spirit may be incarnated in us and in the life, law, literature, and character of all humanity and may our little lives be as letters and a part of His biography, conveying unto our fellow men something of His compassion, courage, good cheer, and unconquerable hope.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On August 2, 1965:

H.R. 1314. An act for the relief of Foster Masahiko Gushard; and

H.R. 1322. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ana Cristina Rainforth.

On August 3, 1965:

H.R. 70. An act to provide for the conveyance of approximately 80 acres of land to the heirs of Adam Jones, Creek Indian not enrolled;

H.R. 1987. An act for the relief of Nabhane M. Nickley (Nabhane M. Karam);

H.R. 2012. An act for the relief of Dr. Ignace D. Liu;

H.R. 2499. An act for the relief of Remedios Ocampo;

H.R. 4131. An act for the relief of Mrs. Phoebe Thompson Neesham;

H.R. 8862. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1935, to increase the authorized annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions; and

H.R. 9041. An act to restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma.

On August 4, 1965:

H.R. 1989. An act for the relief of Krystyna Stella Hancock;

H.R. 2351. An act for the relief of Teresita Centeno Vandez;

H.R. 2360. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio R. Perez;

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. 5508. An act to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5860. An act to amend the law relating to the final disposition of the property of the Choctaw Tribe.

On August 5, 1965:

H.R. 237. An act to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior.

On August 6, 1965:

H.R. 903. An act to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, 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. 8620. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters in reference to the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965.

On August 9, 1965:

H.R. 1771. An act to establish a 5-day workweek for postmasters, and for other purposes; and

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.

On August 10, 1965:

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.

On August 12, 1965:

H.R. 8111. An act to establish the Herbert Hoover National Historical Site in the State of Iowa.

On August 13, 1965:

H.R. 4714. An act to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriations therein;

H.R. 7954. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to conform to the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, London (1960);

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Robert V. Fleming as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

H.J. Res. 481. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to expand the types of equipment furnished Members of the House of Representatives.

On August 14, 1965:

H.R. 4346. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies.

On August 16, 1965:

H.R. 7997. An act 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.

On August 17, 1965:

H.J. Res. 454. Joint resolution to provide for the development of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty Monument, and for other purposes.

On August 21, 1965:

H.R. 9075. An act to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10139. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, relating to the telephone and telegraph service furnished Members of the House of Representatives.

On August 24, 1965:

H.R. 8856. An act to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

On August 26, 1965:

H.R. 206. An act to provide a realistic cost-of-living increase in rates of subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training; and

H.R. 208. An act to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to extend to seriously disabled veterans the same liberalization of time limits for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training as was authorized blinded veterans by Public Law 87-591, and to clarify the language of the law relating to the limiting of periods for pursuing such training.

On August 28, 1965:

H.R. 546. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within Camp McCoy Military Reservation, Wis.;

H.R. 2176. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property to the county of Dare, State of North Carolina, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3037. An act to amend section 1485 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3044. An act to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H.R. 3320. An act to authorize the establishment of the Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4024. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Nelson III;

H.R. 4025. An act for the relief of Terence J. O'Donnell, Thomas P. Wilcox, and Clifford M. Springberg;

H.R. 5034. An act to amend section 2575 (a) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the disposition of lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property under certain conditions;

H.R. 5819. An act for the relief of John Henry Taylor;

H.R. 6097. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7595. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize transportation at Government expense for dependents accompanying members of the uniformed services at their posts of duty outside the United States, who require medical care not locally available;

H.R. 7843. An act 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;

H.R. 9947. An act to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, to provide for reimbursement of transportation expenses for Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 431. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

On August 30, 1965:

H.R. 10306. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, as amended.

On August 31, 1965:

H.R. 881. An act to authorize the establishment of the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument;

H.R. 1291. An act for the relief of the children of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Dombrowski;

H.R. 7181. An act to provide for the commemoration of certain historical events in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7596. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove inequities in the active duty promotion opportunity of certain Air Force officers;

H.R. 7765. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by Sanford Dam, Canadian River project, Texas, as "Lake Meredith."

On September 1, 1965:

H.R. 89. An act to authorize establishment of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1481. An act for the relief of the estate of Donovan C. Moffett;

H.R. 5519. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize language training to be given to a dependent of a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps under certain circumstances;

H.R. 10132. An act to authorize the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept the award of the Military Order of Christ with the rank of grand officer; and

H.J. Res. 639. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

On September 2, 1965:

H.R. 485. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws;

H.R. 1763. An act to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28 for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis;

H.R. 3750. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 3990. An act to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors;

H.R. 3992. An act to amend section 753(f) of title 28, United States Code, relating to transcripts furnished by court reporters for the district courts;

H.R. 3997. An act to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the United States district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means;

H.R. 4719. An act for the relief of Josephine C. Rumley, administratrix of the estate of George S. Rumley;

H.R. 5497. An act to amend paragraphs b and c of section 14 of the Bankruptcy Act;

H.R. 8639. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9544. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 620,000 long tons of natural rubber from the national stockpile.

On September 6, 1965:

H.R. 5401. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7750. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 632. Joint resolution to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into an agreement with the University of Texas for the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Archival Depository, and for other purposes.

On September 8, 1965:

H.R. 4822. An act to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the act of July 14, 1960; and

H.R. 6007. An act 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.

On September 9, 1965:

H.R. 6927. An act to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5280. An act to provide for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States.

On September 10, 1965:

H.R. 496. An act to designate lock and dam 3 on the Cape Fear River, N.C., as the William O. Huske lock and dam;

H.R. 2263. An act to provide for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the extent and means of resolving the critical shortage of qualified manpower in the field of correctional rehabilitation; and

H.R. 6964. An act to amend section 4082 of title 18, United States Code, to facilitate the rehabilitation of persons convicted of offenses against the United States.

On September 11, 1965:

H.R. 1044. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Norfolk, State of Virginia, certain lands in the city of Norfolk, State of Virginia, in exchange for certain other lands;

H.R. 4905. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the Federal Government to the Board of Public Instruction, Okaloosa County, Fla.; and

H.R. 10342. An act to authorize the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, a Member of the House of Representatives, to accept the award of Officier in the French National Order of the Legion of Honor.

INCORPORATE THE YOUTH COUNCILS ON CIVIC AFFAIRS—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 292)

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message from the President on the bill H.R. 3329. Without objection the message and the bill will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOE BATES

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report the passing of former Congressman Joseph Bengal Bates who was elected to this body in a special election in 1938 and served more than 14 years prior to his retirement when his district was reshuffled in 1952.

It was my privilege to serve two terms in this House with Joe, as he was always known to his many friends.

After Joe Bates left the Congress, he continued to serve the public until he passed away last Friday following an operation at the Kings Daughters Hospital, Ashland, Ky.

His 40 years of public service as a county, State, and Federal official were marked by his patient and energetic efforts to improve the lot of his fellow men. His public service began as a school superintendent and this background had much to do with his philosophy of public service.

Born at Republican, Ky., he was a lifetime Democrat. However, as a Member of Congress, he rose above partisan politics and continuously supported measures which he considered good for the country. He rose to prominence as a member of the Rules Committee during the war and postwar period, when legislation had an important effect on the economic development of the period.

His record is his own monument, of which not only his widow and two children but also his many friends and eastern Kentucky may feel proud. I am sure that his many colleagues in this body realize that the country has lost a statesman and his community has lost a public-spirited citizen who will not be readily replaced.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Kentucky in this word of tribute to Joe Bates. He was a fine Congressman, a fine man. He was my good friend. I offer my deepest sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, it was shocking to receive the sad news of the passing away of our erstwhile colleague, the Honorable Joseph B. Bates, who represented the old Eighth District of Kentucky from June 4, 1938—when he was elected to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Fred M. Vinson—to January 3, 1953.

Joe Bates was a man of outstanding ability which permitted him to rise from a modest beginning in Knott County, where he was born, to reach the eminence of a seat in Congress. He taught school after graduating from Eastern Kentucky State College and then studied law and passed the bar examination. He served a number of years as Greenup County clerk.

While a Member of the House, Joe served on both the Appropriations and Rules Committee, where he met fully and completely the trust imposed by the great responsibility of these important committees.

He was patriotically motivated and represented faithfully and well the Eighth District of Kentucky, his State and his Nation. He was a kind and lovable person who was unswervingly sincere and loyal to his friends, both personal and political.

He will be remembered dearly and mourned deeply in this Chamber where he served with such distinction. His passing will be grievous to his many friends, both in and out of the State which could ill afford to lose a citizen and leader of his integrity and sterling character, his devotion to duty and his high sense of purpose and dedication.

I pray that God's blessing will rest with his widow and children and that He will give them solace in this sorrowful time.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, while it was not my privilege to know Joseph Bates personally, the outstanding record which he established during the 14 years he served in the Congress is well known to all Kentuckians. I, therefore, join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of this man who, throughout his life, upheld the fine traditions of a loyal and devoted American. During his tenure of service in the Congress and after his retirement to private law practice, Joseph Bates maintained a keen interest in people and made many valuable contributions to their welfare. His was indeed a life of service from the early days when he taught in the rural schools of Knott County until the time of his passing. Surely he has left behind him worthy examples for all of us to follow.

I join the Kentucky delegation and his many friends in expressing sincere sympathy to his widow, his daughter, and his son.

Mr. Perkins. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks; and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and service of Joe Bates.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RECESS TO RECEIVE GEMINI 5 ASTRONAUTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess later today for the purpose of receiving the Gemini 5 astronauts, Lt. Col. L. Gordon Cooper, U.S. Air Force, and Comdr. Charles Conrad, U.S. Navy.

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

There was no objection.

INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX EXTENSION ACT OF 1965

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4750) to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

Mr. SENNER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 618) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli, which was ordered to be printed.

HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1588) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research, development, and demonstrations in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARRIS, STAGGERS, FRIEDEL, JARMAN, PICKLE, RONAN, WILLIAMS, SPRINGER, DEVINE, CUNNINGHAM, and WATSON.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FOURTEENTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 14th Semiannual Report of the Office of Minerals Exploration, Geological Survey, from the Secretary of the Interior as prescribed by section 5 of the act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its Territories, and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 14, 1965.*

OFFICE SPACE IN THE DISTRICTS OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10014) to amend the act of July 2, 1954, relating to office space in the districts of Members of the House of Representatives, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after "That", insert "(a)"

Page 1, after line 11, insert:

"(b) The second paragraph under the subheading 'Administrative Provisions' under the heading 'SENATE' in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 (2 U.S.C. 52), is amended to read as follows:

"'Each Senator shall be entitled to office space suitable for his official use at not more than two places designated by him in the State he represents. The Sergeant at Arms is authorized and directed to secure for each Senator such suitable office space in post offices or other Federal buildings at the places designated by each Senator in the State he represents: *Provided,* That in the event suitable space is not available in post offices or other Federal buildings at one or both of the places designated by a Senator within his State, such Senator may lease or rent other office space for the purpose at such place or places, and the Sergeant at Arms shall approve for payment from the contingent fund of the Senate vouchers covering bona fide statements of rental due in an amount not exceeding $2,400 for any fiscal year for such Senator.'"

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the act of July 2, 1954, relating to office space in the districts of Members of the House of Representatives, and the act of June 27, 1956, relating to office space in the States of Senators."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS—INVESTIGATION AND STUDY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 68, 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 553, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 553

Resolved, That the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by H. Res. 68 of the Eighty-ninth Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all meetings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, strike out "$75,000" and insert "$25,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937 AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill, H.R. 10874, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce spouses' annuities by the amount of certain monthly benefits, to increase the base on which railroad retirement benefits and taxes are computed, and to change the rates of tax under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the chairman please explain the bill?

Mr. HARRIS. Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, this is an emergency.

It may be recalled that some time ago the committee reported and the House approved a bill to do away with the so-called dual provisions applicable to a spouse of a railroad employee.

The bill went to the other body. The social security and medicare bill came along, and made modifications which drastically changed some of the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act. As a result thereof, the Senate committee conducted hearings and reported what has been commonly referred to as the Pell amendment. That amendment provided an additional tax, which originated in the other body.

It is well known that under the rules of the House any provision for a tax should initiate in the House of Representatives.

That created somewhat of a controversy. In addition, the provision in the Pell amendment seemed to be displeasing to a great many people.

Under the circumstances, and because October 1 is the deadline for action to be taken, or the administration of this phase of the medicare program affecting railroad retirees will go to the Social Security Administration, our committee conducted hearings on this bill and has reported a bill which has for its purpose a reduction of taxes beginning October 1 for a period of 3 months, of 1 percent on each side, and one-fourth of 1 percent for each year for the following 4 years, to get back to what would be the case under the Pell amendment.

At the same time, this would increase the requirement under the social security medicare program on the taxable base from the present $5,400 to $6,600.

This will equalize the tax impact on both the employees and the employers, and ultimately, over a period of 4 years, will graduate it to the point that the benefits will remain the same and thereby meet the requirements of the social security medicare program. It will give us a program which will be satisfactory both to railroad employers and employees.

Because of the emergency phase we have asked that it be considered under this procedure.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD with reference to this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10874

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SPOUSES' ANNUITIES

SECTION 1. Subsection (e) of section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 (45 U.S.C. 228b(e)) is amended by changing the colon before the last proviso to a period and by striking out all that follows down through the period at the end of such subsection.

INCREASE IN BASE FOR BENEFIT COMPUTATION PURPOSES

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "the next $300" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the remainder up to a total of (i) $450, or (ii) an amount equal to one-twelfth of the current maximum annual taxable 'wages' as defined in section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, whichever is greater".

(b) The second sentence of subsection (c) of such section 3 is amended by inserting before ", shall be recognized" the following: "and before the calendar month next following the calendar month in which this Act was amended in 1965, or in excess of (i) $450, or (ii) an amount equal to one-twelfth of the current maximum annual taxable 'wages' as defined in section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, whichever is greater, for any calendar month after the month in which this Act was so amended".

(c) Subsection (f)(2) of section 5 of such Act is amended by inserting after "so amended" where it appears the second time in the first parenthetical phrase after clause (vi) the following: "and before the calendar month next following the month in which this Act was amended in 1965, and in excess of (i) $450, or (ii) an amount equal to one-twelfth of the current maximum annual taxable 'wages' as defined in section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, whichever is greater, for any month after the month in which this Act was so amended".

(d) Subsection (l)(9) of section 5 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" where it appears the fourth time and inserting in lieu thereof a comma;

(2) by inserting after "so amended" where it appears the second time the following: "and before the calendar month next following the calendar month in which this Act was amended in 1965, and any excess over (i) $450, or (ii) an amount equal to one-twelfth of the current maximum annual taxable 'wages' as defined in section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, whichever is greater, for any calendar month after the month in which this Act was so amended";

(3) by striking out "$6,600" both times it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "an amount equal to the current maximum annual taxable 'wages' as defined in section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954"; and

(4) by striking out "$450" where it appears the second time and inserting in lieu thereof "(i) $450, or (ii) an amount equal to one-twelfth of the current maximum annual taxable 'wages' as defined in section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, whichever is greater,".

(e) Subsection (l)(10) of section 5 of such Act is amended by striking out "$450" and inserting in lieu thereof "(i) $450, or (ii) an amount equal to one-twelfth of the current maximum annual taxable 'wages' as defined in section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, whichever is greater".

INCREASE IN BASE FOR TAX PURPOSES

SEC. 3. Sections 3201, 3202, 3211, and 3221 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to taxes under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act) are each amended by inserting after the phrase "or $450 for any calendar month after the month in which this provision was so amended", wherever such phrase appears in such sections, the following: "and before the calendar month next following the calendar month in which this provision was amended in 1965, or (i) $450, or (ii) an amount equal to one-twelfth of the current maximum annual taxable 'wages' as defined in section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, whichever is greater, for any month after the month in which this provision was so amended".

CHANGES IN TAX RATES

SEC. 4. (a) Section 3201 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on employees under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act) is amended by striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) 6¼ percent of so much of the compensation paid to such employee for services rendered by him after September 30, 1965,

"(2) 6½ percent of so much of the compensation paid to such employee for services rendered by him after December 31, 1965.

"(3) 6¾ percent of so much of the compensation paid to such employee for services rendered by him after December 31, 1965,

"(4) 7 percent of so much of the compensation paid to such employee for services rendered by him after December 31, 1967, and

"(5) 7¼ percent of so much of the compensation paid to such employee for services rendered by him after December 31, 1968,".

(b) Section 3211 of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employee representatives under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act) is amended by striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) 12½ percent of so much of the compensation paid to such employee representative for services rendered by him after September 30, 1965,

"(2) 13 percent of so much of the compensation paid to such employee representative for services rendered by him after December 31, 1965,

"(3) 13½ percent of so much of the compensation paid to such employee representative for services rendered by him after December 31, 1966,

"(4) 14 percent of so much of the compensation paid to such employee representative for services rendered by him after December 31, 1967, and

"(5) 14½ percent of so much of the compensation paid to such employee representative for services rendered by him after December 31, 1968,".

(c) Section 3221 of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employers under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act) is amended by striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) 6¼ percent of so much of the compensation paid by such employer for services rendered to him after September 30, 1965,

"(2) 6½ percent of so much of the compensation paid by such employer for services rendered to him after December 31, 1965,

"(3) 6¾ percent of so much of the compensation paid by such employer for services rendered to him after December 31, 1966,

"(4) 7 percent of so much of the compensation paid by such employer for services rendered to him after December 31, 1967, and

"(5) 7¼ percent of so much of the compensation paid by such employer for services rendered to him after December 31, 1968,".

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 5. The amendments made by the first two sections of this Act shall take effect with respect to annuities accruing and deaths occurring in months after the month in which this Act is enacted, and shall apply also to annuities paid in lump sums equal to their commuted value because of a reduction in such annuities under section 2(e) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as in effect before the amendments made by this Act, as if such annuities had not been paid in such lump sums: *Provided, however*, That the amounts of such annuities which were paid in lump sums equal to their commuted value shall not be included in the amount of annuities which become payable by reason of section 1 of this Act. The amendments made by section 3 of this Act shall take effect with respect to calendar months after the month in which this Act is enacted. The amendments made by section 4 of this Act shall take effect with respect to compensation paid for services rendered after September 30, 1965.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to eliminate certain provisions which reduce spouses' annuities, to provide coverage for tips, to increase the base on which railroad retirement benefits and taxes are computed, and to change the railroad retirement tax rates."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, after line 2, insert the following new section:

"COVERAGE OF TIPS

"SEC. 2. (a)(1) Subsection (a) of section 3202 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction of tax from compensation) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'An employer who is furnished by an employee a written statement of tips (received in a calendar month) pursuant to section 6053(a) to which paragraph (3) of section 3231(e) is applicable may deduct an amount equivalent to such tax with respect to such tips from any compensation of the employee (exclusive of tips) under his control, even though at the time such statement is furnished the total amount of the tips included in statements furnished to the employer as having been received by the employee in such calendar month in the course of his employment by such employer is less than $20.'

"(2) Such section 3202 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) SPECIAL RULE FOR TIPS.—

"'(1) In the case of tips which constitute compensation, subsection (a) shall be applicable only to such tips as are included in a written statement furnished to the employer pursuant to section 6053(a), and only to the extent that collection can be made by the employer, at or after the time such statement is so furnished and before the close of the 10th day following the calendar month (or, if paragraph (3) applies, the 30th day following the quarter) in which the tips were deemed paid, by deducting the amount of the tax from such compensation of the employee (excluding tips, but including funds turned over by the employee to the employer pursuant to paragraph (2)) as are under control of the employer.

"'(2) If the tax imposed by section 3201, with respect to tips which are included in written statements furnished in any month to the employer pursuant to section 6053(a), exceeds the compensation of the employee (excluding tips) from which the employer is required to collect the tax under paragraph (1), the employee may furnish to the employer on or before the 10th day of the following month (or, if paragraph (3) applies, on or before the 30th day of the following quarter) an amount of money equal to the amount of the excess.

"'(3) The Secretary or his delegate may, under regulations prescribed by him, authorize employers—

"'(A) to estimate the amount of tips that will be reported by the employee pursuant to section 6053(a) in any quarter of the calendar year,

"'(B) to determine the amount to be deducted upon each payment of compensation (exclusive of tips) during such quarter as if the tips so estimated constituted actual tips so reported, and

"'(C) to deduct upon any payment of compensation (other than tips, but including funds turned over by the employee to the employer pursuant to paragraph (2)) to such employee during such quarter (and within 30 days thereafter) such amount as may be necessary to adjust the amount actually deducted upon such compensation of the employee during the quarter to the amount required to be deducted in respect of tips included in written statements furnished to the employer during the quarter.

"'(4) If the tax imposed by section 3201 with respect to tips which constitute compensation exceeds the portion of such tax which can be collected by the employer from the compensation of the employee pursuant to paragraph (1) or paragraph (3), such excess shall be paid by the employee.'

"(b)(1) The second sentence of subsection (e)(1) of section 3231 of such Code (relating to definition of compensation for purposes of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act) is amended by inserting '(except as is provided in paragraph (3))' after 'tips'.

"(2) Subsection (e) of such section 3231 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(3) Solely for purposes of the tax imposed by section 3201 and other provisions of this chapter insofar as they relate to such tax, the term "compensation" also includes cash tips received by an employee in any calendar month in the course of his employment by an employer unless the amount of such cash tips is less than $20.'

"(3) Such section 3231 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h) TIPS CONSTITUTING COMPENSATION, TIME DEEMED PAID.—For purposes of this chapter, tips which constitute compensation for purposes of the tax imposed under section 3201 shall be deemed to be paid at the time a written statement including such tips is furnished to the employer pursuant to section 6053(a) or (if no statement including such tips is so furnished) at the time received; and tips so deemed to be paid in any month shall be deemed paid for services rendered in such month.'

"(c) Section 3402(k) of such Code (relating to income tax collected at source on tips) is amended (1) by inserting 'for section 3202(c)(2)' after 'section 3102(c)(2)' and (2) by inserting 'or section 3202(a)' after 'section 3102(a)'.

"(d)(1) Section 6053(a) of such Code (relating to reports of tips by employees) is amended by inserting 'or which are compensation (as defined in section 3231(e))' after 'or section 3401(a)'.

"(2) Section 6053(b) of such Code (relating to statements furnished by employers) is amended (A) by inserting 'or section 3201 (as the case may be)' after 'section 3101', and (B) by inserting 'or section 3202 (as the case may be)' after 'section 3102'.

"(e) Section 6652(c) of such Code (relating to failure to report tips) is amended (1) by inserting 'or which are compensation (as defined in section 3231(e))' after 'which are wages (as defined in section 3121(a))', and (2) by inserting 'or section 3201 (as the case may be)' after 'section 3101'.

"(f)(1) Subsection (h) of section 1 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended (A) by inserting '(1)' after '(h)', (B) by inserting in the second sentence thereof '(except as is provided under paragraph (2))' after 'tips', and (C) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'(2) Solely for purposes of determining amounts to be included in the compensation of an individual who is an employee (as defined in subsection (b)) the term "compensation" shall (subject to section 3(c)) also include cash tips received by an employee in any calendar month in the course of his employment by an employer unless the amount of such cash tips is less than $20.

"'(3) Tips included as compensation by reason of the provisions of paragraph (2) shall be deemed to be paid at the time a written statement including such tips is furnished to the employer pursuant to section 6053(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 or (if no statement including such tips is so furnished) at the time received; and tips so deemed to be paid in any month shall be deemed paid for services rendered in such month.'

"Page 2, line 4, strike out 'SEC. 2.' and insert in lieu thereof 'SEC. 3.'

"Page 4, line 12, strike out 'SEC. 3.' and insert in lieu thereof 'SEC. 4.'

"Page 5, line 2, strike out 'SEC. 4.' and insert in lieu thereof 'SEC. 5.'

"Page 6, line 18, strike out '3221' and insert in lieu thereof '3221(a)'.

"Page 7, line 13, strike out 'SEC. 5.' and insert in lieu thereof 'SEC. 6.'

"Page 7, line 13, strike out 'the first two sections' and insert in lieu thereof 'sections 1 and 3'.

"Page 7, strike out 'The amendments' in line 25 and all that follows through page 8, line 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The amendments made by section 2 of this act shall apply only with respect to tips received after 1965. The amendments made by section 4 of this act shall apply only with respect to calendar months after the month in which this act is enacted. The amendments made by section 5 of this act shall apply only with respect to compensation paid for services rendered after September 30, 1965."

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to eliminate certain provisions which reduce spouses' annuities, to provide coverage for tips, to increase the base on which railroad retirement benefits and taxes are computed, and to change the railroad retirement tax rates."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3157, TO AMEND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House and offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 578

Resolved, That the amendment in the nature of a substitute added by the Senate to the House bill (H.R. 3157) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 in the opinion of this House contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States and is an infringement of the privileges of this House, and that the said bill, with the amendments, be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND SECTION 170 OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 579, Report No. 990) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 579

Resolution, 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. 2042) to amend section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 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.

AMEND CONSOLIDATED FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. BOLLING (on behalf of Mr. SISK), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 580, Rept. No. 991) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 580

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. 10232) 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, water systems, and waste disposal 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, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After passage of H.R. 10232, the Committee on Agriculture shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 1766, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 10232 as passed.

JEFFERSON NATIONAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 581, Rept. No. 992) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 581

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. 6519) to amend the Act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), as amended, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old Saint Louis, Missouri, 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 House Administration, 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.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 294]

Adair	Harvey, Ind.	Poage
Andrews, George W.	Harvey, Mich.	Pool
Arends	Hébert	Powell
Ashbrook	Hungate	Resnick
Baring	Ichord	Rivers, Alaska
Bolton	Johnson, Okla.	Roosevelt
Bonner	Jones, Mo.	Rosenthal
Casey	Kelly	Ryan
Celler	Keogh	Sickles
Conyers	Lindsay	Sisk
Cunningham	Long, Md.	Stalbaum
Daddario	McClory	Thomas
Derwinski	McDowell	Thompson, Tex.
Farnsley	Martin, Ala.	Toll
Fogarty	May	Weltner
Ford, Gerald R.	Morton, Md.	Willis
Gallagher	Moss	Wright
Griffiths	Multer	
	Pirnie	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 377 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

RELATING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CONCESSION POLICIES IN THE AREAS ADMINISTERED BY NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 520 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 520

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. 2091) relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 520 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 2091, a bill relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service and for other purposes.

The principal purpose of H.R. 2091 is to put into statutory form policies which, with certain exceptions, have heretofore been followed by the National Park Service in administering concessions within units of the national park system and in writing contracts for concessionaire services there. These policies have been in force since 1950 by virtue of an understanding between the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the then Secretary of the Interior. Among other things, they deal with the subjects of a concessionaire's possessory interest in improvements constructed or acquired by him on national park land, the compensation to which he is entitled if, in various circumstances, he wishes or is obliged to give up this possessory interest, and the granting of preferential rights to established concessionaires to furnish additional facilities and services when needed and in the renewal and extension of contracts.

The bill also deals with other matters related to concessions.

Visitation to the various units of the national park system has expanded steadily since World War II and the need for this legislation has been growing year by year.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not go further into the details or the merits of this legislation, because it will be ably presented a little later by those who favor and oppose the legislation.

I urge the adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the able gentleman from Iowa, my learned friend.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me say to the gentleman that I am pleased to see the House back today to normal procedure. Not only that, but I note this bill has been around for quite some time, apparently about 4 weeks. That is somewhere in the neighborhood of 28 days, not 21 days. If I am informed correctly, the rule was granted on this about 4 weeks ago.

So I say to the gentleman I am pleased to see we are back to normal procedure, that the 21-day rule has been more covered, without resort to it and everything appears to be lovely and the goose hangs high.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of our able chairman and my colleagues on the committee, I thank the able gentleman.

It is always a pleasure for this committee to serve this great House.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, we are considering House Resolution 520, which would grant a 2-hour open rule for H.R. 2091—a bill relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by the National Park Service. The committee report states:

The principal purpose of H.R. 2091 is to put into statutory form policies which, with certain exceptions, have heretofore been followed by the National Park Service in administering concessions within units of the national park system and in writing contracts for concessionaire services there. These policies have been in force since 1950 by virtue of an understanding between the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the then Secretary of the Interior. Among other things, they deal with the subjects of a concessioner's possessory interest in improvements constructed or acquired by him on national park land, the compensation to which he is entitled if, in various circumstances, he wishes or is obliged to give up this possessory interest, and the granting of preferential rights to established concessioners to furnish additional facilities and services when needed and in the renewal and extension of contracts. H.R. 2091 also deals with many other matters related to concessions.

There is a controversy on the purposes of this bill between two of the most outstanding committees of the House—the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Government Operations.

The Rules Committee first took up H.R. 2091 with the very able chairman of each of the committees appearing and presenting their testimony.

It was hoped that the membership of the two committees could get together and agree on a bill. The chairman of each committee reported that they were hopelessly deadlocked.

Under date of July 29, 1965, the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, wrote to the chairman and members of the Rules Committee. The gentleman will explain this during the general debate. I am, however, including his letter for RECORD purposes:

I ask your support of the request for a rule on H.R. 2091 (to establish concession policies in the areas administered by the National Park Service), which will be considered by your Committee in the near future.

This urgently needed legislation has been endorsed by the National Park Service, by Interior Secretary Udall, and by many organizations and individuals familiar with the problems in the National Park Service. It was reported from our committee by a unanimous vote.

We recognize that there is opposition outside the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to this legislation and that the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations wrote to all members of the Rules Committee on July 19 and July 26 expressing his reasons for thinking that H.R. 2091 should not be enacted. We are also glad to note, however, that Chairman DAWSON's letters do not oppose the granting of a rule on this bill.

Some background on the bill and our committee's reasons for thinking it important that it be acted on at this time follow:

During recent years, visits to National Park Service areas have increased at a fantastic pace and last year reached more than 110 million. There is a pressing need for all kinds of additional visitor facilities, including hotels, restaurants, etc. Most of the new facilities must be provided by private capital obtained by companies and individuals holding concession contracts with the National Park Service. For the last several years the National Park Service has been under pressure from the Hill not to enter into the new or renewed long-term contracts which are necessary to cope with this situation. Nearly all the contracts it has negotiated and entered into have been 1-year renewals of existing contracts as they expire. This is thoroughly unsatisfactory and only enactment of H.R. 2091 or something like it can cure the problems at hand.

I mention this first because of the emphasis Congressman DAWSON's letters put on the desirability of a Government-wide review of concession policies. I agree that such a review is desirable; I hope that it will be undertaken, and I will be glad to help in it. But we cannot let the shadowy prospect of (to quote the Bureau of Budget) "a special study of this matter" which may or may not be "undertaken under its leadership within the next year" and which "might (or might not) lead to the submission of recommendations for appropriate legislation, either in an omnibus bill on a Government-wide basis, or in a series of bills for the agencies concerned (which might or might not be enacted)" stand in the way of consideration by the House at this time of a bill that is long overdue and that has been thoroughly considered by our committee two Congresses in a row.

H.R. 2091 would simply enact into law the policies which now and for many years have been used by the National Park Service with the approval of the House Interior Committee. It is time that these policies be incorporated into the statutes, for it has been extremely difficult for the national park concessioners to obtain equity or loan capital where there is no statutory statement of Government policy applicable to these business operations.

Opposition to the bill comes from people who we believe fail to appreciate the special problems and difficulties of park concessioners. While the concessioners in many instances have an exclusive franchise, they operate under great restraints not imposed on the rest of the tourist services industry. For example:

1. The concessioners do not own the lands on which they erect expensive buildings and improvements; they are thus prevented from borrowing money on ordinary mortgage arrangements.

2. Most of the concessioners operate highly seasonal businesses with their assets idle

the rest of the year. They are often located far from established communities and suppliers.

3. They operate under rigorous, detailed Government contracts which frequently require nonprofitable services and under which their rates and prices are subject to control by the Secretary of the Interior.

4. The concessioners must pay, in addition to all regular taxes and business expenses, a Park Service franchise fee.

The assumptions of the opponents of H.R. 2091 bear little or no resemblance to reality. They assume that National Park Service concessioner enterprises are businesses which can be conducted under the normal rules of free competition and that in granting concessions the end in view should be that of procuring as much income for the Government as possible. We, on the other hand, are convinced that the results of applying the usual competitive bidding rules would be as unsatisfactory in the future as they have been in the past, that the object of having concessioners must be more to satisfy the public's needs for good services in our parks than to get money into the Federal till, that satisfactory concessioner services cannot be procured by seeing who bids highest for the privileges involved, and that fairly long-term contracts with a preferential right of renewal are necessary not only to induce the necessary capital to come into the market but to assure that continuity of experience which is important to the public as well as to the Government and to the concessioner himself. These are the premises on which H.R. 2091 is built and which furnish answers to most of the detailed criticisms of its opponents. We believe we are correct in the premises and that our opponents are mistaken and that, right or wrong, they are matters which can and ought to be argued out and decided on the floor of the House.

I conclude, therefore, as I began—H.R. 2091 deserves consideration by the membership of the House as a whole and not only by members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Government Operations. To this end, I ask your support for the necessary rule.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

Under date of August 11, 1965, the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, wrote the chairman and members of the Rules Committee.

The gentleman will explain this during general debate. I am, however, including his letter at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., August 11, 1965.

Hon. JAMES H. QUILLEN,
1318 Longworth Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We appreciate your giving us this further opportunity to place before your committee the chief arguments on which we base our opposition to H.R. 2091, relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by the National Park Service.

H.R. 2091 would prepetuate, in statutory form, many practices and policies relating to Park Service concession contracts which the Government Operations Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Comptroller General have long branded as deficient and detrimental to the public. Let me be brief but specific:

1. The bill almost entirely disregards the potential benefits of promoting even a moderate degree of competition among existing and prospective concessioners.

2. The bill virtually guarantees to an established concessioner that he will always be able to get reconstruction-cost value for his concession improvements whenever his contract is terminated—regardless of how much he may already have amortized it.

3. The bill in effect tells the Secretary to set franchise fees by giving first consideration to the concessioner's interest. It shows insufficient regard to appropriate and reasonable returns to the Government and to protecting the public.

4. The bill would legalize a practice now used to permit concessioners to obtain a reduction in franchise fees on condition they build new facilities. The Comptroller General has held this violates section 321 of the Economy Act. Yet, the Park Service persists in the practice. When this subsidizing through reduction of franchise fees is combined with the right of the concessioner to receive almost full reconstruction cost of his improvements on termination of a contract, one can see that the Government would be not only giving away the improvements but later buying them back all over again.

5. The bill grants special contract renewal and extension privileges to established concessioners. Thus, they can easily become permanently entrenched. This, of course, means that competition for concession contracts would be eliminated forever.

We have been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that the Executive Office of the President is undertaking a complete study of the concession policies of the various agencies of the Federal Government. These agencies include the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, and many other agencies in similar circumstances. Such a study will consider carefully from the standpoint of the public interest the types of contracts that should be entered into, the types of compensation that should be provided when they are terminated, the types of franchise fees, and all other related matters. This is well known to the proponents of H.R. 2091, and, in fact, may be a factor in their efforts to rush through a bill unconscionably favorable to the concessioners before the subject matter is considered on a Government-wide basis. If H.R. 2091 does pass, property rights will be created and given to the concessioners which subsequent legislation can never alter.

We understand that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has finally and reluctantly, after 2 years of insistence by the Government Operations Committee and by the Comptroller General, agreed that the Comptroller General should have the same rights with respect to inspecting books of concessioners that he has with respect to nearly all other holders of negotiated contracts with the Government. Unfortunately, as we have shown above, this does not even touch the basic evils of the bill.

We urge, therefore, that no action be taken on H.R. 2091 at this time.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

It is my understanding that there was an agreement made between the two committees that the Comptroller General should have the same rights with respect to inspecting books of concessionaires that he has had with respect to nearly all other holders of negotiated contracts with the Government.

It is my opinion that this measure tends to eliminate free enterprise and competition.

I know of no objection to the rule, and I recommend the adoption of House Resolution 520.

Reserving the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, reluctantly I oppose H.R. 2091. This bill infringes on the enjoyment of our national parks by the public for whom the parks exist. The Congress set forth the purposes of our national park system almost 50 years ago with the establishment of the National Park Service in 1916. Those purposes have not changed and must continue to be uppermost in our minds when legislation on the national parks is being considered.

The purposes of the national parks are restated in this legislation we are considering today. However, immediately after the restatement of those purposes is the phrase, "without limitation of the foregoing." That phrase is somewhat ambiguous, making it difficult to determine whether the preceding sections or the following sections are to be unlimited. The discussion in the report on this bill, which incidentally is shorter than the bill itself, does nothing to clarify the meaning of that phrase. Unfortunately, this phrase, which can be interpreted to exempt concessionaire practices from the longstanding policy of Congress, sets the general tone which is maintained throughout the bill.

Practically every sentence of this legislation is objectionable. This bill would enact into law the very policies of the National Park Service which the Committee on Government Operations, the Appropriations Committee, and the General Accounting Office have criticized for years. Three years ago the Subcommittee on Government Activities of the Committee on Government Operations held hearings involving park concessionaire policies of the Interior Department in which some glaring deficiencies were uncovered. Now, instead of resolving those problems, we are being asked to enact the very causes of the problems into law.

The most objectionable feature of the legislation is the provision that the park concessioners will be given a possessory interest in the national parks. These parks are set aside for the use and enjoyment of the entire public and the Secretary of the Interior should not be given the power to grant possessory interests to individuals, groups, or corporations. Under this bill the concessioner's possessory interest would extend beyond the period of his contract and, indeed, in perpetuity unless it is bought back by the U.S. Government at reconstruction cost less physical depreciation, but not to exceed fair market value. In effect, the Secretary of the Interior would be empowered under this legislation to permanently give away possessory rights in national parks.

Certainly the concessioner's interest should be protected. But, this does not demand giving him a permanent possessory right. The concessioner is granted a monopoly franchise to provide a service needed in a national park area. His rates and his franchise fees are set so that he can provide the service at a rea-

sonable rate to the public and at the same time realize an adequate profit on his investment.

Under this bill, the concessioner can pass his possessory right on to the highest bidder, thus receiving a windfall profit in addition to the profits on his services. Or, if the United States rebuys the possessory right, it must pay the concessioner reconstruction cost at the time of taking less physical depreciation even though the concessioner has fully amortized his costs and the rates charged the public have included the full return of his investment.

For example, a concessioner may have invested $100,000 in a facility in 1920 which would cost $500,000 to build today. He may have fully recovered his $100,000 years ago, but, if the United States does not renew his contract, it could divest the concessioner of his possessory right only by paying him the $500,000 less some physical depreciation.

A more reasonable protection would be to provide for payment to the concessioner of the unamortized book value of the facilities. In that way he is assured of recovering his investment but his profit is made on the services provided. He can no longer gamble on windfall profits from appreciated park property values to be reflected in higher charges by subsequent concessioners to the traveling public.

The park concessioners contend they need a possessory interest in order to obtain adequate financing for constructing facilities. In view of the facts that these contracts are generally for long periods of time—authorized up to 30 years—the entire cost of construction can usually be amortized during the period of the contract. Any bank should be willing to finance facilities that will be completely paid for before the contract expires. For those facilities on which the useful life extends beyond the contract period, a guarantee of payment of the unamortized portion of the cost would guarantee full return of the investment in the event the contract is terminated or is not renewed. The granting of a possessory interest in park facilities is not necessary to provide the concessioners with the security they need to obtain financing.

This bill is totally destructive of any competition in the awarding of concessionaire contracts. The holding of a possessory interest by one of the bidders so prejudices his offer over that of his competitors that no competition can survive since their proposals must include a payment for purchasing the possessory rights at an amount equal to the cost of reconstructing a replica of the facilities. The public may therefore be denied better services and lower rates because the competition is unable to compete with the possessory interest of the present concessioner.

There are several other objectionable features in this legislation in addition to the possessory interest which completely destroy all competition. The most obvious of these is the preferential treatment the present concessioners will be given.

Park concessioners, like any other businessmen, should be subjected to the rigors of competition at least every 20 or 30 years. Most businessmen face competition every day. We Members of Congress must face election every 2 years. Is it asking too much for a park concessioner to meet the competition on equal ground every decade or so? Some of the park concessioners have lived in and on the national parks since before I was born.

This bill would direct Secretary Stewart Udall to give preferential treatment to present concessioners in the renewal of contracts and in the negotiation of new contracts. It further would freeze into law the extremely unwise and unjust practice of negotiating new contracts with the present concessioners before expiration of the old contract. The Secretary would be permitted to negotiate a new long-term contract at any time at his discretion. This practice of preferential treatment and unpredictable contract negotiation completely destroys the competitive spirit upon which our economic system is built.

Another section of this bill expressly removes concession contracts at historic sites from competitive bidding.

It seems to me that the whole purpose of this bill is spelled out in its possessory interests, its preferential treatment, its renegotiation of contracts at any time, and its express exemptions from competitive bidding. The whole purpose of this bill is to remove all competition from park concessionaire contracts and to enact into law perpetual monopolies in our national parks.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would also permit the continuance of a practice that has been declared illegal by the Comptroller General and condemned by the Supreme Court.

In the past the Secretary of the Interior has allowed the reduction of franchise fees in return for an agreement by the concessioner to construct needed facilities. This practice is contrary to the Economy Act of 1932. The effect of it is to subsidize the construction of specific facilities with money that should be paid into the U.S. Treasury. In other words, the Secretary of the Interior agrees to reduce a franchise fee from 5 to 2 percent if the concessioner will construct a facility. The concessioner then, in effect, uses the 3-percent fee which should be paid into the Treasury to construct the building. This procedure short circuits the appropriations functions of Congress by permitting the Secretary of the Interior rather than the Congress to determine what facilities will be constructed with U.S. funds. Not only will the facility be constructed with what should be public funds, but, in addition, the concessioner would have a permanent possessory interest in it under this bill and we would have to pay him construction costs again to divest him of that interest. In this way the taxpayers pay for the facilities twice.

No reason has been cited to show why park concessioners should be freed from the ever-watchful eye of the Congress over the public purse. We would be consciously shirking our obligation to the taxpayers to affirmatively approve of this practice.

Enactment of this bill will also subject the United States to liability for discretionary acts of a public official. This is a new and possibly unbounded area of liability. Government officials have an obligation to carry out the duties of their offices. They will hardly have a free hand in performing their functions to the best of their ability if one or maybe all of the alternatives will subject the Government to extensive liability. I wonder if the opinion of the Justice Department was ever requested on the advisability of opening up this new area of liability and possibly hamstringing the Government in carrying out its obligations to the public?

Mr. Speaker, there are many other objectionable features in this legislation such as improper determination of rates and franchise fees and inadequate congressional and GAO review.

In short, the entire bill is solely in the interest of the concessioners and primarily at the expense of the public. Concessioners perform an indispensable function and there are some risks involved in every undertaking. Furthermore, they have many unique problems. On the other hand, there are many compensating factors. They receive millions of dollars in free advertising each year. All roads and highways and other facilities are provided them so as to encourage the public to utilize their concessions and, once the visitor enters the park, the concessioner has a monopoly insofar as the visitor's business is concerned. My objections to this legislation do not ignore the legitimate interests of the concessioner and the opportunity for him to do a good job and make a reasonable profit. My objections rest with the fact that there must be a proper balance between the interests of the concessioner, the Government, and the public. Enactment of this bill would give the concessioners much more than protection. It would give them ownership interest in our national parks paramount to the interest of the Federal Government and to the millions of American citizens who visit our parks each year.

One final factor merits our consideration. As we know, there are a number of Federal departments and agencies offering services to the public requiring concessioner contracts and agreements. At this time there is no uniformity in policy concerning concessionaire contracts on a governmentwide basis. The Bureau of the Budget recognizes this deficiency and points out that an overall policy should be developed for the management of concessions generally throughout the Government. This being the case, it would be more appropriate, in view of the long-lasting nature of these contractual agreements, that the formulation of government-wide concession policies precede any further enactments in this area. Such a study as the Bureau of the Budget suggests and as the Government Operations Committee so strongly advocates need not take an unduly long period of time. Based upon the findings of such a study, Congress could enact comprehensive legislation providing a uniform policy applicable to all concessions. As legislation relating to national park concessions does not require emergency action, it would be both reasonable and appropriate that consideration of

this legislation be postponed pending the results of a comprehensive study. The interests of the Government or the thousands of Americans visiting our national parks would not be prejudiced by such an approach, nor would the legitimate interests or our concessionaires.

In closing, I urge rejection of this legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. 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. 2091) relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Colorado.

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. 2091, with Mr. McFALL 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 Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, as the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs brings H.R. 2091 to this commitee for consideration today let me say it is my opinion as chairman of this committee—for the last 9 years—that the committee and the subcommittee handling the legislation have done everything in their power to bring good, substantial, and honest legislation before the Congress.

This legislation is reported out of our committee by a unanimous vote. There is no objection to the report as it is written. This situation has not always been true, as we study the legislation, because there have been times when different members of the committee in the 88th and 89th Congresses wondered whether or not we were proceeding on the right course. After great and extended deliberation we decided this is the only avenue left open to us.

We believe that the needs of the Park Service, the visiting public and the concessionaries themselves demand a law patterned after this legislation. We have tried diligently to work with the opposing committee, the great Committee on Government Operations. This has been the practice of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs over the years. Whenever we have a bill that seems to cut across jurisdictional lines, we advise the other committee as to what is involved and ask for their position and ask for their help.

May I say in this particular operation it appears that we have come to an honest impasse. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] has just addressed you. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs does not agree with the position taken by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS]. Because of the fact of fundamental differences we have not been able to get together. So we bring the legislation to the House for resolution because we think that is absolutely necessary. And may I say further our only aim as the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is to make needed services available for a public which is demanding to be served.

If any member of this committee thinks he can help the bill he has the right, of course, to offer amendments, and we welcome any criticism, constructive criticism, or any amendment that will make the bill better.

There are only two new factors involved in this legislation. One is the requirement of section 5 that the Secretary give advance notice of any intention to extend or renew a contract, and he shall consider and evaluate all the proposals received as a result of such notice.

This takes care to a great extent, although it does not meet the objections of the gentleman from Texas, of out and out competition procedures as usually understood. If an amendment which I shall propose is adopted the concessionaire's books will be open to the GAO for inspection and audit. Some of us thought our original bill provided for this. There was some question, so we went to the GAO and we got their agreement.

Mr. Chairman, enactment of the bill we are now about to take up, H.R. 2091, will establish in statutory form a number of fundamental policies relating to concessions in the areas administered by the National Park Service. Most of these policies are already in force and have been in force for 15 years or more by virtue of an understanding arrived at in 1950 between the Secretary of the Interior and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but they need to be firmed up by being enacted into law.

I wish I could assure the House that all of these policies are satisfactory to everyone concerned, but I cannot do so. Although the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I recognize that there are substantial and honest differences of opinion between the members of our committee on the one hand and some other members of the House. These differences will no doubt come out in the course of the debate. All I ask at this time is that attention be given to the size of the problem that needs to be met in the park concession field, to the ways in which we think the problem can best be met, and to the reasons we have for so thinking.

There are now 203 areas in the national park system with a total of over 26 million acres of land. Last year more than 102 million people visited these areas, and the number has been increasing year by year at a compound interest rate of 7½ to 8 percent per year. Nearly all of these visitors need services of one sort or another. Some of them want no more than to buy a souvenir postcard or a bottle of soft drink. Others find they need fishing tackle or equipment for a cross-country hike. Still others want sleeping accommodations for a night or a week.

To meet the needs of all these people requires the investment of substantial amounts of private capital. As of the end of the last fiscal year there were, as a matter of fact, 195 concessioners operating in our parks with a capital investment in their facilities of over $73 million. The Government can and does make the initial investment in the parks themselves, their roads and trails, their visitor centers, and their campgrounds. But it cannot and, in my judgment, ought not to be asked to install hotels and motels and cafeterias and lunch counters and gift shops in any except the most extraordinary circumstances. That is a job for private investment.

The need for private investment and the need for flexibility in order to encourage such investment has been recognized in the law for at least 50 years. The act of August 25, 1916, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to "grant privileges, leases, and permits for the use of land for the accommodation of visitors in the various parks, monuments, or other reservations."

It also authorized him to "grant said privileges, leases, and permits and enter into contracts relating to the same with responsible persons, firms, or corporations without advertising and without securing competitive bids" and it further authorized him to allow "such grantees, permittees, or licensees to execute mortgages and issue bonds, shares of stock, and other evidences of interest in or indebtedness upon their rights, properties, and franchises, for the purposes of installing, enlarging, or improving plant and equipment and extending facilities for the accommodation of the public within such national parks and monuments."

By a later provision of law, all concession contracts involving a gross annual business of $100,000 or more or having a life of 5 years and upward are required to be reported to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate 60 days before they are awarded.

Merely to write such provisions as these on the statute books, however, is not enough to attract capital. There must also be an atmosphere of assurance that the investor—whether he be an investor of equity capital or an institutional lender—will probably earn a fair return on his money over a reasonably long period of time. H.R. 2091 is intended to give this assurance, as far as any law can do so when we consider the inevitable hazards of weather and other factors that influence the comings and goings of our people. I shall outline in brief form

some of the ways in which it does so, leaving details to my colleagues who will wish to speak on the matter.

One of the most important parts of H.R. 2091 is its recognition that the concessioner has a possessory interest—an interest which he can mortgage, assign, or relinquish—in improvements which he lawfully constructs in our national parks. Since the term "possessory interest" may not be familiar to many of you, let me explain the importance of this provision this way. Concessioners are allowed to occupy land in the national parks, but they do not own the land they occupy or even have a leasehold interest in it. They are, in the words of the 1916 act which I read a few minutes ago, licensees or permittees. Under the law as it stands, title to their improvements is in the Government just as title to the land on which their improvements are placed is in the Government. Many lenders, therefore, refuse to make capital available to the concessioners, for they think they have inadequate security for their loans. It is this difficulty that the provision of H.R. 2091 I am speaking of seeks to overcome. Its importance, I am sure, is obvious to all.

As a corollary to the point I just made, the bill provides for compensation to a concessioner whenever he is deprived of the use of his facilities. Normally this compensation will be measured by the reconstruction cost of the improvement less depreciation, but the bill allows the Secretary to bargain for a different measure if that appears to be justifiable in the circumstances.

The proper measure of compensation was a matter of long discussion in our committee in both the 88th and the 89th Congresses. There were those who thought that it should be what is sometimes referred to as prudent investment with provision for amortization over a period of years. This idea was given careful consideration. The trouble with it is that, good though it may be from the standpoint of financing with borrowed capital, it does little to encourage that investment of equity capital which is also needed. Others thought that the standard should at all times be fair market value, but this also has its problems for, in many cases in our national parks, there is simply no market for an improvement in any normal sense of the word. In the end, therefore, we came back to what has been the usual formula over the years in park concession contracts—a formula which we believe is fair to both types of investor and to the public and the Government as well.

A third important feature of H.R. 2091 directs the Secretary of the Interior "to encourage continuity of operation and facilities and services in the renewal of contracts and permits and in the negotiation of new contracts or permits who have performed their obligations to the satisfaction of the Secretary." This provision is important to the National Park Service, to the concessioners, and to the public which both of them serve. Certainly the value of an experienced concessioner, familiar with the problems of the national park in which he operates, the policies of the National Park Service, and the needs and expectations of the public which visits his area cannot be overestimated. Continuity of service—as Members of the House well know from their own experience here—is a valuable asset in any walk of life. It is not something to be thrown away, as opponents of the bill would throw it away, if I understand them correctly, if someone else outbids an established concessioner and thus brings in a few dollars extra income to the Government.

In this connection, I want to point out one very important provision of the bill to which too little attention has been paid. It is the one which is found at the end of section 5 and which requires the Secretary, before he extends or renews any contract, to give "reasonable public notice of his intention to do so" and to "consider and evaluate all proposals received as a result thereof." Our committee received and acted on a suggestion last year that any concession bill should include such a provision and I want, here and now, to thank the Appropriations Committee members who interested themselves in this matter for making that suggestion to us. It was a most valuable suggestion. Though it does not go, and ought not to be construed as going, the whole way toward competitive bidding, and might be disastrous if it did, it will help to assure everyone that all factors are taken into account when old contracts are renewed or extended—the satisfactoriness of the existing concessioner's operations, the desirability of allowing him to continue them, the amount which he and those who are competing against him are willing to pay for the concession privilege, the amount of capital he and they are willing to invest to meet new needs, the prices he and they charge for services, and so on and on. The chance to bring knowledge of all these factors into focus and to weigh them against each other will be a great help to all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I could continue with details of the bill for a long time, but I want now to close with attention to three other aspects of the legislation that is before us. The first is that I understand an amendment will be offered relating to the auditing of concessioners' books by the General Accounting Office. Such an amendment is acceptable to me and I shall support it.

The second is my desire to assure all Members that this bill is not a hasty product and that it is not the product of doctrinaire thinking on the part of the 33 members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is the result of an honest attempt to get to the heart of a problem and to solve it as best we know how. It is, moreover, the product of many years of work—work that, in my case and the case of the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], goes back almost as long as we have been Members of this House. I can recall our discussions with the Department of the Interior in the early 1950's when some members of that Department had a very different notion from the committee on what concession policy should be and how facilities for visitors in the parks should be financed. I can recall hearings that we held in the early 1960's when, in reviewing a number of concession contracts we found that the Department was proposing to deviate from the policies that were agreed upon in 1951 between Secretary Chapman and the committee. I can recall the lengthy hearings we held during the 88th Congress on the predecessor to H.R. 2091 and, on one hand, the concessioners were asking for far more than we were willing to recommend they be given and, on the other hand, the General Accounting Office, going deep into realms of policy that belong to the Congress alone, was fighting for a position under which it would have been well-nigh impossible to attract capital into the national parks. And I can, of course, recall our further hearings this year as a result of which H.R. 2091 is being presented to the House today. I mention all this so that everyone may know that H.R. 2091 is not a hasty product, that it has been carefully considered, and that I consider it worthy of the support of every man here present.

A third matter I want to mention before I close is this: We must think of the concessioner as an integral part of our national park system. He is there to serve the public and he must be selected with this in mind. Our concern here in Congress must not be so fixed on the question of how much his franchise fees yield the Government that we lose sight of the needs of visitors to the parks. It is not dollars but service that we must keep our eyes on.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to some of the questions which have been propounded and advanced, I wish to explain our committee's position.

"Concessioners should not be extended an ownership interest in property within our national parks," it has been said by opponents of this bill.

Why not? What sort of an interest should they be extended if not a possessory interest? And what other sort of an interest will induce the capital that it takes to come into the field? These are the fundamental questions to which no one has supplied an answer as yet. It is all right to be critical at the term "possessory interest" but it would be better still to come up with some constructive approach that would take care of the problems that this concept is intended to take care of. This has not been done by the opponents.

"Any claim they—the concessioners—might have upon contract termination should be based on the unamortized book value of the facilities" rather than on reconstruction cost less depreciation. This states another objection that has been made to the bill.

The question that this objection raises is, again, whether the unamortized book value formula will induce capital to take over a job that the Government is not prepared to do. This formula may conceivably fit the case of borrowed money and give adequate protection to the lender. It will not fit the case when equity capital is involved as it is and as it ought to be in the area which we

are discussing. If the object of this proposal is to give a windfall to the Government or to a successor concessioner whenever a contract has run its course or is terminated, this is the way to do it. If the object is to get ready, reliable, reputable concessioners into the picture, it is not.

Moreover, let me point out three other things:

First. This is the formula that has generally been used by the National Park Service for years under the direction of and in agreement with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is not something new.

Second. The question of the proper formula to use in these cases was debated at length in the committee last year and, after much soul-searching and vigorous argument, the committee could come up with nothing better to fit the normal case.

Third. The use of the reconstruction-cost-less-depreciation formula is not mandatory. The bill—page 6, lines 16 and 17—specifically provides for its use only if it is not otherwise provided by agreement of the parties, meaning the Secretary of the Interior and the concessioner. Thus room is left for bargaining and for tailoring the formula to fit the situation on a case-by-case basis.

H.R. 2091 does not "disregard the potential benefits of promoting even a moderate degree of competition among existing and prospective concessioners." In the first place, it does not touch the award of initial contracts for concessioner services in the parks. The practice of the National Park Service has been to solicit publicly for offers when new concession areas are opened up and to negotiate the best contract they can. H.R. 2091 does not disturb this practice at all.

Second. All it does in the case of an existing concession contract is to give its holder a preferential—not an absolute—right to renewal. This is as it should be if the concessioner is doing a good job. Why should he be displaced by some unknown who has contributed nothing to the service of the public?

Third. H.R. 2091 requires, even in this situation, that the Secretary of the Interior give reasonable public notice of his intention to grant extensions or renewals of contracts and to "consider and evaluate all proposals received as a result thereof." This is not competitive bidding, in the true sense of business procedures, but it is competition.

It is completely wrong to say that "the bill in effect tells the Secretary of the Interior to set franchise fees by giving first consideration to the concessioner's interest" and that it "shows insufficient regard for the Government's interest and the need for protecting the public." The very language of section 3(d) of the bill says the contrary:

> Franchise fees * * * shall be determined upon consideration of the probable value to the concessioner of the privileges granted by the particular contract or permit involved.

How could it be said more clearly than this that the concessioner is to be required to pay for what he gets? Or again:

> Consideration of revenue to the United States shall be subordinated to the objectives of protecting and preserving the (park) areas and of providing adequate and appropriate services for visitors at reasonable rates.

How better than this can the public interest and the "need for protecting the public" be made clear?

But I do grant one thing to the argument of the opposition—it does not guarantee the Government the last dollar it might extract from every concessioner. To this I say that it ought not to do so. Protection of the parks themselves and the availability of proper and needed services to the visitors to the parks is much more important. And this is what the bill does.

Section 321 of the Economy Act provides:

> Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, the leasing of buildings and properties of the United States shall be for a money consideration only, and there shall not be included in the lease any provision for the alteration * * * or improvement of such buildings or properties as a part of the consideration for the rental to be paid for the use and occupation of the same.

For years an argument has been going on between the General Accounting Office and the Department of the Interior over whether this section is or is not applicable to Park Service concession contracts. There is no need at this time to get into the merits of the argument but I, for one, believe the Park Service has the better of it, since concession contracts do not normally involve any lease of buildings or properties and the concessioners do not normally pay rent as such. But whether this is right or wrong, the place to settle this argument between two agencies of Government is right here in the Congress. After all, we are the legislators and should establish such policy. H.R. 2091 will settle it, just as a little bill we had a few years ago—Public Law 87-608—settled the same sort of argument as far as repair and maintenance of the same buildings in park areas.

Why should we not have this sort of flexibility? Why should a concessioner who agrees to put in improvements—whether to a Government-owned building or otherwise—not have this taken into consideration when it comes to his franchise fees? Is this not a sensible, businesslike approach to the problems that come up? I think it is.

But it is said that this is subsidizing the concessioner and that, in the end, "the Government would have to pay to the concessioner virtually full reconstruction cost of the facilities if the contract were not renewed." This is not so. I have already pointed out that the question of how much the Government will pay for the concessioner's possessory interest, if and when his contract expires, is left to negotiation between the parties. The bill specifically provides for this. The Secretary is free both to require the concessioner to waive any possessory interest he might otherwise have in this sort of improvement and to adapt the valuation formula to suit the circumstance of such improvement as he sees fit. We cannot write these contracts here on the Hill but we can make it clear—as this record is making it clear—that there is no absolute right to the claim of possessory interest or to a claim of compensation for something that the Government has itself helped to finance.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend the passage of H.R. 2091.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my friend from Utah.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Is it not true that in the hearings held in the last session of Congress before our committee, concessionaire after concessionaire appeared before our committee to say it was almost impossible to obtain institutional financing for a facility to serve our constituents when they visit national parks, on land not owned and facilities in which they have no possessory interest and on a contract which might extend 4 or 5 years?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. If I had more time I could tell of a personal experience.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I should like to give my committee chairman an opportunity to respond.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. Of course, under the present situation the concessionaires cannot depend upon the future so that he can build to take care of the needs of the public.

I wish I had time to tell of what has happened at the Mesa Verde National Park, in the southwestern part of my district, where the militancy of youth and the willingness to gamble has made it possible for a young man 35 years of age, who has taken over the concession operation because of the death of his father, are permitting him—even driving him, in fact—to enter into a contract with the Park Service to serve the visitors to the park with newly constructed facilities.

If July and August of this year had been like June, he would have lost out, but July and August of this year have been good tourist months and he will be able to go through with his commitments at least for this year.

But, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, he has 20 or more years of such operations as this before he will be sure he can take care of his obligations, which are presently personal obligations and not obligations placed upon his concessionaire property.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. It is true that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs does not regard this bill as a bill which is going to protect the vested interest of any present concessionaire or future concessionaire. Do we not regard this as a bill which will enable concessionaires, present and future, to provide adequate facilities which will give us an opportunity to be proud of what is there when our people visit the national parks?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. I say once again that this

places the National Park Service and the concessionaires and the visitors all in their proper roles so far as enjoying the values to be found in these areas is concerned.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kansas for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, in general I am in agreement with the comments that you have made, but a couple of questions have come to my mind that I am concerned about, because, as you know, we have the Point Reyes National Seashore in the process of development in my district. I am concerned about the opportunity for congressional review and protection against abuse with respect to the policies that may be established by any Secretary of the Interior. Is there adequate opportunity to have his contractual arrangements reviewed by the committee or the Congress?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Under the circumstances, in the matter which had been brought to our attention by my friend from California, may I state that the monetary amount of the concessionaires gross would amount to $100,000 to come under the review provisions. It is automatic under the provisions of existing agreements and automatically comes before our committee if the amount is $100,000 annually. May I say that it has been the policy of the chairman of the committee, working with the ranking member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that we always send notice of prepared contracts to the Congressman representing the area in which the concessionaire's contract is to be enforced. So if we have any questions at all, we are right back to the Representative, that is, the Member of Congress, and can see that the questions are ironed out before the concessionaire's agreement is entered into by the Secretary.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I am always concerned when you are dealing in the field of monopoly about setting up something Congress itself has no opportunity to review, and I wanted that assurance.

Mr. ASPINALL. You have that assurance in our present modus operandi.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. We are all looking to maintaining the free enterprise concept. I am concerned about communities themselves that may be located not in or immediately contiguous to the national park but which generally serve that area. Are we going to be creating a problem for them by establishing new facilities which would, in effect, endanger their opportunity to continue their own enterprises?

Mr. ASPINALL. I do not think so. My thought is as soon as one gets out of the park area itself, he gets into a place where the operations of competitive free enterprise take over entirely.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I thank the gentleman. With those assurances from our very able chairman, I feel safe in adding my support to the legislation before us. I think it behooves us to improve the facilities and accommodations in our national parks as rapidly as possible. At the same time, we must be consistently vigilant in the protection of existing entrepreneurs, both in the parks and areas contiguous to the parks. As a matter of fact, we want to encourage opportunities for the communities affected by the establishment of national parks.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee [Mr. ASPINALL] some questions if I could.

I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that there is considerable need for improvement in the services that must be supplied by concessionaires to the public when they go to visit our national parks and national seashores. However, I do not believe that the policy need necessarily be uniform throughout all of our seashores. Certainly, with reference to the Cape Cod National Seashore, where we have a rather unique situation, this fact is true. The Cape Cod National Seashore stretches along 30 miles of beach. One of the concerns that confronted the Cape Codders as they pondered this park with relation to its shores was the impact on established motels, hotels, and camping sites. It is my recollection that as the seashore debate proceeded, both in the hearings and on the floor, those who were in the private sector furnishing these services to the visiting public were reassured that by and large the services of that sort would be provided within the private sector of our economy and not within the enclave at the seashore except as those enclaves were private properties which were incorporated into the seashore and in turn made available to the previous owners to continue their present use.

So we have in Cape Cod 30 miles of beach and backing it up 30 miles of private sector.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] has expired.

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

Mr. KEITH. My question is, with this preface, what arrangements are there to make certain that the private concessionaires on the outskirts of a public park of this sort will not find unfair competition by reason of those who enjoy the advantages of concessions within the park?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, my answer to that is that in that regard we do not do anything in this bill that does not presently exist. I do not know of any unfair competition, although I have heard of some criticism. But I do not know of any instances of unfair competition existing at the present time. This bill does not attempt to give the concessionaires within particular national areas any particular advantage over the nonnational areas existing adjacent thereto.

On the other hand, if the private enterprisers refuse to take care, or do not perform the services necessary for the operation of the national park facility, then, of course, the National Park Service would try to get somebody who does.

Mr. KEITH. There is an advantage which they do have by reason of the fact that they do not pay taxes for the services that are required by the concessionaire on the outskirts of the park.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think it should be plain here that the franchise fee, the flat fee as well as the percentage fee on gross income is supposed to make this equitable situation come into being. The only place, you might say, that we digress from that is where it is necessary to build further improvements and the fee is lessened a little bit. But the investment goes into the operation just the same.

As I understand the gentleman from Texas, this is one of his complaints about the bill, because we permit the person who invests inside of the national park areas to recoup under our formula in this bill which, by the way, is the formula that is in use at the present time.

Mr. KEITH. I think the GAO was concerned, and I am sure some of my constituents were concerned, that the arrangements that might be made within the park would give a preferential advantage to the people who are operating those concessions as contrasted to those on the outskirts.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, let me ask my friend another question. Does my friend have any instance so far in this particular facility where this unfairness has come into being because if he has, he has not brought it to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's question. The Cape Cod Seashore is just in its infant state. The gentleman states that prior to a concession being approved it is customary to advise the Congressman from the district?

Mr. ASPINALL. Not only customary, it is regular, provided the gross returns were over $100,000.

Mr. KEITH. Oh, I see. I do not know what the gross returns are for the two concessions we have now within the seashore. But I do know that I was not advised. I am not positive that I should be advised, because I would not want to think that this man's right to a concession would depend upon any approval on my part or on any assistance on my part.

Mr. ASPINALL. This is not the purpose of the procedure that we use. All we try to do is to see that the Congressman knows what is going on and that the procedures established by law are applied to everybody. That is all we do. There is to be no political stress placed upon any of these operations. If there were, we would all be in trouble.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that there are four concessions within the seashore currently and

they are paying a modest fee for the privilege of conducting their business within a national park. If this practice is expanded it seems to me, in the case of the Nation's seashores, it would be providing services which could be more readily and more profitably and in effect more efficiently provided to the public outside of the park—within the private sector of our economy. And, if the gentleman can recall the debate and the legislative history on this, I would appreciate the gentleman's comment as to whether or not it is not his recollection that by and large we expected the services of this sort would be provided by the private sector insofar as Cape Cod is concerned?

Mr. ASPINALL. Wherever it can be done; that is correct.

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

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

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I noticed that the legislation pending before us affects only the National Park Service. I have also within the congressional district which it is my honor to represent some U.S. property which is managed by the Army Engineers, namely, the Cape Cod Canal and the land along its banks. There are concessions here which have the same problem with which we are faced within the Park Service.

Mr. Chairman, I wondered what is the policy which the Engineers follow with reference to the same kind of problem, and is there any attempt to correlate their operations with yours?

Mr. ASPINALL. If my friend will yield again, insofar as I know there has been no suggestion of this kind made to the committee which handles this bill. The committee which handles this bill has no jurisdiction over the Army Engineers. We have endeavored to coordinate the activities under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and in accordance with the recreation formula which we have brought out. But, as far as concessions are concerned, that is a matter for the other committee and so far as I know they have not brought it up. That is the Committee on Public Works.

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

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

Mr. BROOKS. If I might try and clarify my position, one of my objections and one of the objections of the Committee on Government Operations to this legislation is that it represents a piecemeal solution to a problem that is faced governmentwide. There is no uniformity now in the policy concerning concessioners in the Corps of Engineers' properties, or in the national forests or in the national parks. This legislation deals with the national parks. There has been a determined effort on behalf of many people in Government to obtain a uniform policy which would take into consideration concessioner problems and other problems.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] 1 minute.

Mr. BROOKS. On the basis of this problem with reference to uniformity the Congress should enact comprehensive legislation that provides a uniform policy.

The Bureau of the Budget is now exploring this thorny problem. In their letter of July 22, 1965, the Bureau of the Budget said:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing with regard to your letter of June 24, 1965, to the President, previously acknowledged by Mr. O'Brien, in which you discuss H.R. 2091 on concession policies in areas administered by the National Park Service.

We note that you have advised the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of your concern.

The Secretary of the Interior in reporting on the bill to the latter committee on May 14, 1965, said, in part:

"We believe that legislative consideration of national park concession policy is very timely, in light of the positions taken by the various congressional committees. We recognize fully the legitimate concern of each committee involved, and we believe it is appropriate to have a policy reduced to a legislative directive at this time. We recommend enactment of the bill if amended as suggested herein. However, we wish to call the committee's attention to the fact that the administration may wish to make recommendations at a later date for the consideration of the Congress with respect to concession policies generally throughout the Government.

* * * * *

"The Bureau of the Budget advises that while there would be no objection to the presentation of this report to the committee, the Bureau points out that should an overall policy be developed for the management of concessions generally throughout the Government, the provisions of H.R. 2091 would have to be reconsidered in the light of that policy."

We would expect that such a study might lead to the submission of recommendations for appropriate legislation, either in an omnibus bill on a Government-wide basis, or in a series of bills for the agencies concerned.

Sincerely,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Deputy Director.

This, as far as I know, is the problem about uniformity, to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to advise further with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

We agree that the Budget Bureau's proposal for an over-all study of concession policies is good and we will be glad to assist in it. But this is an idea that has been kicking around for at least 10 years and nothing has happened yet and there is no guarantee that anything is going to happen or that what happens will meet with approval here on the Hill.

A study running all the way from the barber shop concession in the Pentagon to the hotel concession in Mount McKinley National Park is going to run into such a variety of problems and such a diversity of local situations that it cannot possibly come up with any single, all-embracing formula that is applicable at all times and in all places.

Let the study be made but, in the meantime, let us not hold up what progress has been made in this corner of the field—that is, the national parks corner of the field. The need for clarification is too great and the problems to be handled under H.R. 2091 have been hanging fire much too long to be delayed any longer.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, as the author of this bill I urge my colleagues to approve it because it is a good bill.

The Committee on Interior Affairs of the House is not known for its sloppy or incomplete consideration of measures. This bill was considered both in this Congress and the last Congress. Every objection that the gentleman from Texas has made here today was heard by our committee, and when the vote was taken on reporting the bill there was not a single vote against it. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], the gentleman from Kansas, the gentleman from Utah, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS], and other committee members are people who believe just as strongly in the public interest, who are just as opposed to unfair arrangements with private concessionaires as anyone on the Committee on Government Operations. This bill has had careful consideration.

What is the problem? We have a great system of national parks. There are 191 areas that are administered by the Park Service, 31 national parks, 80 monuments, 3 seashores, battlefields, and so on. Since 1916, when we established this park system we have had two conflicting goals. On the one hand, we want to preserve all the scenic and natural wonders for posterity and for ourselves; on the other hand we want to make them reasonable accessible to visitors, and have the visitors provided services when they get there. Sometimes these two goals conflict. So what do we do?

You can do one of three things: You can have the Government run them, and there have been suggestions in the past that the Government run it, with Government ownership. Certainly, while they do not say it, and they do not mean it, this would be the result if we do not get sound policies where a private enterprise man can survive.

You can have open competition, which they seem to hint, and have billboards and have more and more of the park land taken up by hotels and curio shops, which will be the result if you open it up to wide-open competiton, you can have the present concessionaire policy, which this bill ratifies, in which you have a reasonable, workable, moderate conces-

sionaire policy. This bill does not prohibit competition. It says the Secretary can, if the public interest requires it, have a one-concessionaire park, or a one-concessionaire operation. The policies in this bill are the policies now, and they have been the policies for years. We have had the policies in every administration. This bill would simply put these policies into statutory form. These policies were recommended by the ORRC Commission appointed in the Eisenhower administration, headed by Mr. Laurence Rockefeller.

It is true that under the present setup sometimes a park concessionaire has some advantage. He does have a building on Government property, he does have the right to use a national park area to make a profit. There is nothing wrong with profits in our country if they are reasonable profits, if they are not made at the unfair advantage of the Government or someone else.

Here is the crux of the need for this legislation, and let us lay it right on the table, because the gentleman from Texas does not give us any solutions, he just gives objections. In the units of the Park Service last year 110 million people came to visit. In just one National park in the State of the chairman of our committee, in Colorado, more people will visit this year than all the American tourists going to Europe. We need more and more facilities, more and more hotels, we need restaurants, we need campgrounds, we need barber shops, horseback riding, and all of these things. So the National Park Service goes to the concessionaire and he says "Under your contract you have to provide more service. We need 200 more rooms in your hotel, or out you go."

The fellow goes down to the bank and says, "I need a million dollars to use in my operation in the park." The banker says, "Of course you can give me a mortgage." And the fellow says, "No, I do not own the land. My building is on Government land."

"Well, you have a contract, do you not? You can use that as security, can you not?"

The fellow says, "Yes, it has 12 years to run or 15 or 18 or 3 or whatever it may be."

Then the banker says, "Well, can this contract be canceled?"

And the fellow says, "Oh, yes, it can be canceled at any time if I do not provide a satisfactory service or if the park service decides that they do not want it there any longer."

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. Then the banker might say, "Well, if they cancel you out and remove the operation from the park, can you get your money from this facility or hotel that we are going to put in."

The answer would be, "Well, maybe I can get it and maybe I cannot. It depends on the policy of the current Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Interior who may be there at the time."

So these people of whom we are demanding more and more facilities find that they cannot get the equity capital or the loan capital to do the job. The heart of this bill is the thing that the gentleman from Texas complained about—the possessory interest and saying that we are really doing an outrageous thing in this bill when we say that when a businessman goes in and builds a facility in a national park, he has a possessory interest in it. That Uncle Sam is not going to throw him out and take his property without compensation, and we will give him some protection of his interest in the property—and we are told that this is an outrageous thing to do. You can go to Las Vegas and build a gambling casino and find all sorts of bankers to lend you money. But because of the peculiar problems of the National Park Service and our desire to keep these areas for future generations, we have written laws and written regulations that make it impossible for a man to give us adequate service and have adequate security in his investment in these national park areas. This bill would go a long way to correct this situation and the public interest would be adequately protected, I can assure you.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the Smoky Mountain National Park which is not remote, the Government has never established housing concessions since the public is served by privately owned facilities at Gatlinburg and Cherokee and other nearby places. Is there anything in this legislation which changes that policy of not establishing housing concessions in the Smoky Mountain National Park and in similar parks?

Mr. UDALL. Not at all.

Let me comment on this important point. It has never been the National Park policy or the policy of any administration to try to jam as many concessions as possible in a park. The idea has always been to have as few as are really needed to serve the public. Where you have a long strip as you have in the Blue Ridge Parkway and the Great Smoky Mountains which is only 10, 20, or 30 miles wide with all kinds of tourists and visitors who may go in, but they are usually within 10 miles on either side, of a community where private services are available. This bill does not change that policy. It is only in remote areas like Yellowstone Park and Grand Canyon 100 miles away from facilities that we really have to have concessionaires in order to serve the public interest and traveler.

Mr. TAYLOR. I agree fully with the gentleman's statement. Let me say that I supported this bill in committee and I am glad to support it here in the House today.

Housing facilities are not needed in the Smoky Mountain National Park, but in many parks many concession facilities must be constructed during the next few years to satisfy the great public demand.

This can be done by the Government at Government expense or it can be done by private enterprise through concession contracts with the Government.

I favor the private enterprise approach. In order for private enterprise to do the job that needs to be done, this legislation should be enacted.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman.

Let me say I wish I had the time to take up each one of the objections made by the gentleman from Texas.

Let me say to my friends, we went into each and every one of them. We heard testimony in this Congress and in the last Congress and there was not a vote in our committee against this legislation when the vote came to reporting it.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. I just want to say this. I have gone to many national parks and wherever possible I have stayed outside the parks because of the deplorable conditions and the service inside the park, some of which conditions were due to the contractural relationships that you mentioned but some were due to the monopolistic situation on which you had no choice if you were in the park.

It seems to me that the problem of investment could be pretty much taken care of by a negotiated contract. Certainly if someone spends money to build accommodations, we can work out a formula for preserving the property interest and taking care of it. I do not know that we need the proposed legislation to do it.

Mr. UDALL. I do not know what parks the gentleman has been in or in what respect the Service failed. But it has failed in many parks because the concessionaire is under contract to provide many of these services—some profitable and some not. Thousands more visitors are pouring in upon him, and he cannot get the necessary money to improve his services where he wants to. He is caught in a bind. The bill would correct that situation and give the gentleman the kind of service he desires.

Mr. SKUBITZ. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I wish to ask the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] a question. I was glad to hear the gentleman's remarks about the Great Smoky Mountain National Park. I represent a district that borders on a portion of the park. I would like to know who would make the decision as to whether service outside the park was adequate or inadequate?

Mr. UDALL. That kind of decision has always been made by the National Park Service, which is a professional career organization. Their guidelines have been the policy that the national park areas should be preserved, and that we should not use those areas for facilities except where they are needed for the convenience of the public, and, to the greatest extent possible, the policy has been to let the traveling public get their services outside the park.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. We do not have commercial firms inside the park and do not want them. Would the

National Park Service continue to make decisions in respect to whether service outside the park is adequate or inadequate?

Mr. UDALL. Oh, yes. They have the authority to decide to what extent the traveling public needs services within the park.

Mr. SKUBITZ. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could have the attention of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]?

The gentleman from Arizona and I have discussed this question in depth on the floor of the House informally. Could the gentleman give me the assurance that in relation to Point Reyes National Seashore and the King's Range Conservation Area contemplated in my area the existing philosophy will not be altered, and we shall do everything we can to enhance private sector development in the parks and, further, we shall not disturb the private sector opportunities in areas contiguous to the parks?

Mr. UDALL. I have no authority to speak for the National Park Service. I believe I can speak for the intent of my bill. There is no intention on my part, as author of the bill, or the committee which approved it, to change that policy in any way. That has been the policy followed by the National Park Service.

Mr. SKUBITZ. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Colorado a question. Have I overlooked, in the bill, authority for the General Accounting Office to go into the books and records of the concessionaires?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in my opening statement I suggested that I had an amendment which I would offer. I have it here on my desk and I shall offer it. The amendment provides for the General Accounting Office to examine the books and records.

Mr. GROSS. I notice that the General Accounting Office made an issue of the fact that it had been written out of this legislation, and a letter to that effect is made a part of the report accompanying the bill. I would certainly want the GAO to have authority to inspect books and records as it has with other agencies and departments.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Some of us understood that the operation involved was just about the same as that of any other Government operation. The General Accounting Office, as the arm of the legislative branch of the Government, under the amendment could come in and examine the books. They did not think under the general law that they had the authority so we drew up an amendment. That was after we went before the Rules Committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to reply to my distinguished and able friend [Mr. UDALL], who mentioned me and was worrying about the concessionaires.

When we worry about how long these people can survive, how difficult their lives are, I want to read a couple of little examples of initial contract dates of concessionaires now serving in the national parks.

I do not want to be unkind, but I want to be factual. This is from their hearings, at page 151.

Here is one at the Acadia National Park. The initial contract date is January 1, 1933.

The National Park Concessions, Inc., at Mammouth Cave National Park, have an initial contract date of January 1, 1942.

The initial contract date at Cedar Breaks National Monument is January 1, 1930.

These people have been worried all this time, and some of them were worried before I was born.

Here is one who started worrying—the Crater Lake National Park—and sweating it out in 1912. They are still getting by with the lodgings, meals, transportation, service station, souvenirs et cetera.

There is another group at the Grand Canyon National Park. I do not know these people, but I want to give you an example of the rough life these boys and girls and their in-laws and grandchildren have in these concessions.

This is one that started out January 1, 1921, about a year before I arrived in this world. It is called the Babbitt Bros. Trading Co. They may be fine people. I do not know them.

Among the officers listed are: E. D. Babbitt, president and director; Paul J. Babbitt, vice president and director; Ralph Bilby, vice president and director; G. W. Jakle, Jr., vice president and director—I do not know whether they are in-laws—R. G. Babbitt, Jr., secretary-general manager, director; John G. Babbitt, treasurer and director; James B. Babbitt, director; and Joseph R. Babbitt, Sr., director.

Since 1921 they have been right there getting along with Secretaries of the Interior just like they were all brothers-in-law.

I just want to point out that it does not look to me like it is such a risky business. If it is not, why should we not let the Hot Shoppes or the Howard Johnsons or other professional caterers go in there and give the American people decent food at prices they can pay, when they haul the children in an unair-conditioned car 1,500 miles from east Texas way out to the Midwest?

There are a couple of other points I wish to make. I do not have too much time, but I will yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] before I finish.

With respect to the concessioner possessory right, I should like to refer to the Federal Power Act. This provides for licensing power facilities. Huge investments often are made in constructing these facilities and providing equipment. Upon the expiration of the license the Government is authorized to take over the facilities. If it does not renew the license and takes the property, the Government must pay an amount equal to the net investment in the property. The net investment is defined in the Federal Power Act as "actual legitimate original cost less unappropriated surplus, accumulated depreciation, and amortization reserve, if any."

In other words, the Government, on a big power installation, must pay the unamortized book value less a few other deductions. The licensee of such power facilities is not given any possessory right, nor is he paid for the reconstruction costs at the time of the taking.

There is one other point I should like to cover.

In considering appropriations for the Department of the Interior in 1964 the House Committee on Appropriations, a body which looks after these funds carefully, reported that park concessioners—these folks whom we are talking about, who have a little trouble, as surely everybody who is in business has problems—received $48.8 million in gross receipts in 1961. I do not have the figures since then. Of this amount in that year they paid to the Government $660,000 in franchise fees. That is about 1.35 percent of the total gross receipts of their concession operations. In other words, the Government provides the site, builds the roads, does the advertising, builds them up, provides guards and guides and all sorts of operations, and then for a monopoly franchise they pay 1.35 percent of their gross receipts—or did in the year 1961.

In at least one instance subconcession contract commissions received by the prime concessionnaire totaled $448,000 while the prime contractor paid the Government only $16,500 in franchise fees on the same sales. A pretty good markup.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I would like the gentleman from Texas to discuss this valuation of the possessory interest. It appears to me when we refer to reconstruction costs less depreciation as the measure of value of the possessory interest, we could get into trouble. For example, if a building were constructed 20 years ago at a cost of $300,000 and it were completely depreciated and written off the concessionnaire's books, but if today because of price rises it would cost $600,000 to reproduce the building, would not this be a windfall to the concessionnaire if the Secretary decided to terminate his contract?

Mr. BROOKS. It certainly would, and at the cost to every one of the 195 million people in this country who want to go out and participate in the benefits of our great national parks. You are exactly right.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. The original cost might be $300,000 and 20 years later it might cost $600,000 to build it. He may have depreciated every single dollar of it and have it on the books for nothing. Yet for another concessionaire to come

in under this legislation, the Government will be required to recoup for that concessionaire his reconstruction cost minus the physical depreciation, which might be 10 or possibly 20 percent.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I do not want to take up as much time as would be necessary to answer the last point, but the gentleman made one point in saying here that some of these concessionaires had been there for 30 or 40 years.

Mr. BROOKS. For 50 years.

Mr. UDALL. Does the gentleman think that we ought to change them every year or every 2 years or throw them out, or does he think that there is some value in continuity?

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, I do not think they ought to change them every month or so, but I do think that they should open them up and give the people a chance to compete with them. I want competition for these things just as we have competition in Congress. These contracts that they have now run for 20 or 30 years and sometimes 10 or 15 years. There is nothing wrong with a long-term contract, but why do you want to lock it in and give the Secretary of the Interior this right? I will read you the legislation. It is disgraceful. You do not have to do this in order to protect these people. It says on page 5:

> To this end, the Secretary, at any time in his discretion, may extend or renew a contract or permit, or may grant a new contract or permit to the same concessioner upon the termination or surrender before expiration of a prior contract or permit.

They can come in and renew before anybody else knows it is coming up for bid.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. I know he wants to be fair. This is the present practice.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes. And I think it is reprehensible.

Mr. ASPINALL. We go ahead and limit this authority by asking and demanding that notice be published so that anybody can come in and make their position known.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, if they have to pay reconstruction costs minus physical depreciation, there is no benefit to anyone, because you cannot possibly compete against those odds.

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague will yield further here, if there is any value to it, it is because the concessionaire has given the service that he has seen fit to render. Nobody else can offer these services until he has a permit, license, or lease. He has built up the park services. If he has not been giving satisfactory services, his facilities would be of little value.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, why would it not be wise and more in the public interest to give these people only their unamortized book value?

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. RONCALIO. The answer to that, I would like to submit, is that the rules of law for condemnation of private property are that it should not be depreciated to a concessionaire in the park any more than in some city. In a court of law, in determining the value of property, certainly the reproduction cost of the property is a factor. Why jeopardize the rights of the concessionaire because you say that he does not have a right to have reproduction cost considered, when you are going to terminate his contract?

Mr. BROOKS. Even if his property has been depreciated, every dollar of it has been depreciated?

Mr. RONCALIO. That is the free enterprise system that you are attacking, the rule of depreciation.

Mr. BROOKS. But there is no competition in this alleged free enterprise system that the gentleman talks about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, while this colloquy is going on, that we in the Committee on Government Operations—and I speak at the suggestion of our distinguished and able chairman, BILL DAWSON of Chicago—have the highest regard for WAYNE ASPINALL, the gentleman from Colorado, who has worked long and faithfully on his committee and is highly respected and well loved by us on our committee and by the Congress. I must say that he has been gracious in hearing our complaints and our suggestions and our objections. But I have to be candid and say that he has not paid much attention to us other than being gracious and kind and thoughtful and considerate.

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

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. So that I may return the compliment. It has been a pleasure to serve with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] and with the distinguished chairman of the Government Operations Committee [Mr. DAWSON]. They have always been open and aboveboard in every respect in their relations with our committee. They have been as cooperative as anybody possibly could be. I said in my opening statement that here seemed to be a matter which we could not resolve unless we brought it to the floor. We in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs think that we are right. They, in the Committee on Government Operations, think that they are right. May I say that it is a distinct pleasure on the part of our committee to know that we have this Oversight Committee working as it does and paying attention to its responsibilities.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. In the context of the discussion of reconstruction cost less depreciation, I want to point out——

Mr. BROOKS. Physical depreciation only.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I am talking about the discussion had with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Texas about reconstruction cost less depreciation. That is for the purpose of evaluating these properties, perhaps at the termination of the contract.

The language in the bill says in line 22, "but not to exceed fair market value." You can talk about the windfalls, but does not the gentleman think that this is modifying language to do away with any unconscionable windfall?

Mr. BROOKS. To my distinguished friend I would say that any windfall is unconscionable and undesirable, in my opinion. As to fair market value, let us take the example that we used a few moments ago. The cost 20 years ago was $300,000. It would cost $600,000 to construct it now. The fair market value might be $500,000, $600,000—either one would be unconscionable from the standpoint of the Government, if another concessionaire had to pay that $600,000, which might be the fair market value or reconstruction cost, and then compete with them on services, when the original builder has depreciated that property, starting at $300,000 over the 20-year period to $2 on his books, taking it off his tax return.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. Here is the nub of the question. Let us say that I build a $1 million hotel inside a park.

Mr. BROOKS. Does the gentleman want to use the same example we have been using?

Mr. UDALL. This is the same example. You build a hotel outside the park. Both were built 30 years ago. Both cost the same amount of money. We have each taken care of our hotel.

Mr. BROOKS. Both have franchises from the Government?

Mr. UDALL. No. Yours is free enterprise and I am inside the park. At the end of 30 years my hotel is worth $2 million, because I have taken good care of it. Yours is worth $2 million. They are building a superhighway that wipes out one of these hotels. You want $2 million fair compensation. The National Park Service says that they do not want me in the park and that I should get out. You say that they should give me nothing.

Mr. BROOKS. Give you nothing, or give you the unamortized book value, because you have had 20 years to profit out of it. And you did not go in there as a public service.

Mr. UDALL. Under my example, we would both be amortized. We have both been fully amortized. The gentleman talks about a windfall. This situation is a windfall for the Government, taking advantage of my situation.

Mr. BROOKS. There is quite a bit of difference between being inside of the park and operating a hamburger stand or a hotdog stand outside and all of a sudden finding a change in highways, or in zoning requirements. Inside of a national park you have got the U.S. Government promoting business and getting new customers for you every day and providing services, such as roads, and advertising your place, in a general aura of encouragement for people to come inside of that park.

Mr. UDALL. And, you also have the U.S. Government coming in there saying what rates you can charge, what signs you can put up, what months of the year during which you can stay open, and everything else.

Mr. BROOKS. You do not think the Secretary would be unfair?

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

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished and able chairman of the Interior Committee [Mr. ASPINALL] and the able Congressman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] have given you an excellent analysis of the bill. They have explained why this legislation is necessary.

Anything that I might say would in a sense be repetitious, so to conserve the time of this committee—I shall be very brief.

When this bill was before our committee last year, I had certain reservations with respect to certain provisions of it. But after further study and a better understanding of the problems involved and the goals we seek to attain, I have revised my thinking.

This is a good bill, and I support it.

Basically, the problems we are faced with today are the ever-increasing uses that are being made of our national parks facilities.

As our population increases and as people have more leisure time, more of them are visiting our national parks. They are demanding more places to eat, more places to sleep, more places to stay, more places to see. Hence, the question: How shall these requirements be met?

Long ago we established the policy that private enterprise—under contract with the National Park Service—should provide these services—and not the Federal Government. But—if private enterprise is to provide the facilities—and the services required to accommodate the ever-increasing number of park visitors, it must have some assurance that it will not have the rug pulled out from under it. It must be able to negotiate loans. To provide facilities—takes money. Business must be in a position to secure capital. To do this—it must meet the demands of capital.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, in its report to Congress, stated:

> A clear statement of Federal policy toward the concession system is badly needed. Such a system should set forth the role of the concessionaires in a national recreation program as precisely and forthrightly as possible—the goal should be to rewrite the agreements in terms that would fully protect the public interest, but which would be more reassuring to the prospective investors and leaders.

That is what your committee has attempted to do. For the past half century, the National Park Service has developed policies to carry out this intent.

These policies have been approved by the Department, affirmed and reaffirmed by the Committee on Public Lands of the House and by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

What we are doing here today is providing in statutory form a clear statement of the policy and authority that the Secretary of the Interior shall follow, in administering concessions within the National Park System, and in contracting for services provided by the concessioners.

If this body in its wisdom passes this bill today—

First. We affirm the policy—that—in the development of facilities in our national parks, the Secretary of the Interior shall encourage private enterprise to provide them.

Second. We recognize that concessioners have a "possessory interest" in any structure, fixture or improvement which they provide with the approval of course of the Secretary—on land owned by the United States within the National Park System.

Third. The "possessory interest" is an interest in the physical structure and is separate and apart from a right to do business.

Fourth. It does not terminate upon the termination of the concession contract.

Fifth. We recognize that compensation must be paid for the "possessory interest" if it is taken by the Government for its own use—unless otherwise agreed: "The compensation to be equal to the sound value of the structure or improvement at the time of taking based on reconstruction cost less depreciation but not to exceed the fair market value." Note: Usually no market value if the concessioner has no right to do business.

Sixth. We encourage private persons or corporations to provide and operate facilities by providing that the Secretary may include in contracts, such terms and conditions to assure the concessioner of adequate protection against loss of investment—but not against loss of anticipated profits. If such loss is the result of some discretionary act, change in policy or a decision of the Secretary occurring after the contract became effective.

Seventh. Another important policy development is the granting of a contract to one principal concessioner and requiring him to provide a balanced service. Too often, if more than one concessioner is present, each wants to provide the profitable services, neither the unprofitable. Under section 4, the Secretary may authorize the operation of all accommodations and facilities in each area by one responsible concessioner and may grant him a preferential right to provide new accommodations.

Eighth. We recognize that good service is usually related to continuity of operations. The operation of facilities within a park is seasonal in nature. A company must be able to keep its key personnel. This cannot be done unless there is a central charge in management. These are specialized businesses calling for special knowledge and understanding of Government operations.

This bill provides that the Secretary shall encourage continuity of operation by giving preference in the renewal of contracts to those who have performed satisfactorily.

However, by granting an extension, the Secretary must give reasonable public notice of his intention to do so and consider and evaluate all new proposals.

Section 1 of the bill states that Congress recognizes that public accommodations or services to be provided in the national park system should be carefully controlled, and limited, to those accommodations and services needed for the public use and enjoyment of the areas consistent with the preservation and conservation of the areas.

Section 2 provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall encourage and enable private persons and corporations to provide and operate facilities and services desirable for the accommodation of visitors in these areas.

Section 3(a) authorizes the Secretary to include in contracts providing for facilities and services such terms or conditions required to assure the concessioner adequate protection against loss of his investment, but not the loss of anticipated profits resulting from the discretionary acts, policies, or decisions of the Secretary which may occur after a contract has been entered into.

Subsection (b) requires the Secretary to exercise his authority in such a manner to allow the concessioner a reasonable opportunity to earn a profit on his whole operation, considering the capital invested and the obligations assumed.

Subsection (c) provides the basis on which the reasonableness of a concessioner's rates and charges to the public shall be judged, comparing the rates and charges for like facilities and services outside national park areas and taking into consideration any differences such as length of season, peakloads, occupancy, accessibility, and availability and other factors.

Subsection (d) sets forth the manner in which the Secretary shall determine franchise fees and reconsideration of the same at least every 5 years unless the contract be for a lesser period of time.

Section 4 allows the Secretary to vest in a sole concessioner, the operation of all facilities and services in an area or portion thereof, and further permits the Secretary to grant to such concessioner a preferential right to provide new or additional services, and so forth, if necessary for the convenience of the public. This section also gives the Secretary discretion in extending, renewing, or entering new contracts with present nonpreference concessioners.

Section 5 directs the Secretary, to encourage continuity of operation by giving a preference to those concessioners satisfactorily providing the facilities and services in the renewal of contracts or permits. This section also provides that the Secretary in his discretion may extend or renew a contract or permit, grant a new contract or permit to the same

concessioner upon termination, surrender or expiration of a prior contract or permit, provided that before so doing the Secretary must give reasonable public notice of that intention, and he then must consider and evaluate all proposals received as a result of such notice.

Section 6 grants a "possessory interest" to a concessioner who has acquired or constructed, heretofore or hereafter, any structure, fixture, or improvement with the approval of the Secretary on land owned by the United States within the national park system, recognizing the legal title to the same to be in the United States while providing that such possessory interest may be assigned, transferred, or encumbered by the concessioner. The possessory interest so granted by the Secretary is an interest in the physical structure with all incidents of ownership except legal title which may not be taken for public use without just compensation.

Section 7 of the bill states that the provisions of section 321 of the act of June 30, 1932, the Economy Act—47 Stat. 412; 40 U.S.C. 303(b)—is not applicable to privilege, leases, permits and concession contracts in areas administered by the National Park Service.

Section 8 amends subsection (h) of section 2 of the act of August 21, 1935—49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 462(h)—to conform with this bill, H.R. 2091, by amending the language which required competitive bidding.

Section 9 requires each concessioner to keep records prescribed by the Secretary and permit access thereto by the Secretary or his duly authorized representative to determine that all terms of the concession contract have been performed.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation, has passed the careful and deliberate scrutiny of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and its Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation. The bill, H.R. 2091, is very similar to H.R. 5886 on which the committee held extensive hearings during the 88th Congress. H.R. 2091 is an attempt to improve upon the previous legislation considered by this body.

In speaking to the necessity and desirability of this legislation, I should like to refer my colleagues to the committee report on H.R. 2091. On page 7, paragraph 2, of this report the Department charged with the primary responsibility of operating our national park system has stated, after recognizing the legitimate concern of the various Congressional committees of the Congress regarding concession policies, "we believe it is appropriate to have a policy reduced to a legislative directive at this time."

And, in speaking of the timeliness of this legislation, I should like to point out to my colleagues that although concession policies have been under consideration by the Congress for several years, at the present time the National Park Service has only a few long-term contracts in effect and has 19 concessioners operating on 1-year extensions, and three additional contracts will terminate on December 31, 1965.

The long history of the policies and practices as stated in the departmental report of the committee report points out more fully the necessity and desirability of reducing the concession policies and practices to a statutory form.

But more than this, I wish to remind my colleagues that we as the Congress have created the national park system for the fundamental purposes of conserving the natural and historic beauty of our Nation for the public use and enjoyment and to be left unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations. It is, therefore, our responsibility to see that this system is properly administered.

This responsibility and the need for legislation of this kind is growing year by year. Since World War II, the number of visitors to our national parks has steadily increased. In 1964 it reached an alltime high. More than 102 million visitors were attracted to the various national parks. Twenty-nine of these areas, excluding the Capital National Parks, attracted more than 1 million visitors. Another 22 such areas attracted between 500,000 to 1 million visitors each.

Enactment of H.R. 2091 will be a step forward in meeting our responsibility. I think this is a good bill. It is a sound bill. I urge its passage.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the work of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] and also I wish at this time to commend the work of the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] who has worked diligently on this legislation for a long time, and also the services of Mr. Kyl of Iowa, who gave his services in the 88th Congress on behalf of this legislation.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, H.R. 2091. As former chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Outdoor Recreation, may I say we conducted hearings on this legislation in the last session of the Congress, and reported the bill favorably to the House, but were unable because of the lateness of the session to bring the bill to the floor for consideration.

I heard all the arguments presented very ably by my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] while this legislation was being considered in the last session of Congress. The subcommittee went into each and every one of those thoroughly, we explored every possibility and every question that has been raised about this legislation, and came to the conclusion, the same conclusion that the committee has come to in this session of the Congress; namely, that this is a good bill, it is in the national interest, it is essential if we are going to provide these services, and this bill should be passed.

Mr. ASPINALL. I commend the gentleman for his services rendered in the 88th Congress on behalf of this legislation. It was through his efforts this year, as well as other members of the committee, that permitted us to get the bill before the Congress, and I am glad for the legislation.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join in the remarks made by those who are for this bill, also the remarks of the gentleman from California and the remarks made by our wonderful chairman, the gentleman from Colorado, and I thank them for bringing this legislation to the floor of the House today for consideration. I feel, as does the gentleman from New Mexico, that service to the public in the national parks requires that we pass this legislation. I therefore wholeheartedly support this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. RONCALIO].

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to associate myself with the remarks and the position of my chairman, the eminent gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and to urge in other words upon my colleagues the passage of H.R. 2091.

This is a matter of more than normal concern to my district—the State of Wyoming—in which there are located two of the largest national parks, both in area and in numbers served, of our Nation.

I am not altogether sure that H.R. 2091 is the ultimate answer for improving the tourist facilities in Yellowstone National Park, but it would seem if we are to protect what is good about tourist facilities today, and hope to improve them, surely the passage of this act is better than its alternative which is a continuation of an uncertain and entirely unsatisfactory present situation.

I would answer the gentleman from Texas, insofar as the objections he finds in H.R. 2091, by merely indicating that any compensatory features of this act following termination of a lease, are based on the accepted rules of law for the compensation of private property dedicated to public use. Certainly no concessionaire should pay a penalty for being in the national park, when his property is taken, nor should he be discriminated against in comparison to the concessionaire in the jungle of free enterprise which borders most national parks, particularly in the seashore areas.

This bill does not give concessionaires an exclusive right in any national park; that right, when one enjoys it, is granted as a contractual fact by the Secretary of the Interior. This has been the policy for several generations. It is my hope, in the case of Yellowstone National Park and other parks of this kind, that perhaps in the course of the next few years the existing concessionaire may, with the benefit of H.R. 2091, triple and quadruple the accommodations and facilities, so that it will no longer appear to be the mobbed hodgepodge of automobiles in the various tourist sectors that it now is.

Certainly these matters left in the sound discretion of the Secretary of Interior are undisturbed in this bill. On

the other hand, it does provide some security in the form of a possessory right upon which there can be long range planning for modernization of the facilities, so sorely in need of improvement now in many of the Nation's parks.

In short, I believe this is good legislation and I am happy to support it. The objections I have heard on the floor today are certainly not valid to defeat this bill and I hope my colleagues will join me in voting its passage.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to say that I am in support of this legislation, having four very fine national park facilities in my congressional district, being a member of the Subcommittee on National Parks and also the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and having had 5 years of experience working on this piece of legislation.

I want to say that one of these parks in my district is one of the largest parks in the national park system, the Yosemite National Park. The concessionaires there depend on their contract and for a good many years have rendered a very fine service to the people who visit Yosemite National Park. Since I have been a Representative of that district for the past 7 years, I have never received any complaint in that entire time from anyone who visited the park as to the way they were treated by the concessionaires in that park.

But there is one section in the bill that bothers me somewhat. It bothered me in the subcommittee and it bothered me in the full committee. I have talked to the major concessionaires in the parks on it.

I refer to section 4 of the bill and I would like to ask a question of the author of the bill, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]. Under section 4 you point up the advisability and the probability of one concessionaire in our various parks throughout the country. I know that is an ideal situation for the concessionaire and probably for the Government too. But we have had some very fine concessionaires operating in these parks as small concessionaries, some holding rights under contracts issued by the National Park Service and others who have subcontracted with the principal concessionaire. I want to ask this question. I want to know whether this bill would in any way restrict the rights of such concessionaires to remain in the park.

Mr. UDALL. I would rather refer that question to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would prefer the author of the bill to answer that question.

Mr. UDALL. My understanding is that it makes no change in the policy that the gentleman refers to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If the chairman of the full committee now would want to make any further comment on this, I would appreciate it.

Mr. ASPINALL. I agree with the gentleman from Arizona. In this particular, this bill follows the procedures presently in force.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, every Member of the House of Representatives with constituents who have ever been inconvenienced by overcrowded, underdeveloped, or unprovided accommodations in the Nation's national parks will be interested in the merits of this bill.

While it tends to confirm rather than revolutionize longstanding concession policies, passage will have the immediate, desirable effect of making it easier for National Park concessioners to obtain loan capital from private lending sources for improvements and major expansions.

Under existing policies, concessioners have been businessmen without recognized collateral. Lending agencies have turned down their loan requests because there was no statutory policy applicable to their operations. Concessioners have been skeptically viewed as lessees with an understood, but unconfirmed possessory interest in their property.

As a result, concessioners have found it difficult, sometimes impossible to secure financing for large expansion programs.

It was my privilege recently to join with nine other members of the House Interior Committee in coauthorship of a letter to the House membership in which the following points were offered:

First. Concessioners do not own nor hold title to the lands on which they erect expensive buildings and improvements and are thus prevented from borrowing money under conventional mortgage arrangements.

Second. Most concessions are highly seasonal, with assets idle most of the year. Nonetheless, the facilities must be maintained, protected, and, in some cases, operated by the concessioner during these off months.

Third. All concession operations are conducted under rigorous, detailed Government contracts which fix rates and prices and which often require the concessioner to provide many nonprofitable services. The contract is also subject to cancellation at any time.

Fourth. The concessioner must pay, in addition to all regular taxes and business expenses, a Park Service franchise fee.

In the meantime, the demand for concession-provided overnight accommodations, restaurants, service stations, camping equipment and provisions, and other services for travelers have skyrocketed and will continue to do so.

It is estimated that visits to National Park Service areas last year reached more that 110 million. The figure is certain to continue to climb.

This legislation will put concessioners on a better financial footing to provide these urgently needed facilities.

I realize there is opposition to this bill from a few who would have us believe that the concession policies and practices followed by the Federal Government for the past 30 or 40 years have been detrimental to the public.

Opponents who contend it unwise to offer concessioners "possessory interest" overlook the fact that the Interior Department has recognized these rights for some 15 years. However, concessioners have never enjoyed them as a matter of law.

I have been surprised during this debate when the contention has been made by the gentlemen from Texas and others that increases in the value of a concessioner's property interest because of inflation is a windfall. Under the free enterprise system when a man takes his own money and acquires property and builds buildings he has a right to enjoy any increase in value of that property due to inflation. He also assumes the risk of a loss in value because of deflation and a person who builds buildings at today's high prices may some day suffer from deflation.

This legislation gives to a concessioner the same right and the same obligation enjoyed and assumed by every other businessman in America. This is necessary in order for our free enterprise system to operate successfully in national parks.

H.R. 2091 would simply enact into law time-tested policies which now and for several decades have been followed successfully by the National Park Service with the approval of the House Interior Committee.

I am informed that some 20 long-term concession contracts which have expired or will soon expire are being renewed on an annual basis pending the outcome of this legislation. The effect of this has been frustrating to both the Government and the concessioners.

This legislation is the result of 2 years of intensive study by the Interior Committee and I believe passage will serve to stimulate expansion of badly needed facilities in our Nation's Federal recreation areas.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2091.

This legislation is needed to put into statutory form what has been practiced by the National Park Service in fact. The stability of investment which is insured to concessionaires by this bill is vital to the continued growth and development of our national parks.

With leisure time of American citizens ever on the increase, the services rendered by our parks is becoming—and will continue to become—more important. It is necessary to expand the facilities of these parks but private concessionaires have found it difficult to secure financing for expansion and improvement of their businesses without the assurances contained in this bill.

I urge our colleagues to accept this measure without further delay.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want at this point to ask, in behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] who is opposed to this legislation, that he may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2091 is an unnecessary bill and a bad bill.

Those who have opposed the bill are described as people who fail to appreciate the special problems and difficulties of park concessioners. They are saying that the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Comptroller General of the United States, all of whom have seriously criticized concession operations of the Park Service in the past, have no appreciation of the concessioners' problems and difficulties. What they say is nonsense. The criticisms I speak about were issued only after the most detailed investigations including congressional hearings.

The supporters of this bill tell us the legislation is urgently needed and has been endorsed by the National Park Service, by the Secretary of the Interior, and by many organizations and individuals familiar with the problem in the National Park Service. They claim that the bill is necessary to make adequate, private financing available to Park Service concessioners for the building or acquisition of improvements.

The problem, they say, is that concessioners are having or will have difficulty in obtaining financing for their improvements.

There are over 140 major concessioners in our National Park system. Obviously they have had financing in the past. Probably the vast majority will be able to obtain necessary capital in the future, regardless of passage of this bill.

We all know how in recent years the public has increased its use of our National Park areas. In 1962 there were 82 million visits. In 1964, that figure exceeded 110 million. And the first 5 months of 1965 show almost a 7 percent increase over the same period last year. This upward trend gives every indication of continuing. I think it is fair to ask whether year after year more and more millions of visitors would be coming to our National Park areas if the concessioners there were not able to furnish them the services they need and want.

We hear of no great financing problem for concessioners operating in the National Forests or at reservoir projects of the Corps of Engineers. I know of no basic differences between the major concessioners there and the concessioners of the National Park Service. As a matter of fact, the policies and contracts under which the Forest Service and the Corps concessioners operate are on the whole less liberal to the concessioner than those of the National Park Service. Great and growing use of parks and recreation areas carries with it an outstanding opportunity for concessioners to sell goods and services at a fair profit. No other factor I can imagine would be more conducive to the attraction of capital for the financing of concessioner improvement. Last year, the Bureau of the Budget wrote to the Secretary of the Interior concerning a proposed bill to guarantee loans to concessioners.

The Bureau did not suppport the proposed guarantee legislation. In its letter to the Secretary, it offered some interesting comments. It said that the Bureau had not seen even a rough estimate of the extent to which concessions had been unable in the past to obtain adequate financing. Then it stated, and I quote:

> The high investment record of concessioners in recent years, coupled with the outlook for a rapid and continuing rise in the recreation-seeking population, combine to argue that capital is now and will likely in the future be available to existing and potential concessioners for development purposes to a greater extent than in the past.

I simply am not convinced that the basic problem about which the hue and cry is being raised is of such serious general importance that an act of Congress is necessary.

The record simply does not demonstrate that the changes the bill would make are necessary in order to influence sources of capital more favorably toward Park Service concessioners.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 2091 and I urge its passage by the House.

There is an old adage to the effect that it is always easier for a legislative body to do nothing than to do something and that it is therefore far easier for it to do a little than a lot.

That is the situation we are in today. We could, if we wished to, refuse to pass the bill and leave the whole national parks concession policy in its present state of uncertainty. We could, if we wished, strip the bill of a number of its provisions and come out with something only a little better than nothing. These would be the easy courses to follow. They are not courses that I choose to follow or that I can advise the House to follow. Let me tell you why.

For years the Interior Department's policies relating to national park concessions have been on an uncertain foundation. For years they have been under attack, notwithstanding the fact that the Park Service has been faithfully trying to abide by the principles that were agreed upon between the Secretary of the Interior and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in 1950. It is high time that these doubts and uncertainties be laid to rest. It is high time for the Congress to dispel them by the enactment of legislation. I am almost tempted to say that the passage of any bill, regardless of its contents, would be better than continued inaction on our part. But I need not go that far, for I think we have a good bill here.

What are the prerequisites for such a bill? The first is a recognition on our part that we are dealing with a wide variety of situations. Some concessioners have very short seasons—witness Mount McKinley National Park and Katmai National Monument—while other have virtually year-round businesses.

Some concessioners are in parks to which visitors come by the millions, others are in parks where they are numbered in the thousands. Some concessioners have businesses that they can operate on a shoestring, but others have businesses that require very substantial sums of capital. Some parks, and the concessions within them, are so located that there is direct and immediate competition from hotels and shops in the near vicinity; others are so located that they are the only source to which the public can go to obtain the services they need when they visit the parks. Some concessioners may be required by public demand to carry on a part of their business at a loss and to make up the deficit through other operations; others are not in this position. The point is that any bill must be designed broadly enough to allow all these situations to be handled equitably.

The second prerequisite for a good concession bill is a recognition on our part that it is primarily the public that the concessioners are serving, not the Government. Some of the purists among the conservationists would no doubt like to see all concessions abolished in the national parks. Fortunately they are a minority. But concessions must be adapted both to the environment in which they operate and to the public they are called upon to serve. They must always be so operated that they do not interfere with the purposes for which the parks are established. They must, above all, be so operated that those who visit the parks are taken care of at reasonable prices. This is far more important to the Government than any revenues that may accrue to it through concession contracts. It is for this reason that H.R. 2091 lays as much stress as it does on continuity of operations and recognizes that this is not a field adapted to competitive bidding.

Finally, I must mention the need for flexibility as another prerequisite for a good concession bill. This is implicit in the other points I have made, but I want

to lay particular stress on it. The Secretary of the Interior must be given broad authority, and he will be given broad authority by this bill, to gear his granting of concessions and his renewal of concession contracts to the needs of the particular area and the type of people who visit it. He must be given broad authority to gear the operation of concessions to the paramount purposes of the parks. He must be given broad authority to encourage good concessioners—not fly-by-nights, not those inadequately financed, not those who are out simply for a fast dollar—to do the same job in meeting the needs of the visitors to eat and sleep that the parks themselves do in meeting their needs to see and enjoy nature.

Mr. Chairman, I urge enactment of H.R. 2091.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McFALL, 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. 2091) relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE OF ESCORT FOR ASTRONAUTS

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort our distinguished visitors into the Chamber the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. LAIRD; the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BOGGS; the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. RHODES; the gentleman from California, Mr. MILLER; and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state for the information of the Members, it is expected that the distinguished guests of the House will arrive at the Capitol within a very short time, within 15 minutes.

The Chair declares the House in recess at this time subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECEPTION OF THE GEMINI 5 ASTRONAUTS

At 2:55 o'clock p.m., the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, the Honorable William M. Miller, escorted into the House Chamber the families of the Gemini 5 astronauts and Dr. Charles Berry and his family.

At 3 o'clock p.m., the Speaker of the House of Representatives called the membership to order.

The Gemini 5 astronauts, Lt. Col. L. Gordon Cooper, Jr., and Comdr. Charles Conrad, Jr., entered the hall of the House of Representatives at 3:01 o'clock p.m., preceded by Sergeant at Arms Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., and escorted to the Speaker's rostrum by the Honorable William M. Miller, Doorkeeper, Vice President HUMPHREY, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, the Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, the Honorable JOHN J. RHODES, the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER, and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR. [Applause, Members rising.]

Astronaut Conrad was seated to the left of the Speaker and Astronaut Cooper to the right of the Speaker. [Applause, Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Mr. Vice President, my distinguished colleagues, members of the families of the two distinguished Americans whom we honor today, the two distinguished gentlemen the House is honoring today, and ladies and gentlemen, this afternoon marks an auspicious moment in the annals of this Chamber of the House of Representatives. We are privileged at this time to lay aside for a brief period our legislative duties and to welcome here two distinguished, courageous Americans of whom we are very proud—two Americans that have made great records, outstanding records, in what might be termed the field of outer space and in the pioneering of the days that lie ahead. They have brought dignity and honor and glory to our great country.

One of these distinguished men was our guest on a previous occasion, and we are so glad that he is here with us again today and that his family is accompanying him.

I have the great pleasure and honor, the personal privilege of presenting to my colleagues one who has brought, as I said, honor and glory and prestige to our great country, Lt. Col. L. Gordon Cooper, Jr. [Applause, Members rising.]

Lieutenant Colonel COOPER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen: Approximately 28 months ago, I had the very real great privilege of being your guest after an earlier flight that I made. At that time we were in the timespan of making flights of approximately 34 hours, and today my colleague and I am here after having advanced on up to the period of 8 days, some 190 hours. [Applause.]

I hope that I might have the privilege of being your guest again one of these years. [Applause.]

It is a very distinct privilege, and over these years I have had occasion to work with a great many of you and to get to know you and appreciate all of your dedication.

You know, we in the lower echelons of all the agencies, like any other large organization, tend to criticize the headquarters and all of the higher echelons at times because we do not, perhaps, really understand what goes on up here and do not understand a lot of the problems that are involved and many of the decisions that are made.

I must say that over the years, as I have gotten to know many of you and have had occasion to work with you and to have direct association, I have come to have a very much greater understanding and appreciation for all of your problems. I must say I think I have a much easier job than you do.

It is a great privilege to be here and to be able to give you a very brief account of our flight. We set out with our prime objective on Gemini 5 to fly 8 days. We were to fly this 8 days primarily to show that man, with all the various equipment on board, and the machines, could safely and very functionally do this 8-day mission with no adverse effects. We were entirely successful in this.

We had a few of our systems with minor discrepancies, but by far the majority of the systems on board worked not only well, but worked beautifully.

We had as a secondary objective to evaluate and conduct and gather data on radar and computer and platform combinations of the same type we will be using for later rendezvous as we go on into the lunar mission.

I might add that although we did not get the initial part or portion of this data due to a minor failure of a small heater, we did gather the majority of this data, and we gathered even more data on this system on another test. So this portion of the experiment was highly successful; in fact, even better than we had dreamed.

Then we had some 17 scientific experiments which we conducted. Some of them we did not gather at the exact time that we anticipated, but we would pick up other parts of them later on when we could power up the system and control the attitude of the spacecraft in order to get them. So we wound up getting a great majority of some 16—either 100 percent completed or 85 percent or better completed—some 16 of the 17 experiments, including a great many pictures again of some very beautiful areas of the world.

Again, I think one of my greatest impressions of this flight, like the first flight I made, was that it makes man feel rather small and insignificant to see all the great beauties that there are available to see from space and to realize just how small one individual is as compared to this great universe.

I think at this point I would like to turn it over, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to my colleague here, "Pete" Conrad, whom I had the very great pleasure of making the flight with. And I think probably one of the greatest pleasures to me in the flight was watching his reactions to all these things I had seen before and note his enjoyment of them also. [Applause, Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. From the achievements and the records made by these two outstanding Americans, there was—

First. The longest manned space flight;

Second. The longest total U.S. man-hours in space;

Third. The longest multimanned space flight;

Fourth. Most orbits for a manned space flight;

Fifth. Most manned flights;

Sixth. First man to make a second orbital flight—Colonel Cooper;

Seventh. Of these two distinguished gentlemen, the one with the most space flight time is Colonel Cooper; and

Eighth. Both individuals making the longest single space flight in the history of man.

All of these events have brought great honor, and greater glory and prestige to our beloved country. Therefore, it is a great pleasure to me and a high honor to present to you the other distinguished American and dedicated officer, Comdr. "Pete" Conrad. [Applause, Members rising.]

Commander CONRAD. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen and distinguished guests, I cannot say right at the moment that I am not confused. When I first got in here and they seated me on Gordo's left, that broke up everything. I have been sitting on his right for 6 months now.

Gordo did outline to you some of the flight. I would like to tell you a little bit more about it.

Gemini 5 was a significant advance in the whole program in that we flew the first all-out spacecraft. We would not have been able to go without the fuel cells for 8 days. This was the first time they were flown. We had the first radars from which we got some very excellent data to enable the GT6 to continue with their present rendezvous plans. It was the first time that the cryogenic storage of liquid hydrogen and liquid oxygen had been run that long in space.

We did have a problem or two. I think it looked a lot worse to you on the ground than it did to us in flight. As Gordo said, we managed to overcome those problems and continued with the flight.

The scientific measurements were to me extremely interesting to make. I think that it showed that our nature is about the same as that of scientists. After all, a test pilot is a curious person; so is a scientist.

We enjoyed getting the answers and bringing back the data.

My feeling is that I have had 11 days to debrief the flight and had a couple of good nights' sleep and I am ready to go again. [Applause, Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. With the indulgence of my colleagues, I should like to present for a bow Mrs. Cooper and her children.

[Mrs. Cooper and her children rose.]

[Applause, Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. I also have the pleasure to present for a bow Mrs. Conrad and her family.

[Mrs. Conrad and her family rose.]

[Applause, Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Present with us today is Dr. Charles Berry with his wife and family. He is medical director at NASA and he received from President Johnson the NASA Medal for Distinguished Service.

[Dr. Berry and his family rose.]

[Applause, Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. The committee will escort the distinguished visitors from the Chamber.

At 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m., the astronauts and their families retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

CRIME AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5688) relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McMillan, Whitener, Dowdy, Williams, Fuqua, Nelsen, Harsha, Roudebush, and Broyhill of Virginia.

PRINTING PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING THE RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess of the House be printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

U.S. CONTRIBUTION TO INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8715) to authorize a contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Fascell, Fraser, and Gross.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Committee on Public Works, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., September 10, 1965.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

State and watershed	Executive committee No.	Committee approval
		1965
Arkansas: Cooper Creek	1323	Sept. 9
Maine: Limestone Stream	1323	Do.
Mississippi: Long Creek	1323	Do.
Mississippi and Tennessee: Tuscumbia River	1323	Do.
Missouri: Grindstone-Lost-Muddy Creek	1323	Do.
North Carolina and Virginia: Stewarts Creek-Lovills Creek	1323	Do.
Oklahoma: Upper Elk Creek	1323	Do.
Utah: Ferron	1323	Do.
Alabama: Choccolocco Creek	1426	Do.
Arkansas: Little Clear Creek	1426	Do.
Georgia:		
Grove River	1426	Do.
South Fork Broad River	1426	Do.
Indiana: Supplement to Busseron	1426	Do.
Massachusetts: Supplement to SuAsCo	1426	Do.
Delaware and Maryland: Upper Choptank River	1533	Do.
Indiana: Little Raccoon Creek	1533	Do.
Kansas: Timber Creek	1533	Do.
Minnesota: Tamarac River	1533	Do.
Oklahoma: Quapaw Creek	1533	Do.
Texas: Buck Creek	1533	Do.
Virginia: Cherrystone	1533	Do.
Oklahoma: Rock Creek	1549	Do.

Sincerely yours,
George H. Fallon,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 295]

Abbitt	Fulton, Tenn.	Poage
Adair	Gallagher	Poff
Andrews, George W.	Griffiths	Pool
Andrews, Glenn	Hanna	Powell
Arends	Harsha	Resnick
Ashbrook	Harvey, Ind.	Roosevelt
Blatnik	Harvey, Mich.	Rosenthal
Bolton	Hébert	Ryan
Bonner	Henderson	Sisk
Buchanan	Irwin	Smith, Calif.
Carey	Jones, Mo.	Talcott
Celler	Kelly	Teague, Calif.
Conyers	Keogh	Teague, Tex.
Daddario	Lindsay	Thomas
Derwinski	McClory	Thompson, Tex.
Devine	McEwen	Toll
Diggs	Macdonald	Whitten
Dowdy	Martin, Ala.	Williams
Farnsley	May	Wilson, Charles H.
Fisher	Morton	Wright
Ford, Gerald R.	Moss	
	Multer	
	Pirnie	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 365 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONCESSION POLICIES BY NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2091) relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 2091, with Mr. McFALL in the chair.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to my colleague from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the passage of this bill. It is a good piece of legislation. I congratulate the gentleman from Colorado, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my colleague from Arizona, and every other member of the committee who had something to do with bringing this legislation to the House floor.

The national parks are certainly very important elements of our Federal Establishment. They afford education and recreation to great segments of our people. Certainly they should be served by the best of concessionaires and, in my opinion, the enactment of this bill is the best way to insure that this will be done.

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

The Clerk reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in furtherance of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1), which directs the Secretary of the Interior to administer national park system areas in accordance with the fundamental purpose of conserving their scenery, wildlife, natural and historic objects, and providing for their enjoyment in a manner that will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations, the Congress hereby finds that the preservation of park values requires that such public accommodations, facilities, and services as have to be provided within those areas should be provided only under carefully controlled safeguards against unregulated and indiscriminate use, so that the heavy visitation will not unduly impair these values and so that development of such facilities can best be limited to locations where the least damage to park values will be caused. It is the policy of the Congress that such development shall be limited to those that are necessary and appropriate for public use and enjoyment of the national park area in which they are located and that are consistent to the highest practicable degree with the preservation and conservation of the areas.

SEC. 2. Subject to the findings and policy stated in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall take such action as may be appropriate to encourage and enable private persons and corporations (hereinafter referred to as "concessioners") to provide and operate facilities and services which he deems desirable for the accommodation of visitors in areas administered by the National Park Service.

SEC. 3. (a) Without the limitation of the foregoing, the Secretary may include in contracts for the providing of facilities and services such terms and conditions as, in his judgment, are required to assure the concessioner of adequate protection against loss of investment in structures, fixtures, improvements, equipment, supplies and other tangible property provided by him for the purposes of the contract (but not against loss of anticipated profits) resulting from discretionary acts, policies, or decisions of the Secretary occurring after the contract has become effective under which acts, policies, or decisions the concessioner's authority to conduct some or all of his authorized operations under the contract ceases or his structures, fixtures, and improvements, or any of them, are required to be transferred to another party or to be abandoned, removed, or demolished. Such terms and conditions may include an obligation of the United States to compensate the concessioner for loss of investment, as aforesaid.

(b) The Secretary shall exercise his authority in a manner consistent with a reasonable opportunity for the concessioner to realize a profit on his operation as a whole commensurate with the capital invested and the obligations assumed.

(c) The reasonableness of a concessioner's rates and charges to the public shall, unless otherwise provided in the contract, be judged primarily by comparison with those current for facilities and services of comparable character under similar conditions, with due consideration for length of season, provision for peakloads, average percentage of occupancy, accessibility, availability, and costs of labor and materials, type of patronage, and other factors deemed significant by the Secretary.

(d) Franchise fees, however stated, shall be determined upon consideration of the probable value to the concessioner of the privileges granted by the particular contract or permit involved. Such value is the opportunity for net profit in relation to both gross receipts and capital invested. Consideration of revenue to the United States shall be subordinate to the objectives of protecting and preserving the areas and of providing adequate and appropriate services for visitors at reasonable rates. Appropriate provision may be made for periodic reconsideration and adjustment of franchise fees.

SEC. 4. The Secretary may authorize the operation of all accommodations, facilities, and services for visitors, or of all such accommodations, facilities, and services of generally similar character, in each area, or portion thereof, administered by the National Park Service by one responsible concessioner and may grant to such concessioner a preferential right to provide such new or additional accommodations, facilities, or services as the Secretary may consider necessary or desirable for the accommodation and convenience of the public. The Secretary may, in his discretion, grant extensions, renewals, or new contracts to present concessioners, other than the concessioner holding a preferential right, for operations substantially similar in character and extent to those authorized by their current contracts or permits.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall encourage continuity of operation and facilities and services by giving preference in the renewal of contracts or permits and in the negotiation of new contracts or permits to the concessioners who have performed their obligations under prior contracts or permits to the satisfaction of the Secretary. To this end, the Secretary, at any time in his discretion, may extend or renew a contract or permit, or may grant a new contract or permit to the same concessioner upon the termination or surrender before expiration of a prior contract or permit. Before doing so, however, and before granting extensions, renewals, or new contracts pursuant to the last sentence of section 4 of this Act, the Secretary shall give reasonable public notice of his intention so to do and shall consider and evaluate all proposals received as a result thereof.

SEC. 6. A concessioner who has heretofore acquired or constructed or who hereafter acquires or constructs, pursuant to a contract and with the approval of the Secretary any structure, fixture, or improvement upon land owned by the United States within an area administered by the National Park Service shall have a possessory interest therein, which shall consist of all incidents of ownership except legal title, which title shall be vested in the United States. Such possessory interest shall not be construed to include or imply any authority, privilege, or right to operate or engage in any business or other activity, and the use or enjoyment of any structure, fixture, or improvement in which the concessioner has a possessory interest shall be wholly subject to the applicable provisions of the contract and of laws and regulations relating to the area. The said possessory interest shall not be extinguished by the expiration of other termination of the contract and may not be taken for public use without just compensation. The said possessory interest may be assigned, transferred, encumbered, or relinquished. Unless otherwise provided by agreement of the parties, just compensation shall be an amount equal to the sound value of such structure, fixture, or improvement at the time of taking by the United States determined upon the basis of reconstruction cost less depreciation evidenced by its condition and prospective serviceability in comparison with a new unit of like kind, but not to exceed fair market value. The provisions of this section shall not apply to concessioners whose current contracts do not include recognition of a possessory interest unless in a particular case the Secretary determines that equitable considerations warrant recognition of such interest.

SEC. 7. The provisions of section 321 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412; 40 U.S.C. 303(b)), relating to the leasing of buildings and properties of the United States, shall not apply to privileges, leases, permits, and contracts granted by the Secretary of the Interior for the use of lands and improvements thereon, in areas administered by the National Park Service, for the purpose of providing accommodations, facilities, and services for visitors thereto, pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended, or the Act of August 21, 1935, chapter 593 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461–467), as amended.

SEC. 8. Subsection (h) of section 2 of the Act of August 21, 1935, the Historical Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 462(h)), is amended by changing the proviso therein to read as follows: "*Provided,* That the Secretary may grant such concessions, leases, or permits and enter into contracts relating to the same with responsible persons, firms, or corporations without advertising and without securing competitive bids."

SEC. 9. Each concessioner shall keep such records as the Secretary may prescribe to enable the Secretary to determine that all terms of the concession contract have been and are being faithfully performed, and the Secretary and his duly authorized representative shall, for the purpose of audit and examination, have access to said records and to other books, documents, and papers of the concessioner pertinent to the contract and all the terms and conditions thereof.

Mr. ASPINALL (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 21, strike out "the limitation" and insert "limitation".

Page 4, lines 11, 12, and 13, strike out the last sentence of section 3(d) and insert in lieu thereof: "Appropriate provisions shall be made for reconsideration of franchise fees at least every five years unless the contract is for a lesser period of time."

Page 6, line 1, after "title," insert "and except as hereinafter provided,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Page 4, line 1, after "availability" strike out the comma.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Page 8, after line 4, insert a new paragraph reading as follows:

"The Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall, until the expiration of five (5) calendar years after the close of the business year of each concessioner or subconcessioner have access to and the right to examine any pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the concessioner or subconcessioner related to the negotiated contract or contracts involved."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to which I referred in my opening statement. It is the amendment which gives to the General Accounting Office the authority to come in and audit the books of any concessioner. It is placed in a section which has to do with keeping of the records and the use of those records. I think the amendment speaks for itself. I have nothing further to say.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not offered an amendment, has he, to provide that the General Accounting Office can look at the records only after a period of 5 years?

Mr. ASPINALL. No. The amendment is that the General Accounting Office has the right to look at the records for a period of 5 years.

Mr. GROSS. Why the limitation?

Mr. ASPINALL. Of course, the keeping of books, Mr. GROSS, is a rather, shall I say, voluminous operation. Unless there is something found in the 5-year period, it seems to me that the General Accounting Office should show fraud or the like before it has the right to ask for books and accounts over 5 years old. That is the reason.

Mr. GROSS. This question is suggested to me by a colleague, Does this right expire with respect to the contract within 5 years or after 5 years?

Mr. ASPINALL. The contracts are reviewable every 5 years. This amendment is the amendment that the General Accounting Office said would serve their purposes. That is the reason why we accepted it.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 2, strike all of lines 22 through 25, and on page 3, strike all of lines 1 through 14.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the following is a totally unacceptable section of the bill as far as I am concerned. It goes this way.

Without limitation of the foregoing, the Secretary may include in contracts for the providing of facilities and services such terms and conditions as, in his judgment, are required to assure the concessioner of adequate protection against loss of investment in structures, fixtures, improvements, equipment, supplies, and other tangible property provided by him for the purposes of the contract (but not against loss of anticipated profits).

And so forth, on down to line 11, and then this language:

Such terms and conditions may include an obligation of the United States to compensate the concessioner for loss of investment, as aforesaid.

This amounts to a business insurance policy paid for by the taxpayers of this country. I would like to see a farm bill to provide that farmers produce on contract for the Government with the assurance that they would be guaranteed everything but a profit; that if they fell behind in their contracts the Government would step in and compensate them. How in the world could you dream up a better deal for these concessioners? I do not understand how you could put this kind of a provision in this bill or any bill and still say that you are providing for free and private enterprise. The only thing you do not provide for is a profit, a guaranteed profit.

I would like to have someone tell me why this provision is in this bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. I will tell the gentleman why it is in the bill. You are about to get a concessioner to go in and build a large hotel and large, expensive facilities and you have to assure any prudent businessman that he is not going to be wiped out by the decision of some Secretary of the Interior.

The language that the gentleman did not read, on page 3, says, on line 5, is that these losses that we are talking about "resulting from discretionary acts, policies, or decisions of the Secretary" and let me give you a concrete example that occurred in Colorado in the district of the chairman of our committee, the Mesa Verde National Park, a good national park.

A concessioner had a hotel that he had built and that he had been operating for many years. The Park Service comes along and says, "We do not want a hotel at this point any more. It is too beautiful. This is a nice area and it ought to be preserved in its natural state. We want a hotel 6 miles away."

Without this language Uncle Sam could simply tear down the hotel or make him tear it down and he has no protection against the loss of his investment. What is a prudent businessman going to do in a situation of this kind?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. He would have a lot of protection because you have got him covered in another place in this bill, on page 6, line 18, where it says:

Just compensation shall be an amount equal to the sound value of such structure.

As I said, that is on page 6, line 18.

That is on page 6, line 18, fixtures or improvements at the time of taking by the United States is determined on the basis of reconstruction costs, less depreciation, and so forth.

In effect, if they tear down a building they have to pay him the complete reconstruction cost, less whatever physical deterioration there is, and this could be possibly considerably more than he has invested as book value on a given piece of property. He might have amortized it and depreciated it for 30 years and then charged the Government or whoever his competitor would be the full or fair market value at the time of the taking. This, I think, is the unconscionable part of the bill and is the basic problem involved in it.

Mr. GROSS. Even without the provision to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] refers, it is not necessary to put in this bill this kind of shotgun protection and load it on the taxpayers of the Nation. This is a guarantee that will cover every concessioner.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. ASPINALL. The language to which the gentleman from Texas has

referred of course has to do with the expiration and terms of the concessioner contract.

This section has to do with actions that have taken place because of the desires of the Secretary to move in. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] has called to the attention of the House the very example, of course, that has happened, and this has happened and can happen at any place where the Secretary says, "Well, now, you are not operating in accordance with our master plan," as he did at Mesa Verde—having once before agreed that the master plan that they had was the right plan—a concessioner is at the mercy of the Secretary. Then the Department changed plans and said, "We have got to limit your contract." It was a year-to-year contract at the time. The Secretary kept him hanging out in limbo for a period of about 12 years before renewing it.

This provision of the present bill permits the concessioner to have some protection from being wiped out of his entire operations without due consideration being shown him.

Mr. GROSS. I will say it certainly does give him protection. It gives him almost unlimited protection.

I cannot understand why you make it so broad; why you did not write language to protect a concessioner in an instance such as you gave without saying to every concessioner, and I mean every concessioner, that "The only thing we will not assure you is a profit." That is all you leave out.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Of course, that is not right. This has to do with those discretionary powers of the Secretary. My colleague said that this is a shotgun approach. My colleague, however, has taken a shotgun approach in his amendment. He wishes to strike the whole of section (a). However, his argument goes primarily to the last section of section (a).

Mr. GROSS. My protest goes to the whole section and especially to this language, "such terms and conditions may include an obligation of the United States to compensate the concessioner for loss of investment." That goes much too far.

Mr. ASPINALL. Well, I will answer in conclusion that this is not an automatic power or an automatic decision.

Mr. GROSS. What is the limitation on it?

Mr. ASPINALL. It is just what I have suggested.

Mr. GROSS. There is no real limitation. It is wide open.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe the chairman of our committee has nailed down the important things that ought to be said in opposition to this amendment. But let me just make a couple more points here.

First. The section to which reference is made and which the amendment attempts to strike appears at the bottom of page 2 on line 23 says that the Secretary 'may." He may include in contracts adequate protection against loss of investment.

Second. We are talking about two entirely different things. These contracts run for 10 years, 5 years, or 20 years, or whatever happens to be the negotiated length of the contract. At the end of that term, if the contract is not renewed, we provide in the bill that the concessioner has a possessory interest and we give a man dignity and status who holds one of these contracts which he has never had.

The section that the gentleman from Iowa seeks to strike out of the bill is as the gentleman from Colorado said, an entirely different matter. These contracts are made so that the Secretary can cancel them at any time in a number of situations. One of the situations I described earlier is where the existing concession does not fit into our master plan. We say, if it is a hotel or other facility, "we wanted it at one time, it is all nice, but we do not want it any longer. We bid you goodbye. It has been nice having you here."

All this section says that the gentleman from Iowa is attempting to strike out is when you make a contract with the concessioner and get him to invest money on Government land under this contract, where his rates are fixed and everything else, and he is under the thumb of the National Park Service, once put in that contract, Mr. Secretary, if you want to, here is a provision to protect him against loss of investment.

Mr. Chairman, I fail to see anything outrageous in this. I fail to see why it is that the gentleman from Texas and my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] who I thought were friends of business and believe in private enterprise, want to put a man under the thumb of the National Park Service and the Secretary in a position where they can be wiped out by a decision, and by wiping them out, they have no protection against loss of investment.

It is a very deep and important provision.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. This is not private enterprise. The concessioner is given what amounts to an insurance policy, paid right out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. UDALL. It is not an insurance policy. I am asking you to come in and I am asking you to spend your money to build on my property, attempting to make this a going business. I say we can wipe you out at any time. Are you going to enter into such a contract?

Mr. GROSS. I cannot believe that we have a Secretary of the Interior who would do this.

Mr. UDALL. I would hope we do not.

Mr. GROSS. I would not dream we could have a Secretary of the Interior who would be so unjust.

Mr. UDALL. Let us hope that the present Secretary would not do that. But I have cited to the gentleman a concrete example in Colorado of how this has occurred.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have a lot of campers in my district who visit these Federal parks. The Secretary does give the insurance to such a concessionaire, and the concessionaire builds a big hotel, and it develops business is not as expected. So the concessionaire asks the Secretary to reduce the number of campsites in order to exist. Does he then come under the spirit of this act?

Mr. UDALL. This says as a result of a discretionary act of the Secretary.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is what I am worrying about; if the Secretary was pressured by his concessionaire to take out campsites in order to encourage driving people into this hotel.

Mr. UDALL. You can dream up a situation, perhaps, where an injustice would occur.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. This is done under conditions where the authority of the Secretary would cease. The authority of the Secretary would have ceased. He would be in operation, and the Secretary cannot, in my opinion, do this under the terms of any contract I know of.

Mr. UDALL. I agree with the gentleman, and I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to add to what the gentleman from Arizona has already said, that the purpose of this bill and the purpose of this section is that a concessionaire can get credit to improve and to build these concessions, these hotels, or whatever they may be, motels. We have many, many instances where these facilities would be improved if credit were available. That is the purpose of this legislation, and at the same time to curb, if you please, the authority of the Secretary.

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

Mr. Chairman, I share some of the concern that the gentleman from Iowa has expressed with reference to section 3(a). But I think our attention is being diverted from the real problem of the concessioner. If you have a policy, as described in the master plan, to encourage development outside of a park and the private hotel or motel operator is faced with the possibility of competition how can he be certain we would not have unfair competition? As one of my correspondents has indicated, there could be very advantageous arrangements between a concessioner and the Park Service. He could get more favored treatment, obviously, than would be enjoyed by his competitors outside the park.

Take the case of our seashore at Cape Cod. They have four concessions within the park operating on a lease basis—two motels and two snack bars. If they should arrange for more of this kind of

concession within the seashore park, would it encourage development outside of the seashore?

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

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. The problem raised, as I see it, has nothing to do with the pending amendment that is before us.

This deals with a situation where the Secretary has decided there is a public need and that public convenience will be served by concession operation within a national seashore or within a national park. Having made that decision, this language says that he may include in the contract some protection against this man being wiped out or his investment being wiped out by an arbitrary decision of the Secretary. That is all it covers. If the gentleman is concerned about the Park Service adding additional concession units within the Cape Cod Seashore, I think he has a legitimate concern if there is no public need for them and if private interests outside the seashore can do the job, they should have a chance to do it. I would be glad to lobby with the gentleman to see that they have that opportunity. But none of these abuses, rather, these alleged abuses, have been called to the attention of our committee so far as I know and I would like to look into the matter.

Mr. KEITH. There just does not seem to be adequate assurance that there would not be unfair competition engendered by such a policy on the part of future Secretaries of the Interior—and there is from time to time change of policy.

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

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. This is the first time in my time in the House of Representatives that we wrote legislation that I know of where such legislation has been written to provide guarantees against the capricious acts of a Secretary, a member of the Cabinet of this Government. I have never heard of anything like this.

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

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman, the brother of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman from Iowa has made many speeches around here wanting to protect people from big government and from arbitrary actions of the Government. Today he is apparently resisting any provision which would protect private businessmen, to whom I would suppose he would be friendly, against arbitrary acts by the Government. I cannot understand the gentleman.

Mr. KEITH. I am sorry I do not have time to yield further except to say I do think the gentleman from Iowa has a real concern for the greater number of private development people outside a national park or a national seashore.

Mr. Chairman, I support the motion to recommit, which is an indication of my disapproval of this legislation. I recognize that in many national parks throughout the country there is no area of competition between concessioners operating on Federal property and private interests on the outskirts.

But, when we are dealing with Cape Cod and the national seashore there, we are not dealing with the usual, relatively undeveloped national park area. Within the Cape Cod National Seashore we have several important commercial centers—well-developed and long-established communities. The 87th Congress recognized the unique nature of this area and consciously attempted to provide adequate protection for property owners, along with sufficient space within the overall area of the national seashore for the normal economic growth and development of the towns involved, and the private, commercial firms so necessary to that end.

H.R. 2091 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with private interests in which he could guarantee them against loss of investment or even financial losses in connection with fixtures and equipment. In other words, the Secretary could guarantee the concessionaire against most everything except a loss of anticipated profits. And though I was unable to convince the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], the author of this bill and a member of the committee which brings it to the floor, that there was any possible adverse effect on the competitive private interests that may be adjacent to a national park or seashore, the fact remains that private capital will be less likely to be invested in park areas when the investor is faced with the prospect of a competitor underwritten and protected by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Chairman, pointing out some of the dangers of this legislation and possible inequities is a letter I received just yesterday from the vice chairman of the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission, which will be able to exercise some influence in behalf of local communities and private businessmen during the 10 years of its statutory life, but which will unfortunately cease to exist under the law at that time.

The letter to which I refer, Mr. Chairman, was written by Mr. Joshua Nickerson of Orleans, Mass. I would like to insert a pertinent excerpt from that letter at this point:

I should like to point out the following significant factors as (H.R. 2091) applies to the Cape Cod National Seashore:

1. Since a concessioner would have no cost for land and pay no real estate taxes, he would be placed in an unfair competitive relationship with similar enterprises outside boundaries of the national seashore.

2. The towns would nevertheless be forced to provide police, health, and fire services—especially the first two of these—paid for out of local taxes which would necessarily be higher for the real estate owned by competitive enterprises outside the seashore because of the extra people-load produced by the operators of the concessions which would be operating tax free within the boundaries of the national seashore.

3. The suggestion made by the Comptroller General of the United States in the final paragraph on page 12 of Report No. 591 sums up succinctly the proper way in which the possessory interest of the concessioner should be determined upon termination of his contract. To follow the procedure provided in the act, in this period of long term inflationary development, could mean that a concessioner investing a half-million dollars now, could be, years hence, compensated at a then value in excess of the original investment, when in fact he should be reimbursed only, as the Comptroller points out, for the unamortized balance of his cost.

4. The preferential terms specified in the act coupled with the words on page 2, line 17, "to encourage" could mean that the Congress would find itself in the position of having directed the Secretary to promote "sweetheart" deals of a nature not dissimilar to the scandalous carryings-on of such favored friends of the executive department as Bobby Baker and Billie Sol Estes. It seems to me that the Congress should not specifically instruct the Secretary of the Interior to encourage such shenanigans.

Basically, Mr. Chairman, I recognize and appreciate the need for improved contractual arrangement between the National Park Service and concessioners on public lands. But I feel that provisions could have been written into this bill affording a better safeguard to the private, taxpaying businessman, as opposed the businessman who operates as his competition on Federal land and under the sponsorship of the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 40, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCFALL, 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. 2091) relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 520, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2091 to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the nays appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. 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. 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 73, nays 298, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

YEAS—73

Anderson, Ill.	Greigg	O'Hara, Ill.
Annunzio	Grider	Patman
Ashley	Gross	Pickle
Bandstra	Grover	Price
Beckworth	Hall	Pucinski
Brock	Hamilton	Quillen
Brooks	Hansen, Iowa	Randall
Broyhill, N.C.	Hardy	Rogers, Colo.
Buchanan	Hechler	Ronan
Burleson	Hull	Rostenkowski
Burton, Calif.	Irwin	Rumsfeld
Cabell	Karth	Schisler
Collier	Kastenmeier	Schmidhauser
Colmer	Keith	Secrest
Curtis	Kluczynski	Shipley
Dawson	Krebs	Smith, Iowa
Devine	Leggett	Stalbaum
Dickinson	McMillan	Sweeney
Diggs	Machen	Todd
Dingell	Mills	Vanik
Duncan, Tenn.	Mink	Wydler
Dwyer	Monagan	Yates
Edwards, Calif.	Moorhead	Young
Erlenborn	Morse	
Fountain	Murphy, Ill.	

NAYS—298

Abernethy	Carter	Ellsworth
Adams	Casey	Evans, Colo.
Albert	Cederberg	Everett
Anderson, Tenn.	Chamberlain	Fallon
Andrews, Glenn	Chelf	Farbstein
Andrews, N. Dak.	Clancy	Farnum
Ashmore	Clark	Fascell
Aspinall	Clausen, Don H.	Feighan
Ayres	Clawson, Del	Findley
Baldwin	Cleveland	Fisher
Baring	Clevenger	Flood
Barrett	Cohelan	Flynt
Bates	Conte	Fogarty
Belcher	Cooley	Foley
Bell	Corbett	Ford, William D.
Bennett	Corman	Fraser
Berry	Craley	Frelinghuysen
Betts	Cramer	Friedel
Bingham	Culver	Fulton, Pa.
Boggs	Cunningham	Fuqua
Boland	Curtin	Garmatz
Bolling	Dague	Gathings
Bow	Daniels	Gettys
Brademas	Davis, Ga.	Giaimo
Bray	Davis, Wis.	Gibbons
Broomfield	de la Garza	Gilligan
Brown, Calif.	Dent	Gonzalez
Broyhill, Va.	Denton	Goodell
Burke	Dole	Grabowski
Burton, Utah	Donohue	Gray
Byrne, Pa.	Dorn	Green, Oreg.
Byrnes, Wis.	Dow	Green, Pa.
Cahill	Dowdy	Griffin
Callan	Downing	Gubser
Callaway	Dulski	Gurney
Cameron	Duncan, Oreg.	Hagen, Calif.
	Edmondson	Haley
	Edwards, Ala.	Halleck
Halpern	Mathias	Schneebeli
Hanley	Matsunaga	Schweiker
Hanna	Matthews	Scott
Hansen, Wash.	Meeds	Selden
Harris	Michel	Senner
Harsha	Miller	Shriver
Hathaway	Minish	Sickles
Hawkins	Mize	Sikes
Hays	Moeller	Skubitz
Helstoski	Moore	Slack
Henderson	Morgan	Smith, Calif.
Herlong	Morris	Smith, N.Y.
Hicks	Morrison	Smith, Va.
Holifield	Mosher	Springer
Holland	Murphy, N.Y.	Stafford
Horton	Murray	Staggers
Hosmer	Natcher	Stanton
Howard	Nedzi	Steed
Hungate	Nelsen	Stephens
Huot	Nix	Stratton
Hutchinson	O'Brien	Stubblefield
Ichord	O'Hara, Mich.	Sullivan
Jacobs	O'Konski	Talcott
Jarman	Olsen, Mont.	Taylor
Jennings	Olson, Minn.	Teague, Calif.
Joelson	O'Neal, Ga.	Teague, Tex.
Johnson, Calif.	O'Neill, Mass.	Tenzer
Johnson, Okla.	Ottinger	Thompson, N.J.
Johnson, Pa.	Passman	Thomson, Wis.
Jonas	Patten	Trimble
Jones, Ala.	Pelly	Tuck
Karsten	Pepper	Tunney
Kee	Perkins	Tupper
King, Calif.	Philbin	Tuten
King, N.Y.	Pike	Udall
King, Utah	Powell	Ullman
Kirwan	Quie	Utt
Kornegay	Race	Van Deerlin
Kunkel	Redlin	Vigorito
Laird	Reid, Ill.	Vivian
Landrum	Reid, N.Y.	Waggonner
Langen	Reifel	Walker, Miss.
Latta	Reinecke	Walker, N. Mex.
Lennon	Reuss	Watkins
Lipscomb	Rhodes, Ariz.	Watson
Long, La.	Rhodes, Pa.	Watts
Love	Rivers, Alaska	Weltner
McCulloch	Rivers, S.C.	Whalley
McDade	Roberts	White, Idaho
McDowell	Robison	White, Tex.
McEwen	Rodino	Whitener
McFall	Rogers, Fla.	Whitten
McGrath	Rogers, Tex.	Widnall
McVicker	Roncalio	Willis
MacGregor	Rooney, Pa.	Wilson, Bob
Mackay	Roudebush	Wilson, Charles H.
Mackie	Roush	Wolff
Madden	Roybal	Wyatt
Mahon	Satterfield	Younger
Mailliard	St Germain	Zablocki
Marsh	St. Onge	
Martin, Mass.	Saylor	
Martin, Nebr.	Scheuer	

NOT VOTING—61

Abbitt	Fino	Minshall
Adair	Ford, Gerald R.	Morton
Addabbo	Fulton, Tenn.	Moss
Andrews, George W.	Gallagher	Multer
Arends	Gilbert	Pirnie
Ashbrook	Griffiths	Poage
Battin	Hagan, Ga.	Poff
Blatnik	Hansen, Idaho	Pool
Bolton	Harvey, Ind.	Purcell
Bonner	Harvey, Mich.	Resnick
Carey	Hébert	Rooney, N.Y.
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Roosevelt
Conable	Kelly	Rosenthal
Conyers	Keogh	Ryan
Daddario	Lindsay	Sisk
Delaney	Long, Md.	Thomas
Derwinski	McCarthy	Thompson, Tex.
Dyal	McClory	Toll
Evins, Tenn.	Macdonald	Williams
Farnsley	Martin, Ala.	Wright
	May	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee against.

Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Wright against.

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Farnsley against.

For this day:

Mr. Williams with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Poff.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Macdonald with Mrs. May.

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Conable.

Mrs. Kelly with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Ryan.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Purcell.

Mr. Poage with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Long of Maryland.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

Mr. DIGGS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MACKAY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANDING THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. POWELL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which was ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. FASCELL. 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 (S. 1903) to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended (63 Stat. 734–736).

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, S. 1903, with Mr. McFALL 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 Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the

gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

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

Mr. Chairman, the subject matter of this bill is relatively simple and yet very important.

Mr. Chairman, S. 1903 contains two basic provisions:

In section 1, the bill amends subsections (a), (b), and (d) of section 2 of the United Nations Participation Act to provide greater flexibility in the assignment of persons appointed to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations and in such organs, commissions, or other bodies of the U.N. as are concerned with nuclear energy or disarmament.

There are at present five persons who fit that definition and who would be affected by this legislation. They are the principal U.S. representative to the United Nations: his deputy; the deputy U.S. representative to the Security Council; and U.S. representatives to the Trusteeship Council and the Economic and Social Council.

The bill does not increase the number of these principal appointees to the United Nations. It does not change or lessen the requirement that each and every one of them has to be appointed subject to Senate confirmation.

What the bill does, however, is to give the principal U.S. representative to the United Nations more discretion and authority to use his four principal assistants as he sees fit to carry out the task of representing our country in the United Nations.

At present, only three of the five persons we are talking about may represent the United States in the Security Council; and only two of them may represent our country both in the Security Council and in the other principal organs and commissions of the United Nations. The remaining two appointees are frozen in their positions: they can only serve in the Trusteeship Council and in the Economic and Social Council respectively.

S. 1903 would change this. It would enable Ambassador Goldberg to use all four of his principal associates on a flexible basis to advance our national interests in the various organs and bodies of the United Nations.

Now let me comment briefly about section 2 of S. 1903.

Section 2 of the bill would raise the position of the U.S. representative to the European office of the United Nations in Geneva to the rank of statutory Ambassador.

At the present time, there is an ambassador serving in that position. He is Ambassador Roger Tubby. However, he carries the personal rank of Ambassador by a Presidential appointment. He is not subject to Senate confirmation and he is not entitled to draw the salary established in the law for statutory Ambassadors.

Section 2 of S. 1903 would change this. It would authorize the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a representative of the United States to the European office of the United Nations with "appropriate rank and status." Executive branch witnesses testified that the President intends—if this bill is enacted—to assign the rank of statutory Ambassador, class 3, to that position. This mean that Ambassador Tubby's salary would be raised by $2,500 and that his position would become subject to Senate confirmation.

His name would have to be resubmitted and he would have to be reconfirmed in order to hold that position.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation has been recommended by both of our Ambassadors, both Ambassador Stevenson, who testified before our committee, and also our present Ambassador, Ambassador Goldberg. I have his wire to the committee which I should like to read into the RECORD:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 8, 1965.

Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International Organizations, House Foreign Affairs Committee, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to express my complete support of the amendments to the U.N. Participation Act of 1945 now under consideration by the House of Representatives. I agree with the testimony of Assistant Secretary Harlan Cleveland and Ambassador Charles W. Yost on these amendments before your subcommittee earlier this year.

The proposed amendments will provide me with the necessary flexibility to utilize the members of my staff to maximum advantage in the various councils and organs of the United Nations. Moreover, they will accord to our Ambassador in Geneva the rank and status which he needs to deal with his counterparts on an equal footing. The United Nations has grown in size and complexity since the original legislation was passed in 1945. The U.S. representative should be able to respond to increased technical and political demands in the various U.N. bodies by assigning the members of his staff with the greatest expertise and background in the topic then under consideration.

I therefore support the sense of the amendments now before the House and urge you and your colleagues to give them your full and sympathetic consideration.

Ambassador ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this legislation is sound and needed. It will increase the efficiency of our representation in the United Nations by permitting more flexible utilization of the top personnel of our mission in New York. At the same time, it will bring the appointment of the U.S. Representative to the European office of the United Nations under closer congressional scrutiny by making that appointee subject to Senate confirmation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

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

I am not at all enamored of this bill, as I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee well knows. I do not believe that it is a good bill from the standpoint of the language contained on page 2, which provides for the appointment of additional persons with appropriate titles, rank, and status to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations and in such organs, commissions, or other bodies as may be created. This seems to me to be almost unlimited. At the proper time I expect to offer an amendment to at least provide that any additional organizations which are created have the approval of Congress before Americans are assigned to represent the U.S. Government.

I am opposed to "beefing up" the United Nations office in Geneva, Switzerland, for I believe that is what will be the result of the language to be found on page 4 of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time and I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD].

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill S. 1903.

Two years ago, I had the honor to serve—together with our distinguished colleague from New York [Mrs. KELLY]—as U.S. delegate to the 18th General Assembly of the United Nations.

During the 3½ months which we spent at the United Nations, we had ample opportunity to observe not only the operations of that organization, but also the activities of our U.N. mission in New York. And I came away convinced that much needed to be done to streamline, and to make more effective, our permanent representation in the United Nations.

I am very pleased to observe, therefore, that one of the recommendations which Mrs. KELLY and I submitted to the Congress upon our return from the United Nations, is embodied in the legislation which we are now discussing.

On page 2—and again on page 21 of our report—House Report 1103, 88th Congress, 2d session—was said, and I quote:

> The permanent U.S. representative in the United Nations should be given more flexibility in allocating work among the five principal officers of the U.S. Mission [to the United Nations].

This is precisely what S. 1903 proposes to accomplish. It makes our principal representative in the United Nations, the chief of our delegation to that organization, and the boss of the five-man team which represents our country in the various principal organs and commissions of the United Nations.

Under this bill our principal representative in the United Nations is given by law the authority which he needs to do his job well—to represent our country effectively. With this authority, he can utilize the talents—and the time—of his principal associates to the best advantage.

This is the major change embodied in S. 1903. The bill does not remove the requirement of a Senate confirmation for U.S. representatives in the principal organs of the United Nations. It does not increase the number of such representatives. It simply provides that all five of them will serve as a team under the direction of our principal representative—at present, Ambassador Goldberg.

I should like to add a brief note. In our January 1964, report on "United Nations in Crisis," we also voiced some

strong objections to the cumbersome, and often picayune, procedures devised by the Department of State to assure State supervision over our mission to the United Nations. Of course, such supervision is proper and necessary, but in some instances these procedures are so complicated as to be ridiculous. I want to express my personal hope that if the Congress approves this legislation, that the State Department will also endeavor to take a step in the right direction by freeing our mission from the petty controls which also clog the wheels of effective representation.

Mr. Chairman, in order to develop this point, I should like to place in the RECORD that section of our report which dealt with "Relations Between the U.S. Mission and the Department of State." Its text follows:

B. RELATIONS BETWEEN THE U.S. MISSION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

In the course of our assignment as members of the U.S. delegation, we had an opportunity to study the relations between the U.S. mission and the Department of State. We find that the structure of these relationships, and the performance resulting from it, leave much to be desired. This is perhaps the most glaring shortcoming of U.S. participation in the United Nations—a shortcoming which has persisted in spite of repeated criticisms directed against it by the congressional members of U.S. delegations to earlier sessions of the General Assembly.

We recognize at the start that the U.S. mission to the United Nations, like any U.S. diplomatic post abroad, is an extension of the Department of State and must be subservient to the central foreign policy authority in Washington. We find, however, that the manner in which the State Department exercises its control over the mission, the manner in which questions of policy, strategy, and tactics are decided, is unbearably cumbersome and picayune. At times it deprives the mission of meaningful participation in the formulation and execution of U.S. policy with regard to the United Nations. Quite often, it relegates policymaking to second- and third-echelon personnel in the Department of State, and in the mission. We will attempt to show how this happens.

The main outline of U.S. foreign policy is shaped in Washington and then transmitted to the U.S. mission and to the various U.S. diplomatic posts abroad. We are not aware of the existence of any major problem in this area insofar as the mission in New York is concerned. The permanent U.S. representative in the United Nations has probably easier and more frequent access to the White House and to the President's principal foreign policy advisers than any other chief of a U.S. diplomatic mission. We assume that his views are fully considered in the formulation of the broad outline of our Government's foreign policy. It is our impression, however, that, at times, decisions affecting our posture in the United Nations are not promptly communicated to him and his staff. Such slipups should not be allowed to recur.

The process of policy formulation does not stop at this point, however. The world is in a state of change—and a dynamic foreign policy has to respond to this condition. Long-range objectives have to be reviewed and adjusted as necessary. Policy positions have to be prepared as new crises and issues arise. Numerous policy decisions may have to be made, or changed, and implemented, each day. It is in this sphere—the sphere of day-to-day foreign policy formulation and implementation—that the structure of relationships between the U.S. mission and the Department of State comes fully into play and produces, we are convinced, some undesirable results. The major weaknesses of that structure are as follows:

First, there are obvious shortcomings in forward policy planning—particularly decision-making—with respect to U.N. issues. At the beginning of the 18th session of the General Assembly, whose agenda was predictable with a large measure of certainty for several months in advance, the U.S. delegation did not have the official State Department positions on most of the agenda items. On many of the issues considered during the session, 11th-hour decisions were made by the Department of State. The Department's failure to make decisions sufficiently in advance hampers the U.S. delegation in the discharge of its duties and makes it impossible to prepare an effective overall strategy for the session.

Second, lines of communication between the U.S. mission and the Department of State, and the levels at which policy is developed, are not clearly established. Each time that a policy decision is needed, the search for the proper authority seems to begin anew. The request for a decision is generally initiated by a midechelon officer at the mission and transmitted to a midechelon officer in the Department. From there it proceeds to wander laterally, clearing a succession of desks and bureaus—even other Government departments—each of which has staked a claim to an opinion on that particular issue. If an appropriate policymaking official—e.g., an Assistant Secretary of State—happens to be busy with more weighty problems, as they generally seem to be, decisions are made by lower echelon officers who may lack clear understanding of the situation at the U.N. or of the implications of their decision for the overall U.S. position in that organization. In those instances, the decisions may have to be challenged up and down the line before the necessary modifications are authorized.

Third, the mission is allowed virtually no latitude not only with respect to minor policy decisions, but also—and more importantly—with respect to strategy and tactics. Texts of speeches to be given by U.S. delegates, minor changes in approved texts, small tactical maneuvers, and all departures from minutely detailed instructions have to be cleared with, and approved by, the Department of State. The rigidity and the excessive detail of the Department's instructions at times border on the ridiculous; the U.S. delegation, for instance, while negotiating the text of a draft resolution with the delegates of 112 countries, may have no authority to accept any deviation from the Department's preconceived notion of how the resolution should be worded—not even a comma, or an "and/or" phrase.

These are but the most glaring shortcomings in the structure of relationships between the Department of State and the U.S. mission. We find no excuse for them. We believe that means must be contrived between the White House, the Department of State, and the U.S. mission whereby these shortcomings will be rectified promptly. The permanent U.S. representative in the United Nations should be kept fully informed on all major foreign policy matters since all of them have implications for U.S. posture in the United Nations. He should have more latitude with respect to policy formulation and execution within the broad framework of policy made in Washington. And he and his staff, as well as U.S. delegations to the sessions of the General Assembly, should be accorded considerably more flexibility with respect to strategy and tactics employed to implement U.S. policy in that organization.

There is one more thing we would like to add: the United Nations offers unusal opportunities for the advancement of U.S. interests which may be outside the range of the immediate U.N. issues. These opportunities have been used with skill and effect by Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson. We believe that the U.S. representative in the United Nations should be entrusted—as a matter of policy—with the responsibility for utilizing all such opportunities in that organization for advancing our national interest.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I might take something of a different attitude toward the well known "Tower of Babel" in New York City otherwise known as the United Nations if it were performing any kind of a substantial service with respect to world affairs, but it is not carrying out any part of the mission for which it was organized. It is intriguing to note that the new so-called ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur Goldberg, has convinced President Johnson that what he ought to do now is start exporting the Great Society. This would be humorous if the end result were not so serious for American taxpayers. The Great Society is mostly a socialistic foreign import. It must sound real strange to foreigners to hear that this Government is now going to export to them the socialism they already have in adequate supply. I refer, for instance, to medicare, which the British and Italians have had for a long time. I assume from the activities of Mr. Goldberg that we are now about to try to export medicare to the British, who are today in serious trouble with the pound sterling.

Around the first of this year, we put up the substantial end of $3 billion to bolster the pound sterling. Only the other day, according to press reports, we handed out another half a billion dollars to prop up the pound sterling. The pound sterling is in trouble, and one of the reasons it is in trouble is because of the socialistic government they have in Great Britain.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. YATES. Do I gather from the gentleman's initial comment that he favors the withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations?

Mr. GROSS. Unless the United Nations starts to pay its bills, unless the United Nations starts to perform some of the services for which it was intended, I would say yes, we ought to withdraw. And certainly if those who assumed the responsibility of paying their bills when they become members of the United Nations continue to refuse to pay them, then we ought to withdraw or force their withdrawal.

Mr. YATES. Do I understand the gentleman favors a withdrawal by the United States from the United Nations at the present time?

Mr. GROSS. Unless the countries that are debtors, that refuse to live up to their obligations to the United Nations, meet those obligations. I said before, they either ought to be forced to withdraw or we ought to get out of the United Nations. One or the other.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. YATES. Does not the gentleman agree, however, that as long as the United States is a member of the United Nations our mission to the United Nations should be run as efficiently as possible? My own view, of course, is this is a necessary bill. Having served there and having seen the pigeonholing of the representation of the various ambassadors, it seems to me that a good thing to do is the very thing sought to be done in this bill; that is, to give the permanent delegate, the Chief Ambassador to the United Nations, the opportunity to use the various ambassadors in various positions so that there is not an inflexibility in their representation.

Do not the gentlemen agree that there ought to be as efficient an operation as possible in the U.S. mission to the U.N.?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I would like to see efficiency, but I fail to see any in the organization now.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will permit me a further comment, may I say that the reason for this bill, I think, is to satisfy the gentleman's desire for additional efficiency. With the passage of this bill such additional efficiency will be made possible.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know about additional efficiency, because I do not know of any efficiency now.

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

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

Mr. HALEY. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me if, by the passage of this bill, we might be able to recover some of the hundreds of millions of dollars that we have poured into this debating society.

Mr. GROSS. That is one of the questions the gentleman will have to ask some of the financial experts on the United Nations. Of course, there is no indication that the passage of this bill, or any other bill, will provide for the collection of the obligations that are owed to the United States.

Mr. HALEY. And which probably the people of the Congress knew at the time that we voted it.

Mr. GROSS. Of course.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I would like to associate myself with his remarks. I think it is time that we quit pumping money into an organization which will not pay its just and levied debts, at least when they are so determined by the International Court of Law whose decision it was agreed to recognize. The question is becoming serious, as we meet in the city of Washington on World Law Day, who is going to enforce whatever laws we might agree to.

The gentleman referred to importing ideas from other members of the United Nations and, in turn, reexporting those. Does he think this has any relationship to the European Common Market and our Reciprocal Trade and Tariff Agreement Act of 1962 which brought on the chicken war and the impact of imports of beef and other related items?

Mr. GROSS. I certainly do, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I would say that at the time we are shoring up the pound sterling, for the second time, and when we have lowered the protective tariff against the interests of the people here who are wage earners under a high standard of living, in the United States, to say nothing about the matter of medicare or other pigs in the poke that have been proposed and brought in here for reexport eventually to these same countries, when they are losing their technically trained people by the hundreds to their own colonies and elsewhere, it is a rather sorry situation and I doubt that our taxpayers can afford this.

I wonder if the gentleman knows from what contingency fund this money came that we sent over to England to shore up the pound sterling while we are having here an outflow of gold and an imbalance of payments?

Mr. GROSS. No; I have not been able as yet to ascertain that. Apparently this occurred only during the last weekend, at least in the last few days. I am not aware where the money came from to the tune of half a billion dollars that was poured into the kitty to shore up the pound sterling.

Mr. HALL. It certainly seems to me that at a time when we are demonetizing our own silver and taking the backing of gold off our money and still selling nickel and silver for export, in quantities more than we are mining, that we ought to reopen our own mines and quit giving away Uncle Sam's taxpayers' money; because, in addition to what the gentleman has pointed out, we are also oversubscribing above what this Congress has approved to the Technical Assistance Fund of the United Nations, regardless of how efficient we can make these people by putting the right man in the right pigeonhole.

Mr. GROSS. Well, of course, what Mr. Goldberg really wants to export is some more of our money. This is what he wants to export, because it is impossible to export medicare to Great Britain or to Italy. They already have it in their Great Society and that is where we got it.

Mr. HALL. Or to Germany where it started, if I may interpolate.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. You cannot export many of the theories of the Great Society and actual practices of the Great Society because they already have them over there. What Goldberg seeks to do in the program being set up is to export some more of the American taxpayers' cash.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to associate myself with my colleagues who have spoken before me, in urging the enactment of H.R. 6283.

This is a very worthy bill and one which is much needed to take some of the pressures off our principal Representative in the United Nations.

One of the things that impressed me in 1963, during my service as U.S. Delegate to the 18th General Assembly of the United Nations, was the tremendous work burden shouldered by our principal representative—then the late Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson—and his deputy.

From early in the morning until late at night, day in, and day out, these men were continuously occupied holding conferences, attending meetings, and participating in various representational functions. They worked under great pressure—primarily because there were not enough hours in each day to respond to all the demands made upon them.

The bill before the Committee of the Whole House would help to remedy that situation. It would lighten the workload of our principal representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Goldberg, by authorizing him to assign some of his tasks to his four associates—the men and women who represent our country in the principal organs and commissions of the United Nations.

We must remember that these men and women will not be making individual policies. They will continue to carry out the policy of this country made by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State. But in carrying out this policy they will have more flexibility in the division and allocation of specific tasks.

I believe, therefore, that this is a good bill, and a needed bill. I hope that the House will approve it overwhelmingly.

I would like to add a word about section 2 of this legislation.

As we all know, several dozen international organizations—including the United Nations—have offices in Geneva. Our country is represented in those organizations. We also have an Ambassador who represents us in the European office of the United Nations in that city. The problem is that while he should act as our senior representative in Geneva, he only holds the rank of Ambassador by a Presidential letter. He is not a full-fledged, statutory Ambassador. As a result, he is outranked by many other emissaries, ours and those of other nations. This creates some problems.

The bill before us addresses itself to that problem and proposes to solve it in a very reasonable and inexpensive way. It simply raises our representatives to the European office of the United Nations to the rank of Ambassador and makes him subject to Senate confirmation. The total amount involved in this change is only $2,500.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the bill be adopted.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments now before the House.

Twenty years ago the Congress passed a bill which was adequate to the needs of the day. It provided for the appointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of a U.S. representative to the United Nations, two deputies, one of whom would serve on the Security Council, and certain other representatives who would serve on the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council. It also authorized the President to appoint certain other persons to represent the United States in the other organs and agencies of the United Nations.

This was at a time when the Economic and Social Council could be depended upon to limit itself largely to economic and social concerns and when the Trusteeship Council could be depended upon to restrict itself primarily to trusteeship affairs. The other U.N. organs not only were less numerous in 1945; they were also less busy and less preoccupied with political matters not normally within their jurisdiction.

Today, 20 years later, the United Nations has expanded from 51 to 114 members. Its Councils and other organs have also grown, including the two principal councils whose size was established by the framers of the U.N. Charter in San Francisco.

The scope of the problems taken up by each of these bodies is no longer circumscribed by its agenda. U.S. actions in Vietnam may come up in the Economic and Social Council or in a subcommittee on the status of women. The OAS presence in the Dominican Republic can arise in a committee on U.N. finances.

In this changed environment, it only makes sense for this country to be able to field its ablest technicians and political experts in the issue then being discussed. The U.S. representative to the U.N. should be able to assign the members of his staff to the particular tasks that they are best qualified by talent and training and experience to perform.

Mr. Chairman, this is the purpose of the amendments now before us. They do not authorize any additional personnel for the United States Mission or provide any pay increases for our U.N. representatives in New York. They merely permit Ambassador Goldberg to do what any supervisor is expected to do to conduct his business efficiently and well.

Surely there can be no serious objection to our extending this flexibility to Ambassador Goldberg in the conduct of his important mission. Indeed we would be remiss in our obligations and hobble the operation of our country's foreign policy in this vital arena should we fail to provide the freedom of operation demanded by the circumstances prevailing today.

Mr. Chairman, the other aspect of the proposed amendments has to do with our Ambassador to the European office of the United Nations in Geneva. Geneva is the site of some 3,000 conference sessions a year. It is the location of 20 international organizations and the headquarters of four specialized agencies of the United Nations. Several thousand foreign and international official personnel and 36 resident missions are located there. Thirty-one of these are headed by representatives with ambassadorial rank and status.

The amendments now under consideration would extend statutory ambassadorial rank and status to our representative in Geneva. It would provide the U.S. representative equal footing and status with the representatives of most of the other countries stationed there. It would facilitate his work and accord him the diplomatic prestige and dignity to which our Ambassador at this important post should be entitled.

The cost of this amendment is small, representing only the difference between the incumbent's foreign service rank and that authorized by existing legislation for our Ambasadors in the capitals of other countries of the world. I submit that the returns are potentially greater than the small amount of money involved.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of this House soon to become a part of Ambassador Goldberg's staff, I urge the most careful and unbiased consideration of these proposed amendments. Politics and partisanship to the side, they cannot fail to make sense to anyone wishing to strengthen the hand of our U.N. team as it faces up to a new and important session of the General Assembly.

The United Nations is 20 years old this year. It has made changes in its charter and in its organization to account for its growth and the changed international environment in which it operates. I submit that we cannot fail in this House to take similar stock of the changed requirements of our representation there.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the adoption of these pending amendments to the U.N. Participation Act of 1945.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield for a unanimous-consent request to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I fully support the amendments to the United Nations Participation Act embodied in S. 1903, because I believe that this legislation will provide the necessary flexibility to enhance our representation at the United Nations.

I believe that the recent appointment of our highly distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], will prove to be a source of great strength to the U.N. His extensive experience in legislative affairs, his concern with peace and justice the world over, and his unquestioned stature as a humanitarian of the first order, are ample evidence of the rare qualifications he brings to this high post.

I salute this legislation and this appointment because I believe that they clearly demonstrate the high regard and earnest hopes we in the United States have for the U.N. If we are to live at peace, we need a strong United Nations and an effective U.S. representation in its highest offices.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, once again I urge that the fullest advantage be taken of the machinery of the United Nations, in decelerating the course of the war in Vietnam. Once again, I call upon the President to direct Ambassador Goldberg to secure a General Assembly resolution which would authorize the dispatch of a U.N. peacekeeping force to South Vietnam. This force, through aerial reconnaissance and ground patrols, could put an end to the infiltration of men and materiel into South Vietnam, and could secure areas of relative safety where the beleaguered civilian population could find refuge and succor from the scourge of war.

If the United States has to bear the lion's share of the costs of providing such a force, I believe we should accept this as the price of leadership in an anxious world. We have today, 125,000 men in South Vietnam, at a cost of $3 million a day. I think we need the U.N. to help grind this war to a halt. If by this U.N. involvement, an end could be put to the infiltration which prompted our bombing of North Vietnam. We would be in an excellent position to cease this retaliation.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill and will support other efforts to strengthen the United Nations, because in this troubled world this institution has responsibilities of enormous proportion; and its strength is a prerequisite to the effective action needed to meet these responsibilities.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to yield any further time?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1903

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsections (a), (b), and (d) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended by Public Law 341, Eighty-first Congress, October 10, 1949, are hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative of the United States to the United Nations who shall have the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and may serve ex officio as representative of the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations other than specialized agencies of the United Nations, and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may, from time to time, direct.

"(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint additional persons with appropriate titles, rank, and status to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations and in such organs, commissions, or other bodies as may be created by the United Nations with respect to nuclear energy or disarmament (control and limitation of armament). Such persons shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the Representative of the United States to the United Nations. They shall, at the direction of the Representative of the United States to the United Nations, represent the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations, including the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council, and perform such other functions as the Representative of the United States is authorized to perform in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations. Any Deputy Representative or any other officer holding office at the time the provisions of this Act, as amended, become effective shall not be required to be reappointed by reason of the enactment of this Act, as amended.

"(d) The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in organs and agencies of the United Nations. The President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act without additional compensation as the representative of the United States in either the Economic and Social Council or the Trusteeship Council (1) at any specified session thereof where the position is vacant or in the absence or disability of the regular representative or (2) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified session of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The President may designate any officer of the Department of State, whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Senate, to act, without additional compensation, for temporary periods as the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the absence or disability of the representative provided for under section 2 (a) and (b) or in lieu of such representatives in connection with a specified subject matter."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such Act as hereby further amended by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) to be subsections (f) and (g) respectively; and by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative of the United States to the European office of the United Nations with appropriate rank and status who shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the Secretary of State. Such person shall, at the direction of the Secretary of State, represent the United States at the European office of the United Nations, and perform such other functions there in connection with the participation of the United States in international organizations as the Secretary of State may, from time to time, direct".

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On the first page, line 3, strike out "That subsections (a), (b), and (d)" and insert in lieu thereof "That (a) subsections (a) and (b) of section 2".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 5, strike out "amended." and insert in lieu thereof "amended.'".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, immediately after line 5, insert the following:

"(b) Subsection (d) of section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 15, immediately before the quotation marks insert a period.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 2, line 16, delete the period and insert the following: "and which the United States may join or assent to by a treaty hereafter ratified or by authorization through an Act of Congress hereafter passed."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would make the pertinent language on page 2 of the bill, beginning on line 10, read as follows:

The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint additional persons with appropriate titles, rank, and status to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations and in such organs, commissions, or other bodies as may be created by the United Nations with respect to nuclear energy or disarmament (control and limitation of armament), and which the United States may join or assent to by treaty hereafter ratified or by authorization through an act of Congress hereafter passed.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is prompted by the susceptibility of the language of this bill to a misinterpretation which could have a far-reaching impact. The specific language to which I refer is contained in subsection "(b)" and appears on page 2 of the bill on lines 10 through 16. This provision of the bill, without my amendment, states:

The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint additional persons with appropriate titles, rank, and status to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations and in such organs, commissions, or other bodies as may be created by the United Nations with respect to nuclear energy or disarmament (control and limitation of armament).

The effect of this language is to authorize the President to appoint persons to represent the United States in international bodies to which the United States is not yet a member and even to international organizations which have not yet been created. Judging from the testimony by the Department of State on this measure, it is not the expressed intention of this language to authorize U.S. membership in such organs, commissions, and other bodies which may be created by the United Nations with respect to nuclear energy or disarmament. One cannot, however, escape the susceptibility of this language, and the power which it grants to the Executive, to interpretation as an authorization for U.S. membership in such bodies. In the absence of such a construction, U.S. membership would be contingent on a treaty ratification by the Senate.

If there is no intention for this act to authorize U.S. membership in such organizations even before they are formed, then certainly there should be no objection to the amendment which I have offered. The amendment merely limits the power of appointing a representative to those international bodies to which U.S. membership is authorized by a treaty hereafter ratified by the Senate or an act of Congress hereafter passed.

By no means should the Congress leave this language so ambiguous that it is susceptible to being construed as a left-handed approval of U.S. membership in international organizations which may be created in the future. U.S. adherence to, or membership in, any international organization should be approved in the specific manner specified by the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one gets the impression from the remarks of my good friend from Iowa that what is proposed in this paragraph is the authority to join international organizations other than those created within the United Nations itself. That is not the fact at all.

An examination of this language indicates that it proposes to grant the President authority to appoint with the approval of the Senate to any commission or groups created within the United Nations, membership which the United States now has as a result of a treaty with the approval of the Senate and in only two fields—in the field of nuclear energy or disarmament.

The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa would require that in the event the United Nations were to create a commission, a committee, a formal group of some kind to look into the possibility of establishing a basis for disarmament, in such a situation it would be necessary for our representatives not to participate as a member of such a commission until the participation of the United States were approved by an act of Congress or by a treaty with the consent of the Senate.

Of course, as the gentleman from Iowa indicated earlier, he does not hold in high regard the United Nations and he does not hold in high regard our membership in the United Nations. I think that is the

essence of this amendment, that it hamstrings the participation and cooperation of the United States in the functioning of the United Nations. As long as we are full-fledged members of that organization, we ought to be able to participate in all of its activities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

The Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCFALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1903) to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended (63 Stat. 734–736), pursuant to House Resolution 562, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be 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.

INSPECTION OF THE HAVOC CAUSED BY HURRICANE BETSY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I have just now come back from an inspection of the damage caused by hurricane Betsy in Louisiana.

Hurricane Betsy which struck southeast Louisiana on Thursday night and early Friday morning did incredible damage. There are many areas that are still under water and there are thousands upon thousands of refugees. There are areas within my own congressional district such as Grand Isle on the Gulf of Mexico that have been totally destroyed. The damage to crops, to homes, to businesses, to public utilities is still incalculable.

In the Parish of St. James as of yesterday there was not a telephone or an electric light in operation.

The port of New Orleans, one of the great shipping centers of the world, suffered unbelievable losses when ships tore away from their moorings, barges, and other marine vessels were thrown against the docks and many lodged on dry land on the levees and battures.

The dispatch and efficiency with which the Government of the United States, under the direction of the President has responded, has earned the praise and gratitude of the people everywhere throughout my State.

Upon learning of the extent of the disaster throughout our congressional delegation, the President went to New Orleans almost immediately. He saw the flood waters, he saw the damage, and he saw the human misery. He personally talked with the people. Since that time the Government, working with the State, municipal, and parish governments, has acted with fantastic speed.

Units of the 4th Army were airborne almost within hours after the President returned to Washington. They flew in food, medicine, blankets, cooking equipment, and so forth. Now they are feeding thousands of people. Likewise all of the other agencies of the Government have been mobilized: the Bureau of Public Roads to open highways; the Department of Agriculture to provide food stocks; Housing and Home Finance to assist in home repair, renovation, and restoration; Small Business Administration to make direct loans to homeowners and businesses; the Army Engineers to direct port and levee restoration; Coast Guard in rescue operations everywhere; Health, Education, and Welfare, to give medicine and supplies; and the Office of Emergency Planning, coordinating all of their activities through Governor McKeithen in Baton Rouge, and agencies of the State, municipal, and parish governments throughout the area.

It has been a major disaster, Mr. Speaker. But it has strengthened my faith in man's humanity to man, in the compassion of our people everywhere, and in the dispatch with which our public officials from President Johnson and Governor McKeithen down, have responded to the needs of our people and our State.

My State has suffered a blow, but it will rebuild and rebuild quickly. Our greatest blow has been the loss of life, which cannot be restored. But to the families of these unfortunate people every help from public and private agencies is being made available.

President Johnson summed up the sentiment of all Americans when he said that the Nation grieves for its hurricane-stricken neighbors in Louisiana. But the President did much more than just act as a national spokesman. He acted as the national leader that he is.

Despite the overwhelming burdens of his office, President Johnson put everything else aside to fly to Louisiana.

He wanted to see for himself the extent of the devastation.

He wanted to let the stunned and grief-stricken people there know that the Nation had not forgotten them.

And he wanted to let them know that help was on the way.

I was privileged to be with the President in New Orleans last Friday evening. I know the tremendous impact which his visit made there. His compassion was translated into hope for an entire State—and that hope gave them the will to carry on.

We will never be able to fully express our thanks to this great President.

But we will never forget his concern in our time of need.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I would be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, Louisiana was hit by one of the worst hurricanes in the history of mankind. Hundreds were injured. Thousands were rendered homeless. And tens of thousands were without food and water. The human suffering that I saw will remain forever in my mind.

But into the midst of that suffering—before the wind had even died down—came our great President of the United States. I was on the plane with him and I know what that visit meant to the suffering and beleaguered citizens of all Louisiana. President Johnson brought to them a new hope—when hope seemed farthest away. He brought them the will and the courage to fight back against the catastrophe of wind and water wrought by nature that had befallen them. And he brought to them the assurance that the mighty U.S. Government was fighting beside them and for them.

President Johnson has always shown himself to be a man of deep compassion and unusual understanding. And for me, that compassion and unusual human understanding will always be symbolized by his timely and sympathetic visit to a great American State in its darkest hour of destruction and suffering.

Saturday, after a meeting with Governor McKeithen and other officials I traveled over a lot of my district by automobile and finished traveling over the district on Sunday. Destruction was everywhere looking as if thousands of tornadoes had hit everywhere. One thing stood out above all else—our people. They were brave and gallant and even elderly men and women were working, helping, and giving their very all, cleaning up debris and doing all kinds of jobs.

In the words of Mayor Woody Dumas of Baton Rouge, which suffered over $50 million in damages, who himself has been magnificent and tireless in his efforts, who said:

> President Johnson could not be doing more. He has cut the redtape * * * every Government agency has thousands of people working while many thousands are being fed and cared for. President Johnson has given his all and his dynamic efforts are a great and magnificent hour for Louisiana in this great catastrophe and tragedy.

On behalf of all the citizens of the Sixth Congressional District I wish to thank President Lyndon B. Johnson from the bottom of our hearts.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority whip yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening, the President of the United

States stood on the windswept runway at the New Orleans International Airport and delivered a brief message to the hurricane-stricken citizens of Louisiana. He told them he had come to view the damage with his own eyes. He told them he knew of their suffering. And he told them that the Nation was behind them in their efforts to fight their way back.

Then he went into the city where the storm had left its mark; where rubble was everywhere; where half the streets were under water; where stunned children were crying out for food and water. What he saw and said in New Orleans applies to the Sugar Belt and all the other affected areas of the State of Louisiana.

His presence acted as a shot in the arm for the entire State of Louisiana. Suddenly the people knew that they could fight their way back. Suddenly they stood a little straighter and began to look to the future with a new spirit of determination.

This is the stuff that leadership is made of—and I would like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to our great and compassionate President for providing it at a time when we needed it most. A friend in need is a friend indeed.

THE DEVASTATING EFFECTS OF HURRICANE BETSY

Mr. BRADEMAS. 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. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] for the remarks that he addressed to the House a few minutes ago with respect to the terrible disaster which recently hit many communities in his State and elsewhere in that part of the United States. I express to him the deep compassion and sympathy of the people of northern Indiana for the victims of hurricane Betsy.

On April 11, 1965—last Palm Sunday—a devastating series of tornadoes tore through my State leaving death and destruction in their wake. The loss to my district alone, with many dead and injured, and property damage in the millions of dollars, was catastrophic. In one small community, Dunlap, the desolation in some places was total and the individual suffering was and remains beyond total measurement or belief. We can truly identify with the people who have met America's most recent natural disaster.

Mr. Speaker, one must see the results of a storm like Betsy to fully appreciate the force with which she strikes. Three days after the holocaust, President Johnson, my colleagues, the senior Senator from Indiana, Senator HARTKE, and the junior Senator from Indiana, Senator BAYH, Indiana Gov. Roger Branigin, Buford Ellington, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, and I, visited the stricken area. The crippling effects of the storm were overwhelming. The evidence of personal and community tragedy, on all sides, stunned and moved us all.

We were surrounded, Mr. Speaker, by the remnants of what had previously been clean suburban homes in neat divisions. We saw a battlefield of broken boards, dirt, shattered glass, splintered furniture, and fragmented household goods. Neat rows of mobile housing units had been reduced to lifeless rubble.

Entire families were killed; others deprived of one or more of their members. Hospitals were filled to capacity. The human loss was the worst of any natural disaster in Indiana memory.

We bear witness to all of this and more.

Mr. Speaker, we in Indiana found that for the most part, the aid of the Federal Government came quickly and effectively. We found that medicines, foodstuffs, and provisions of all kinds came as soon as the President declared our territory a "disaster area." But, we also found that, necessary and comforting as these immediate short-term measures were, it soon became clear that Federal machinery required to give meaningful long-term resource therapy to the stricken individual or family either did not exist or fell far short of what was required. Economic aid in the forms of loan adjustment or mortage postponent came, if at all, too little or too late. The best aid available was just not enough.

Mr. Speaker, on May 11, 1965, I introduced H.R. 8069, a bill designed to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] has introduced a similar bill. On June 22 of this year I stated before the Senate Public Works Committee, then considering a bill cosponsored by Senators BAYH and HARTKE which deals with additional aid to areas suffering a major disaster:

> We have found, to our dismay, in Indiana, as have other unfortunate communities, which have been victims of major disasters, that, notwithstanding the impressive battery of general Federal disaster relief relating to public property losses, as the people go courageously about the trial of rebuilding their homes, farms, businesses, and lives, little or no direct assistance is available to them. Our experience, and that of other hapless citizens in Alaska, Iowa, California, Minnesota, Oregon, Missouri, Washington, Idaho, Wisconsin, Kansas, and Colorado, has made it clear that new legislation is required aimed at providing proper financial help for people who lose everything except their obligations in tornadoes, floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, and earthquakes. Our present knowledge of meteorology may limit what we can do to influence the weather, but it does not confine our compassion for those who have been damaged nor our responsibility to assist those whose lives have been devastated.
>
> It is imperative that we act with dispatch. For some, such as farmers, help must come now or it shall be too late to revive their operations. There are many who desperately watch our actions and await our assistance. While we mediate, disaster, and its resulting toll in suffering, hovers in the wings. It would be unconscionable if another tragedy should find us unprepared.
>
> The Nation can wait no longer. We, in Congress, must take the initiative. We must establish continuing authority to enable the executive agencies to deal adequately with the multitude of problems which follow every disaster.
>
> It is within our power to mitigate the economic hardship which has been thrust upon some members of our community by forces beyond their control.

On July 22, 1965, the Senate passed its Disaster Relief Act of 1965. Parallel legislation has been introduced as H.R. 9885 by the Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and a similar bill was introduced yesterday in the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]. I want to reaffirm my hope that in the wake of the Louisiana disaster we can have hearings on this legislation now and enact it into law before Congress adjourns.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

GENERAL DISASTER ACT NEEDED

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend the deep sympathy of the people of the State of Indiana to the citizens of the State of Louisiana who are now recovering from the disastrous effects of hurricane Betsy. Parts of my State felt the destructive force of nature this past April when tornadoes struck the central and northern parts of Indiana.

As my distinguished colleague [Mr. BOGGS] has said, the Federal agencies were quick to offer aid to Louisiana in its distress. Indiana received the same quick attention when recovery began following the tornadoes on Palm Sunday. For this aid, we were deeply grateful. However, as the initial shock quieted and recovery progressed, we became aware that there are still inadequacies and shortcomings in the present Federal recovery programs.

This most recently declared "natural disaster" in Louisiana marks the 47th time in the past 20 months where we have seen the horror and havoc which results when nature's forces reach an extreme stage. Disaster relief is currently operating on the basis of the Federal Disaster Act of 1950. But each time the President declares a "natural disaster," additional and special legislation appears to be necessary. Yet the people of Indiana discovered, and I am certain that we shall also discover in the aftermath of hurricane Betsy in Louisiana, that this is not enough.

One shortcoming in particular will stand out in the weeks ahead when all of these efforts to assist the hurricane-torn cities and parishes of Louisiana are reviewed. This will be the insufficient aid available to the individual in his effort to regain his original physical and fiscal status. Five months ago when tornadoes swept through my congressional district in Indiana, this shortcoming in Federal assistance to disaster areas was quickly spotlighted. It was succinctly described by the mayor of one of the stricken cities in these words: "We have a void in assisting people."

A bill providing for a comprehensive overhaul of existing disaster programs

was introduced last spring by myself in the House of Representatives and in the Senate by Indiana's junior Senator BIRCH BAYH. After an extensive and exhaustive study by all agencies concerned, this measure was adopted in revised form by the Senate. The revised bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives by the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. It is now awaiting consideration by the House Public Works Committee. Its early consideration is imperative. Its early approval is mandatory if we hope to respond adequately to the needs of those persons in Louisiana and other States with declared disaster areas who find themselves left with only life itself as their sole possession.

WASHINGTON WORLD CONFERENCE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in our Capital and country occurred an event of great historical significance. This was the convening of the Washington World Conference on World Peace Through Law.

Mr. Speaker, to our Capital have come over 3,000 of the most eminent judges and lawyers of the world to dedicate themselves to the pursuit of that old dream of the human heart, world peace through world law.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion a great address was delivered by the illustrious Chief Justice of the United States—an address filled with wisdom, inspiration, and hope.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I include the address of the Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Earl Warren.

The address follows:

I bid you welcome to my country and to our Nation's Capital City. Especially do I welcome my colleagues of the high courts of nations and judges of international courts who are our honored guests, this being our first meeting together on a worldwide basis. I have met many of you in my travels and look forward to renewing the warm friendship thus created. And I am certain many new friendships will be born here among those of you whom we meet for the first time. May I say that anything I or my colleagues on the Supreme Court of the United States can do to make your visit more pleasant and fruitful will be done.

We of the law are gathered here from the four corners of the earth to make our personal contributions to a program to help achieve mankind's greatest need—world peace. We come from more than 100 nations. Collectively, we live under all political systems, adhere to all religions and creeds, use all languages, and are composed of all races; yet we possess a common core of understanding which springs from universal ideals of fairness and reasonableness which are inherent in the principles of the rule of law. Thus the rule of law gives us a "common language" which bridges our differences and enables us to work together on the great task for which we are assembled.

The control of force in international relations is the paramount problem of our day. I believe that the legal profession has a unique contribution it can make to the solution of that problem. The lawyer's skills in problem solving, the judge's experience in deciding, the leadership of all elements of the law in public affairs are sources of strength we must draw upon as we face up to our challenge and responsibilities.

Our task at this conference is to move humankind forward along the road to peace. We will do this by counseling together upon concrete steps to strengthen existing rules of law and existing judicial institutions. We will do this also through the formulation of ideas for new rules and new adjudicating institutions.

This year has been designated International Cooperation Year by proclamation of the U.N. General Assembly—a year "to direct attention to the common interests of mankind and to accelerate the joint efforts being undertaken to further them." No more important common interest exists than our shared interest in a world ruled by law; for mankind's most practical hope for world peace lies in an orderly world community under the rule of law.

We live in an era in which concentrated research involving worldwide exchanges of knowledge and experience in the physical sciences has brought dramatic achievements.

When the scientists split the atom, their success was the end result of the combined cumulative research of men of science from throughout the world. The knowledge and experience of these thousands of scientists was used to achieve this great goal. Centuries of hard work were thus finally crowned with success, and a seemingly impossible result was thereby accomplished.

My thesis is that we can and must accomplish our objective in like manner. But our approach must be different. Instead of breaking society down to its most minute elements, we must bind it together into a viable whole. Achieving and maintaining a rule of law strong enough to regulate actions of nations and individuals in the world community is no more dreamy, impossible, or impracticable than was the idea of splitting the atom, or putting a man on the moon, or sending a missile to Mars a few years ago. I believe we of our generation can translate the centuries-old dream of a world ruled by law from dream into reality. In part, my belief is based upon the imperatives of our day which make this a necessity to save mankind from nuclear holocaust. In part, my belief is based upon the fact that there is more law and judicial institutions today, nationally and internationally, than ever before in the history of mankind. Given this knowledge and reliance and taking note of the necessity that we succeed in order to survive, I would like to comment upon factors we possess which should enable us to move forward in our quest for a world ruled by law.

First. We know more about law in the world internationally and within nations than any other generation of the legal profession. There is an ever-growing worldwide dialog among men of the law which is making itself a factor in world affairs. Human unity and interdependence of men and nations upon each other have reached such a degree that none of us can remain ignorant or indifferent to what is happening in law in other nations or in international organizations. Because of the faster and more comprehensive communications which now exist we know more about the basic facts of the law systems and judicial systems of the world than ever before.

This is not to say our knowledge is as complete as it should be, but only that it is greater than in the past and is continuing to grow. Through exchanges of law books, law journals and other media, we are learning more about law and justice all over the world. In the field of law, we will soon be able to bring the totality of man's legal knowledge and experience to bear on our task of creating enough law and enough judicial agencies to enable the world to operate under the rule of law.

Second. More and better law exists today in each nation than ever before. All recent surveys prove this fact. Nearly every nation is reforming, updating, and expanding the rule of law within its borders. This tremendous ferment and growth in the field of law on a global basis is the response by the law to the great changes which are the hallmark of our day.

In England they are doing a major overhaul of their ancient criminal laws, as are we on many subjects. Newly developing nations have new constitutions and new law codes. Many illustrations could be cited nation by nation. The most obvious development is the expansion of protections for the individual, a response to the universal striving for human dignity and freedom.

As we learn more about the law systems of other nations, our respect is increased for some of the improvements many nations have made in such fields as criminal law, family law, commercial law, and others. By exchanging ideas and experiences on a worldwide basis we will enable ourselves to perform a better service in our respective nations.

We must get to know each other as well as to know each other's law because from personal friendships we can forge links of great worth to the people we serve and provide continuous contacts for further collaboration on matters of mutual interest.

The unique exhibit at this conference of great historic and current instruments of law gives us an opportunity to share the law heritage upon which we must build the world of law we seek. These great documents like the Magna Carta, the Code of Justinian, the Declaration of Rights of Man, the Code of Napoleon, the U.N. Charter, and many others of even earlier times which are on display, lend a glowing inspiration to our meeting and our work together.

When such an exhibit for this conference was suggested, it was with the thought that this common heritage of the law would give impetus to our work by spotlighting the ideals we have in common, thus minimizing our differences. It was an acknowledgement that we, a young nation, honor the older nations for their contributions to the laws and institutions which we cherish.

Third. More international law exists today than ever before. The pace of discovery and invention has forced this rapid development of law. In the past 20 years, the U.N. and its specialized agencies have spurred, spawned, updated, or sponsored more international law and legal institutions than was created in all human history. In the preoccupation with some of the more divisive problems of the United Nations, we sometimes overlook the law that has been generated by it. But when one takes an inventory of what has happened, this growth of law and legal institutions stands forth as conclusive proof of how tremendously valuable the U.N. has been, and is today.

The United Nations has updated such ancient world as the law of the sea and the law of diplomatic immunity. It has drafted new law on subjects such as the nuclear test ban, human rights, space, aviation and communications. The new law and the new legal institutions which the U.N. and its specialized agencies have brought into existence are tremendous in their scope and volume.

In aviation, for example, there is a worldwide regulatory agency for rates and one for safety operations. There are also agencies for decision of airline disputes and law rules

relative to a veritable host of related needs like weather, customs, and accidents on the ground and in the air. Domestic law on aviation in nation after nation complements international aviation law, and together they form an excellent example of how wise it is to develop each in step with the other.

Regional agencies under the U.N., and non-U.N. agencies like the European Common Market and the recently born South American and Central American Common Markets, are also creating a vast volume of new law and new law agencies. By necessity the interdependent nations and peoples of our day are demanding the creation of new rules of law to govern and guide their ever-accelerating international trade, travel, investment, and other relations—new transnational law for both men and nations.

Above all, one must note that in every field, on every subject, where law and judicial agencies are in existence they are working well and their acceptance and use are at an all-time high. That law which is adequate will work where used internationally is easily proved. Those relations of men and nations now amply covered by world law provide this proof. I cite the law of the sea, the law of diplomatic immunity, and the Postal Convention. For relations and contacts in those fields operate smoothly under law rules that are well-nigh universal because so many nations are parties to those treaties.

If we had hundreds of other subjects covered by such universally accepted laws rules, frictions and disputes would be lessened and world peace through law would be within reach. Our great task is to draft and sell to the peoples and governments of nations the hundreds, perhaps thousands, of agreements needed to cover in an adequate manner transnational relations of men and nations. And the most certain fact is that, with the ever-growing increase in international trade, travel, and other contacts, the number of such agreements needed for this purpose will increase greatly in the years ahead. We must, therefore, set up law-drafting, law-creating procedures and methods to meet this obvious need.

Fourth. International judicial bodies have grown in number and use. We have a World Court (International Court of Justice) whose use and prestige are increasing constantly; in fact there is a growing tendency in treaties to expressly provide for jurisdiction of the World Court over disputes involving their provisions. I am happy to know that the distinguished Chief Justice of the World Court will soon follow me to this podium. The European Court of Justice has had brought before it more than 1,000 international cases arising out of the functioning of the European Common Market. The Conciliation Commission of the European Human Rights Court has considered, mediated, or dismissed over 2,000 complaints, making it necessary for the Court itself to consider only 2 cases.

Many U.N. and non-U.N. international agencies have quasi-judicial bodies as a part of their legal structure to which governments and individuals may take disputes for decision under prescribed law rules. Last year the use of international arbitration bodies in the commercial area reached an alltime high. The World Bank's recent proposed convention to create a world dispute center to provide judicial arbitration and conciliation panels to decide commercial disputes over foreign investments will accelerate this use of international adjudication manifold.

Domestic courts, too, are increasingly called upon to decide international law questions. My own court has recently decided such questions as whether to uphold the "law of the flag" and the "act of state" doctrines. I am sure that you judges of national courts are having similar experiences, the exchange of which among us will add to the value of this conference.

Fifth. The rapid expansion of the scope of international law and the expansion of the jurisdiction of international judicial institutions to encompass rights and protections for the individual have brought to this field thousands of new supporters. While fully recognizing that traditionally international law and its institutions have been largely confined to governmental relations among nations, we cannot blind ourselves to the impact of this new and growing constituency, who out of self-interest, are demanding that international law be developed to meet their needs as individuals.

The individual of our day trades and travels on a worldwide basis and feels the necessity for law to govern, guide, and protect his constantly increasing relations with his fellow man in other nations. The European Court of Justice for the European Communities and the European Human Rights Court both allow individuals to bring cases before them. Most of the new international courts now proposed would allow individuals to appear before them, and much of the new world law of recent years has as its main object the needs and desires of the individual.

Sixth. We are reexamining traditional concepts of international law in the light of the world of today, not only as to applicability of international law to individuals, but in an attempt to insure that international law of our day takes into consideration the history, traditions, customs, and needs of newly independent and newly developing nations. Thus the gap between East and West is being bridged. New international law is being created which is acceptable both to lawyers and the peoples of the East and West because it is a molding of the ideas and ideals of all mankind.

Seventh. Heads of state and other leaders of nations are giving more and more attention to world law and are resorting to it with increasing frequency in their dialog among themselves in their conduct of foreign affairs. In part, this is because more international law exists and it, therefore, offers an excellent starting point for many efforts in foreign relations. Nearly every dispute between nations today begins with a citation by both sides of alleged rights or claims under international law.

At this conference and previous conferences leading up to this meeting, more than 100 heads of state have sent messages stating their adherence to the idea of a world rule of law. I believe that this increasing interest in and increased reliance on world law by governmental leaders is a relevant fact as we consider the road to peace through law.

Eighth. The peoples of the world are more and more aware of the promise and potential of a world ruled by law. This is shown by reports in news media and publications on a worldwide basis. One finds that religious, scientific, and other organizations in their resolutions and statements more and more are urging a world rule of law. True, they ask for it in wondering sort of way without specifying the steps to achieve it. But discussions, arguments, speeches, and debates on this subject all tend to educate both lawyers and laymen on the value of law in the search for ways and means of achieving and maintaining world peace. Law, in ultimate thrust, is the end result of conferences, discussions, diplomacy, resolutions, and other public consideration. Especially valuable in building world law is public enlightenment, education, interest, and support. All world law must result from international cooperation and agreement by nations and leaders of nations will hardly agree to any treaty or convention unless their people want them to agree. That is why I commend my colleague Chief Justice Yokota, of Japan, for his proposal of World Law Day which has resulted in so much international public attention being focused at this very moment upon world law and its promise and potential.

Ninth. Judges, professors, and lawyers of the world are becoming organized to take advantage of the facts I have just enumerated. This organized strength of the legal profession helps make possible a breakthrough in the growth and development of world law parallel to those in science and other disciplines. We are learning to think and act globally for the first time in history. We can no longer await the slow and episodic growth over the centuries as was the case, for example, of the law of the sea. A more speedy and orderly process is essential and is evolving out of necessity.

This is only the second world conference of the legal profession attended by delegates from more than 100 nations. The reports, addresses, and discussions at this conference will demonstrate the value of the organized effort thus far generated. The igniting of ideas on an international basis, the bringing to bear of this assemblage of manpower and brainpower on what to do and how to do it are all exciting new advances toward our towering goal of a world rule of law.

Tenth. This historic first world gathering of chief justices and high court judges is also a plus factor in the movement toward world peace through law. As in the case of law and lawyers, we have more courts and more judges than ever before in all history both nationally and internationally.

Since one objective of the world peace through law program is to have legal disputes decided in courts rather than by violence, we who devote our lives to deciding such disputes may be able to make a major contribution to this quest for peace under law. Just what our role should be in this program is yet to be developed but we should make a beginning here at this conference. Perhaps we can begin to define the proper role for judges in this great effort by a frank exchange of ideas on this subject at our joint discussions. I feel certain that we can evolve a role for judges that is proper, beneficial, and adequate as our contribution to the great need which exists.

Knowledgeable observers of the development of law in the world community agree with the obvious conclusion which flows from this recitation of the incontrovertible facts describing the ever-accelerating expansion of the field of law. In every instance where the law is plentiful and strong enough to be effective, it works well.

This story of the law's dramatic growth is not intended to present the rule of law as a panacea for peace or as creating a utopia in ultimate thrust. Nations are run by men, and differences and disputes are inherent in human nature. The rule of law in a nation or internationally does not end all disputes or prevent the breaking of the law. In its simplest form, a law system is a set of rules to govern and guide human conduct so as to avoid conflicts and a court system for peaceful decision of the inevitable disputes that will arise.

No law system is put forth as providing perfection. Perfect justice is an ideal we all strive for but never quite accomplish. But the lesson of history is that when law systems and court systems become adequate within nations they do provide order and peace. When such systems are developed for the world community, they can and will perform the same service internationally. The international law that exists already is a force for peace and as we strengthen and expand it the occasions for disputes leading to war will lessen.

My message is one of hope and accomplishment—a report of achievements in the field of law which are clearly preludes to great advances—advances which will benefit the status of all peoples by advancing the cause

of peace. The law is on the march everywhere. We now have a sound foundation upon which to erect a more complete rule of law for the world community.

We are matching our words about a world ruled by law with a program to give them substance. That the task is not easy and that it requires years of dedicated effort should make us determined rather than fainthearted. For success in our ultimate program means we will so harness mankind's newly developed power under the rule of law that it will be used for man's benefit rather than be used for his death in nuclear holocaust. The only provable harness for the peaceful containment of power yet developed by the mind of man is the rule of law.

I for one believe we can create just as mightily in the law field as our scientific brethren did in the field of science. We can, because we must, create sufficient law to prevent use of the awesome power of the atom to destroy man and civilization.

It is now time for us to get with our task. Certain it is that no man or woman can engage in a greater enterprise, for it is no less than a joint endeavor to save humankind from extinction by creating a world order under law wherein all men, women and children everywhere can live in peace and decency.

INVESTIGATION OF USE OF POLYGRAPH BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. KING of Utah. 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 Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, hearings were held last month by the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information of the Committee on Government Operations, on the investigative use of the polygraph by the Department of Defense. We on that subcommittee were particularly concerned with determining if any new legislation was needed to safeguard employees and servicemen whose rights and privacy were being restricted.

During the hearings, which I chaired, an official witness, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Security Policy, admitted that investigative material collected under the industrial security program sometimes gets back to employers.

With the legislation that I am introducing today, I hope to remedy this deplorable situation.

The Office of Industrial Personnel Access Authorization Review is established by Executive order of July 28, 1960. The Secretary of Defense is directed to investigate and clear employees of private industry who must have access to classified security information because their companies have defense contracts.

The Department of Defense runs approximately 300,000 clearances of private industry employees each year. These clearances require a full background check of the employees by Defense Department investigators, including interviews of friends, neighbors, and coworkers.

The polygraph is also used to determine such things as emotional stability although experts testified before our subcommittee that a true lie detector simply does not exist.

It is this material from the investigation files that is occasionally turned over to an employer, even in cases where the Government investigators have found nothing to prohibit clearance.

There may be something on the man's background or habits which would induce an employer to dispense with the employee's services even if the Government finds him to be a loyal citizen.

Currently, the only protection against divulging investigative material is contained in an Executive order and departmental directive. This apparently has not completely stopped such information from leaking out, however. What we seem to need is a law with some teeth in it.

My bill would make it a Federal crime to divulge information acquired by Government investigation to anyone other than proper Government officials. My bill would set a penalty of up to $1,000 fine and an up to 1 year imprisonment for improper disclosure of personnel information.

We must act quickly to terminate this kind of activity that can flaunt a person's personal life without regard for his rights to privacy. People receiving security clearance investigations should not have to worry about irrelevant personal information getting into the hands of inappropriate persons and hurting their lives and opportunities.

CHALLENGE TO PREVENT THE SEATING OF REPRESENTATIVES CERTIFIED TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. VIVIAN. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 4th of January of this year a legal challenge, under the Constitution and laws of the land, was formerly presented to this House. This challenge seeks to prevent the seating of Representatives certified to us by the State of Mississippi. On that date, 149 Members of the House formally recorded their desire to delay the seating of the Mississippi delegation until the charges could be formally heard, and a determination of their merit made.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that the House will be asked early this week to vote on a motion to dismiss that challenge.

Last week, the attorney general of the State of Mississippi went into court in that State to institute suits aimed at disqualifying individuals, largely, of course, Negroes, who have been registered by Federal registrars in the few weeks since the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was signed into law.

The decision of the State of Mississippi to further delay the registration of qualified Negro applicants has, it seems to me, made even more urgent the necessity for serious consideration of the merits of the challenge placed before this House. For, unless this House clearly demonstrates, under provisions of the Constitution of the United States, and duly enacted Federal laws, that only Members who have been legally elected in legal and open elections in the several States shall have the right to sit in this body, we will be giving encouragement to yet another stage in the continuing effort by the State of Mississippi to prevent qualified Negro voters from participating in the elections and government of that State.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members who support the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to reject the motion to dismiss the challenge to the seating of the Representatives from Mississippi. For only by hearing that challenge on its merits, and only by then voting to unseat Members if they were illegally elected, will the House clearly show the State of Mississippi as well as other States now sincerely trying to comply with the Voting Rights Act of 1965, that it is our intention to encourage compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and to sharply discourage efforts to obstruct its application.

I ask that two newspaper articles dealing with this serious matter be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 8, 1965]

MISSISSIPPI CHALLENGES VOTERS UNITED STATES ENROLLED

JACKSON, MISS., September 7.—State Attorney General Joe Patterson asked Mississippi courts today to keep off the voting rolls persons registered by Federal examiners under the new voting rights law.

Patterson filed the suits in the chancery courts of Leflore, Madison, and Jefferson Davis Counties. He said a similar suit would be filed in Jones County tomorrow. These are the four Mississippi counties to which Federal registrars have been assigned.

Filing of the suits sets the stage for a legal showdown on conflicting Federal and State requirements for voting.

In the suits, Patterson said the Federal law ignored the State voting requirements and required the county registrars to act in a manner contrary to State law.

"The clerks are on the horns of a dilemma," Patterson told the Associated Press. "They are put in the position of accepting these people registered by Federal registrars and violating State law, or refusing to list the names compiled by the Federal registrars and violating Federal law."

Informed sources said the State apparently would launch its court challenge of the Federal Voting Rights Act in this manner, rather than file suit directly challenging the act itself.

"This is the kickoff," was Patterson's only comment.

If Patterson secures the State court injunctions blocking the listing of federally registered persons on county rolls, the Federal Government is expected to go into Federal court in an effort to dissolve the State court injunction. This would lead to a head-on contest between the State and Federal Governments over voting laws.

The State suit said each circuit clerk is charged by law with registering "the names

of all residents of said county who have complied with the laws of the State of Mississippi prerequisite to such registration."

Patterson said Federal registrars are signing up as voters persons who do not meet State qualifications "without requiring such persons to comply with valid nondiscriminatory State requirements."

He said the State "will be immediately and irreparably injured and damaged through the multiplied violation of its said civil and criminal laws through the intimidation and coercion of the defendant officials (the clerks) to breach and violate said laws, and through an illegal dilution of the individual voting rights of its citizens who are properly qualified under its laws as State electors."

[From the Jackson Daily News, Sept. 2, 1965]

LATER THIS MONTH—EFFORT TO DISMISS CHALLENGE AGAINST STATE SOLONS EXPECTED

(By William Peart)

The U.S. House of Representatives is expected to vote during the week of September 13 to dismiss a seating challenge against Mississippi's five Congressmen, it was learned today.

A Washington source reported that Representative OMAR BURLESON, of Texas, chairman of the House Committee on Administration, is expected to introduce a resolution calling for the dismissal.

And, the source added, the House is expected to approve the resolution.

Mississippi's five-Member delegation filed motions with BURLESON's committee Tuesday asking that the challenge filed by the mostly Negro Freedom Democratic Party be dismissed.

The source reported that House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, has instructed the committee "to get busy and do something."

After the committee studies the delegation's arguments for retaining its congressional seats. BURLESON is expected to offer the dismissal resolution on the House floor.

The delegation is quietly confident it has the votes for approval of the resolution.

The source reported that these four recent developments have benefited the congressional delegation's battle to retain its seats:

The Los Angeles riots.

Lowered requirements in Mississippi's voter registration laws.

Passage of the Federal voting rights act.

The Freedom Democratic Party's action relative to members ignoring draft action into the armed services.

UNSEATING ASKED

The Freedom Democratic Party initiated the seating challenge when Congress convened in January. It claimed the Congressmen should be denied their seats because, it contended, Negroes have been systematically excluded from voting in Mississippi.

Exactly 149 Members of the 435-Member House voted in January to unseat the delegation.

To bolster its case, the Freedom Democratic Party took depositions in the State during the spring.

Representative WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, of New York, a Freedom Democratic Party spokesman, has threatened to introduce a resolution in the House September 21 calling for the immediate unseating of the delegation.

MASS MARCH PLANNED

Additionally, the Freedom Democratic Party official Lawrence Guyot has called for a mass demonstration in Washington on the challenge beginning September 18.

The source reported that at least some Members of the House frown on prior associations of the attorneys-of-record representing the Freedom Democratic Party.

Civil rights organizations have been active in the predominantly Negro party's efforts to unseat the Congressmen.

"They have created an atmosphere of hysteria," the source reported.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES NEEDED NOW

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, there is a bill awaiting our consideration which I believe to be of great importance for the development of our society and of the individuals in it. I wish now to reiterate my support for H.R. 9460, a bill to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Our society has become a science-orientated society. Science is not only directly related to our ability to operate more efficiently and more profitably, but now is of great importance to our national defense. Perhaps this is why the sciences receive the great public and Federal support which they do. But there is now widespread concern that this emphasis on science is creating an imbalance in our society and civilization. It is creating a society which runs the risk of being very shallow and short-sighted and either ignorant or unconcerned with the larger issues involved. In our great attempt to keep pace with the new developments and the "knowledge explosion" in the field of science, we often forget that science can show us "how to" but does not necessarily tell us "why."

It is the arts and the humanities which deal with the lives and aspirations of men. They are at once the record and the very product of our imaginations, our creativity, and our hopes. Barnaby C. Keeney, president of Brown University, summarized very well the importance of the arts and the humanities to our society.

Upon the humanities and the arts—

He said—

depend the national ethnic and our morals, the national esthetic and our beauty or lack of it, the national use of our material environment and, above all, of our accomplishments * * *. On our knowledge of men, their past, their present, their aspirations depends our ability to make judgments—especially those judgments that influence our control of our environment, of ourselves, and of our destiny.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I believe it to be in the national interest to support the humanities and the arts. A National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities can be a clear expression of our national concern and regard for the arts and the humanities. It can also help us to meet the needs of the arts and humanities for support and to meet the needs of the country for the arts and humanities. But Government support of the arts and humanities is not to replace private initiative, reduce private responsibility, or restrict artistic freedom. Rather it is meant to recognize the important place which the arts and humanities have in our national life, to develop a broad policy of national support for the arts and humanities, and to give them a permanent base. H.R. 9460 fulfills these objectives.

The bill establishes a National Endowment for the Arts and a National Endowment for the Humanities within the Foundation. Each endowment is authorized the sum of $5 million. The Endowment for the Arts will use this money to carry out a program of matching grants to groups and individuals for productions and projects of high artistic quality. The Endowment for the Humanities will make grants, loans, and fellowships to individuals and institutions for research and training, and will support the publication of scholarly works and the interchange of information. The bill is also intended to stimulate private philanthropy and encourage State activities in the arts and humanities. To attain this end the endowments are authorized additional funds to match private donations and to support State projects.

The arts and humanities have a vital role to play in the educational system of the country. But this role has been all but overshadowed and neglected by the stress which has been placed on the physical and life sciences. The establishment of the National Science Foundation testifies to the status of the sciences in our country. We fail, however, to assist, in a similar way, the arts and the humanities which are equally important. H.R. 9460 takes remedial action against this deficiency. It makes funds available to the Commissioner of Education to make payments to State educational agencies for the strengthening of instruction in the arts and humanities. It also authorizes the Commissioner to arrange for teacher training institutes. In this way the bill will strengthen the teaching of the arts and the humanities in our elementary and secondary schools. At a time when education is such a vital national concern and when we seek to make as much education as possible to as many people as possible, we must take steps to insure that the education our citizens receive is of as high a quality as is possible. This means that the study of science must be balanced by the study of the arts and the humanities. It is important that we know about the world around us and how it operates, but it is also very important that we understand and are able to communicate all that man has thought and created and experienced during his life on earth.

As one scholar stated, the case for the support of the arts and the humanities is the case for the preservation and improvement of the very bases of our civilization. This echoes something President Johnson wrote last June:

The continued vitality of the humanities and the arts in America is required not only for the enrichment of our lives as individuals, but also for the health and strength of our society.

H.R. 9460 will insure the continued vitality of the arts and humanities. We cannot afford to hesitate, the time to act is now. I enthusiastically support and I encourage the support of my fellow Congressmen for H.R. 9460.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have had a great deal of discussion about the subject of home rule for the District of Columbia. At this time I would like to read the words of a great American on this subject:

From time to time there is considerable agitation in Washington in favor of granting the citizens of the city the franchise and constituting an elective government. I am strongly opposed to this change. The history of Washington discloses a number of experiments of this kind, which have always been abandoned as unsatisfactory. The truth is this is a city governed by a popular body, to wit, the Congress of the United States, selected from the people of the United States, who own Washington. The people who come here to live do so with the knowledge of the origin of the city and the restrictions, and therefore voluntarily give up the privilege of living in a municipality governed by popular vote. Washington is so unique in its origin and in its use for housing and localizing the sovereignty of the Nation that the people who live here must regard its peculiar character and must be content to subject themselves to the control of a body selected by all the people of the Nation. I agree that there are certain inconveniences growing out of the government of a city by a national legislature like Congress, and it would perhaps be possible to lessen these by the delegation by Congress to the District Commissioners of greater legislative power for the enactment of local laws than they now possess, especially those of a police character.

Those are the words of President William Howard Taft in a message to the House in 1912.

NEWS MEDIA APPLAUD LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN'S APPOINTMENT AS POSTMASTER GENERAL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Lawrence F. O'Brien of Springfield, Mass., Special Assistant to the President for Congressional Relations, as the new Postmaster General, continues to be universally acclaimed by the news media, both in his home State of Massachusetts and in the mass circulation national weekly news magazines.

The Springfield Daily News, Mr. O'Brien's hometown paper, says of the appointment:

His talented and dedicated labors for the Democratic Party, for two Presidents, and for the country have been fittingly recognized by his appointment to the President's family of highest advisers.

The Holyoke, Mass., Transcript-Telegram, editorialized on the O'Brien appointment as follows:

He is a thoroughbred political pro. He was the late President Kennedy's workhorse in the political arena, handling the White House relations with the Congress. He is versatile and a realist.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to read excerpts from Time magazine of September 10, 1965, concerning the Lawrence F. O'Brien appointment, and include with my remarks the complete editorials from the Springfield Daily News of August 30, 1965, and the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram of August 31, 1965:

[From Time magazine, Sept. 10, 1965]

BACKROOM BOY UP FRONT

For all their divided loyalties and divergent styles, Lyndon Johnson and President Kennedy's political legatees have apparently reached a working truce. BOBBY KENNEDY, who earlier this year was shafting the Johnson administration for deepening the U.S. military involvement in Vietnam, of late has had only praise for the President's policies. While most other top advisers to J.F.K. have now left the White House, one of the most valued of all has stayed on to play an even more influential role in the Johnson administration. He is Larry O'Brien, John Kennedy's most artful campaign manager and Capitol Hill strategist, who has since shouldered the bigger burden of pushing Johnson's mighty legislative raft through Congress.

Last week L.B.J. showed his own high opinion of J.F.K.'s key aide by naming him to the politically potent Cabinet post of Postmaster General. The appointment drew added piquancy from the fact that O'Brien wanted to give up his White House duties even before John Kennedy's death, and in recent months had been hotly wooed to direct the top-to-bottom reorganization of the Massachusetts Democratic machine sought by yet another Kennedy—Senator TEDDY. In any case, Larry had let it be known that he would definitely leave Washington when the present Congress adjourns. By putting him in the Cabinet instead, Johnson thus wrested from the Irish Mafia a man who might have loomed as large in TEDDY's career as he had in Jack's—and plainly has plenty of loom in Lyndon's plans.

Of all Kennedy men who suddenly became Johnson's retainers in 1963, Larry O'Brien's prospects for advancement hardly seemed the most radiant. While he was a relative stranger in 1961 to the complexities of Capitol Hill—though hardly to politics—O'Brien was largely responsible for passage of the few bills that J.F.K. managed to get through Congress. His success sorely dismayed Vice President Lyndon Johnson, the old maestro of Senate consensus, who had naturally expected to be No. 1 New Frontiersman on Capitol Hill. Yet, to O'Brien's amazement, on the plane back from Dallas after Kennedy's assassination, Johnson asked him to stay on—and promised him a "blank check."

BRIDGING THE GULF

Despite Johnson's reputation for pressuring Congress, he has scrupulously observed his pledge to O'Brien, twists the congressional arms of Larry's choosing and, mostly, at Larry's request. With an expanded corps of operatives—5 men for floor work, 12 women researchers and secretaries—O'Brien has shown unprecedented ability in spanning the hazardous chasm between the Hill and the White House—maintaining what Bryce Harlow, President Eisenhower's legislative man, called an ambulatory bridge across a constitutional gulf.

O'Brien is, for all his skill, essentially a backroom boy. The Great Society's architect and principal prophet has been, and will continue to be, Lyndon Johnson, and his extraordinary legislative record is 90 percent his own. The importance of O'Brien's 10 percent was demonstrated nonetheless by the fact that the entire Congress, Republicans as well as Democrats, had planned an unprecedented party to bid him farewell when—as he fully expected—he quit Washington this fall.

GENERAL DELIVERY

With this year's congressional blitz all but completed, Johnson's challenge next year will be to preserve all be can of his Democratic congressional majority. O'Brien will have a critical part in that effort, too, both as campaign strategist and patronage dispenser, with 35,000 appointive postmasterships and 33,000 rural lettercarrier jobs at his disposal.

Larry's move out front may also benefit the Nation. So highly do Congressmen regard his drive and organizational talents that many last week were already looking forward to better postal service under "General" O'Brien, as his 600,000 employees will now call him. After all, without reasonably efficient mail, how could its citizens ever convince each other that Lyndon's society was great?

[From the Springfield Daily News, Aug. 30, 1965]

POSTMASTER GENERAL O'BRIEN

Lawrence F. O'Brien is the 31st Massachusetts man but the first Springfield native to be named to the President's Cabinet.

A former resident of Springfield was named to a Cabinet post 120 years ago, but George Bancroft was a Worcester native. Only when President Johnson announced his designation of Larry O'Brien to be Postmaster General could Springfield boast of a native son in the White House Cabinet.

"I know of no single individual who has contributed more to the enactment of legislation that touches the lives of so many Americans," said the President as he announced his selection of Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. O'Brien friends will recall that he seemed to have retired from politics at an early age when a Congressman of exactly the same age asked him to organize his U.S. Senate campaign in this State in 1952. In 1960, he was national organizer of that Senator's successful campaign for the Presidency, and became his liaison man between the White House and the Congress. Mr. O'Brien was with the President in Dallas on November 22, 1963, and decided to remain in his job to work for the legislation the late President had favored.

Mr. O'Brien's political rise from 1952 obscurity to 1965 secretariat has been swift, but not surprising to those who have seen him at work. His talented and dedicated labors for the Democratic Party, for two Presidents, and for the country have been fittingly recognized by his appointment to the President's family of highest advisers.

We happily join Mr. O'Brien's many other friends and neighbors in wishing him well in his new post of honors and responsibilities.

[From the Holyoke Daily Transcript-Telegram, Aug. 31, 1965]

LARRY O'BRIEN, A POLITICAL PRO

Western Massachusetts again will have a son in the Cabinet of the President of the

United States. Lawrence F. O'Brien, of Springfield, moves into the mighty inner circle of our National Government as Postmaster General. The first citizen of this area to serve in a Cabinet was the late William F. Whiting, of Holyoke, who was Secretary of Commerce under his friend, President Calvin Coolidge, from July 1928 until the close of the Coolidge administration on March 4, 1929.

The Postmaster General's role traditionally has been completely political. Its zenith in modern times was reached when James M. Farley presided over that branch of Government during the first two terms of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Never before or since has the Postmaster General been so powerful. Mr. Farley was a 100-percent professional and we use that term with respect.

Lawrence F. O'Brien comes as close in comparison to him as anyone could. He is a thoroughbred political pro. He was the late President Kennedy's workhorse in the political arena, handling the White House relations with the Congress. He is versatile and a realist. He alone of the inner Kennedy group—the Irish Mafia—was able with satisfaction to move over into the Johnson team. The others have departed. They couldn't be happy under the new regime. Larry O'Brien could make the transition.

For certain the Post Office Department will be managed by a strong willed man who will supervise all patronage. He will require complete partisan loyalty. There will be the regular civil service examinations but you can be sure the postmaster appointments will go to the tried and true faithful. It may be a cynical observation, but it's practical politics and this is what keeps the blood of life flowing through political machines.

Larry O'Brien will do nothing shabby. But you need not expect a nod from him unless you are a 100-percent Democrat.

RULES FOR ROLLCALL VOTES

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, one of the things that has made this great House of Representatives perhaps the greatest deliberative body in the world is the fact that even when it is inconvenient, this House abides by its rules—and by its rules whatever they may be. For a number of months I have been concerned, however, about one rule, one of the basic rules of this body, the rule which prescribes the manner of voting on constitutional roll calls. Yesterday in 1 day there were over 100 cases of apparent violations of this rule. I asked for a special order this afternoon to point out the results of my study and I ask all Members of the House, and particularly members of the Committee on House Administration, to meet with me and join in with me on this special order because I sincerely believe the best way to preserve the dignity of this House is to enforce all of our rules.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SAYS SMALL TOWNS MUST NOT BE ALLOWED TO DIE—THAT THEY ARE REALLY THE BACKBONE OF THE COUNTRY

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, President Johnson, more than any other Chief Executive in the history of this country, understands the needs and the problems of our rural areas and communities.

President Johnson was born and grew up in a rural section of Texas. His roots are deep in this central Texas land of farms and ranches. He and his family participated in and led the hard-fought battles to develop this area of his native State.

Mr. Speaker, today our rural areas—areas like those where the President was raised—are at an important crossroads in their development. The country can continue, if it chooses, to go down the road to big corporate farms, to the continued deterioration of the family farm and the depopulation of our countryside cramming our industries and people into a few crowded cities.

The Nation can, however, take action to revitalize our rural areas, to decentralize industry, and to take advantage of the tremendous resources which today go unused. If we but give our people the tools, they are more than willing to do the job. Through programs such as provided by the Area Redevelopment Administration and the new Economic Development Act, we can make available the credit which the rural people need to buy the capital goods essential to a modern business or farm. We can supplement this with the necessary economic substructure in terms of roads, sewers, and water systems and provide the impetus for rural America to grow and farms and industries to prosper.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act which the President signed into law on August 26 will be a vital tool in the development of these areas. In signing the bill, the President eloquently described the needs and the hopes of our rural communities. His words should hearten rural people throughout the Nation. I include these excerpts from the President's remarks in the RECORD:

I go back to my hometown and I find difficulty locating anyone under 21 years of age that has finished high school. They have moved on. I see the men sit around under the shade playing dominoes—but they are in the late sixties and early seventies.

Now two courses of action are open to us in the face of these conditions. One is to do nothing. That is the thing we have been doing for a good many years, and we just let these little towns die. Their schools and their churches will grow empty each year. The "for rent" signs will appear with depressing frequency before their stores and their little modest cottages.

If we take that course, we do more than just write off small town life as unimportant to America. We make certain that thousands upon thousands of families will be compelled to move away and go into the great cities, and when they get there, they are going to be concentrated in slums, they are going to live on the edge of poverty, they are going to be separated from all that would give them security and give them confidence if they could stay back home.

Now the other course is the course of opportunity. If we choose that, we say that empty fatalism has no part in the American dream. Like the lawmakers in our past who created the Homestead Act, some of them who wrote the Land-Grant Act, some of you out there who helped write the Farmers Home Act, we say that it is right and that it is just and that it is a function of government, and that we are going to carry out that responsibility to help our people get back on their feet and share once again in the blessings of American life. We say that we are not helpless before the iron laws of economics, that a wise public policy uses economics to create hope—and not to abet despair.

That is the course we are taking today under the leadership of you men that sit there in that front row and all those other rows. We are embarking this morning on a new program of grants and loans to those cities and those towns where too many men have been out of work too long, and we think that is the proper function of government. We want them in these little towns, to put their men to work, to improve their water systems, stop the pollution of the streams and lakes, and I do hope that some of you can help Senator MUSKIE and the members of the House Public Works Committee, Congressman BLATNIK, to get that pollution bill out—let's not get it tied up in conference. I know it is difficult and I know we have some disagreements and I know we have some other disagreements too—I have been observing them—but if we could, we could pass that bill now and make a great contribution to our country. We could develop our harbors and our channels, control our rivers and lay out roads and provide utilities for new industry. We want them to do whatever it takes to bring hope back to the people of these smaller towns.

The question has really never been how to do these things. The question always has been where do we find the means to do them. In my judgment this new act—the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965—gives us the authority and gives us the vision that we need. And under the leadership of these substantial numbers of progressive Congressmen and Senators who are here this morning, the fine Secretary of Commerce and that brilliant new Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Gene Foley, who is going to be Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, I believe we are going to open the gates of opportunity for yet another body of this people.

So this morning, I sign into law with gratitude to each of you in the Congress that passed this bill, and I am confident in the future that you and your posterity will remember being participants here in the East Room in this forward looking step to try to save people, save human beings, save the small towns that are really the backbone of our country. We can always put off these things, and we have had a habit of doing that in bygone years, but we are facing up to most of our responsibilities—sometimes we face up to them a little late.

THE GREAT HIEBERT FAMILY—AN ADDRESS BY DR. J. MARK HIEBERT

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, I am inserting an article entitled "The Public Responsibilities of the Manufacturer of Home Remedies," by Dr. J. Mark Hiebert, chairman of the board of Sterling Drug, Inc., which is included in the annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, July 14, 1965, in the RECORD with my statement.

Dr. Hiebert, born in Kansas, the son of a minister and educator, typifies the farm boy who rose with the dawn and completed his assigned chores before going on to school. On completing high school, he took time out for a year to become the one teacher in a 1-room school of 47 pupils in all 8 grades. After that experience, he enrolled in Tabor College, an institution founded by his father, and received his A.B. degree.

But the Hiebert family has a doctoral tradition. Some 18 Hieberts—brothers, uncles, nephews, and cousins—are doctors. Dr. Hiebert earned his M.D. degree at the Boston University School of Medicine where, incidentally, he found his bride, the former Dorothy Prior, who also received her M.D. from the same university. The doctoral Hieberts are engaged in many fields: As general practitioners, surgeons, internists, radiologists, pathologists, professors, and medical reseachers.

In addition to his association with Sterling Drug, Mark Hiebert is vice chairman of the board of trustees of Boston University; a trustee of the Columbia University College of Pharmacy, and of the American Child Guidance Foundation. In commerce and industry, he is a trustee of the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce; director and past president of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, and member of the executive committee of the Proprietary Association of America. His professional memberships include: American Association for the Advancement of Science; American Medical Association; the New York Academy of Medicine; the New York Academy of Sciences. He is licensed to practice medicine in New York, Maine, Illinois, and Michigan.

This article is an example of industrial statesmanship in the public interest. In the article Dr. Hiebert points out that the primary public responsibilities of the manufacturer of home remedies are to earn, hold and build public confidence in his products, in home medication, and in the industry. He urges manufacturers to work unceasingly to achieve these goals because the public deserves home medication products and the public interest demands it.

THE PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE MANUFACTURER OF HOME REMEDIES

(J. Mark Hiebert, Sterling Drug, Inc., New York, N.Y.)

The most important link that joins home medication with the public welfare is, it seems to me, described by a single word: confidence. The primary responsibilities of the manufacturer are to earn, hold, and build public confidence in his products, in home medication, and in the industry of which he is a part.

This paper includes a few observations concerning home medication; but major emphasis is placed on the ways in which public confidence can be earned, held, increased. I present my views as a physician and as chief officer of a company that is a major producer of prescription and nonprescription medicinal preparations.

A salient fact about home remedies is that they form the first and most inexpensive line of defense against minor ailments. And so they have served throughout the history of mankind. There is reference to the binding up of wounds and the pouring in of oil and wine in the story of the Good Samaritan.

Mother is the first line of health defense in the home. From time immemorial, she has ministered to her young in response to an instinct that "the ages cannot wither, nor custom stale." Modern nonprescription medicines help the 20th century American mother—already housewife, cook, teacher, seamstress, chauffeur, volunteer worker—to increase her usefulness as family nurse and acknowledge authority on the application and reliability of the home remedies in the family medicine chest.

She is part of a sophisticated generation. Her knowledge of medicaments is derived from actual use as well as from keeping up to date on many things that affect the home and family, particularly in matters of health. She is familiar with many minor ailments that affect her family and knows pretty well when to call the doctor. Mother knows, too, that the Congress of the United States shares her confidence in home medication products and is mindful of the future needs and demands of the people in this area.

We appreciate that the Durham-Humphrey Act of 1951 recognized the public's right to home medication, nor did the Drug Amendments of 1962 repeal that right. In fact Congress, by its enactments, has sought to make the public's possession and exercise of that right more valuable and more helpful. The clear, overriding purpose of the Congress has been to assure the physician and the layman that the medicines offered to them will be effective and safe when taken as directed.

The mother-nurse of the American household would, I submit, be quick to resent any action that she would interpret as interference with this right to home medication.

Chester Scott Keefer looked at home medication from another point of view when he said about a year ago: "In the group of minor illness, we have such disorders as the common cold in the head, slight indigestion, transient headaches, diarrhea, itching, constipation, sleeplessness, musculo-skeletal pains and aches. These complaints are so common and so frequent that if a doctor had to be called or consulted about every case, the number of doctors required might be 10 to 20 times the number available today. It is in this large group of minor diseases which are transitory and temporary that we need home medication which is safe and effective, i.e., drugs which will act in the manner claimed for them." Merely to contemplate the implications of this statement—in terms of multibillions of dollars of added cost, or effect on the quality of medical care—is sobering. The public rightly believes that it is sound public policy to preserve the professional time, training, and expert skills of the physician for the important work of his profession. Home medication contributes to his ability to concentrate his activities on the treatment of illness obviously of a serious nature, or serious enough to bring patients to physicians.

In this connection, we might ask ourselves: What does the speedy elimination of a headache mean to the individual? Or fast and economical relief from pain or discomfort? What benefits are there for the individual and the economy in time saved that might otherwise be lost in absenteeism? The answers to these questions are useful in arriving at a realistic appreciation of the value of home medication.

But, of course, the fundamental element of public confidence is home medication that is safe and effective—i.e., drugs that will act in the manner claimed for them.

All medicines ought to be able to pass a reasonable test for efficacy, and their usefulness should be determined by modern technology, pharmacology, and clinical response. But I would remind you that in many types of home medicaments the users themselves are best able to determine whether the relief they seek is delivered. It is hardly necessary for mother to consult a scientific panel to learn whether her headache or muscular pain has disappeared or her child's fever come down.

As a physician and drug manufacturer, I am ever urging scientists and technologists to continually seek for increased safety of our medicinal preparations. But I also recognize that absolute safety, like absolute purity and absolute zero on the thermometer, is still beyond the reach of man. In this connection, all of us recognize the danger that lies in abuse—abuse not only in taking overdoses of good medicines that are safe in normal use—abuse in driving a car too fast, in overindulging in food or drink—abuse in a thousand or more ways that the perverse human mind can all too easily conceive. One serious abuse lies in the thoughtless and careless leaving of medicines around the house—within easy reach of small children.

I hold, and believe that the American people hold, that a medicine efficacious for treatment of the illness for which it is indicated and safe when taken as directed is a good medicine that ought to be available to the public.

There is always room for improvement in medicines, as in other things. If necessity is the mother of invention, dissatisfaction is the father of progress. We appreciate that public confidence in home medication will increase to the degree that the industry conscientiously and realistically directs its effort to the further improvement of established products and the development of new products. But we are disturbed that improvement of established home remedies appears to have become a more difficult and more expensive undertaking since any change in the established product might classify it as a "new drug," requiring the exhaustive procedures involved in the filing of a new drug application.

Public confidence in home medication also requires of the manufacturer that he accept and discharge certain other responsibilities—that he produce his products in accordance with the latest advances in technology and that he employ the finest quality control procedures in order to assure their uniformity, purity, potency, and stability. The public benefits from the conscientious striving of the industry to attain ever higher standards; and, in turn, the industry benefits from the public confidence such performance inspires.

The public has a right to other benefits. It properly expects a social profit from the manufacturer in the form of research. The industry is expanding its research year by year, particularly in those companies that produce both prescription and nonprescription drugs. And, I am glad to say, the public has become increasingly well informed about this important phase of our industry's activities.

I would like to address myself next to the active principle of our free enterprise system: competition. The economic philosophy of the United States is based on competition. Competition gives the consumer a full complement of home remedies from which she

can choose the product that she considers best. In the case of aspirin, one brand—Bayer—created and expanded the market; there are now 1,000 brands in that market, offering a plentitude of quality and price alternatives.

Competition, to be sure, develops a by-product of this proliferation of alternatives. Some call it product duplication, which is another way of saying that competing manufacturers are ever anxious to share in the profits of a product that another manufacturer has nursed to popularity. Freedom of entry into a market created by another is a major distinguishing characteristic of a free enterprise system. In the case of medicines, is it not better for the pharmacist, guided by the disclosed preferences of physician and consumer, to decide what his pharmacy should stock rather than for some individual in government to make that decision for him? I think it is and so, I believe, do most Americans.

There is another form of competition that has critical effect in building up, or breaking down, public confidence in home medication. I refer to the competition in communications. In this instance, we manufacturers are competing not only among ourselves. Our interest as manufacturers of home medication products and the public interest are also being affected when public communication concerning home medication products is made by any public or private agency; by legislative bodies and committees; by individuals—public and private, professional and lay, authoritative and uninformed. We have often heard our era characterized as the "golden age of medicine." Every one of us feels himself a part of this era of medicinal miracles. We have been witness to—and some of us have participated in bringing about—the discovery and development of a remarkable group of therapeutic agents that have saved literally millions of lives: chemotherapeutic preparations, from antimalarials to sulfa drugs; antibiotics; steroids; vaccines; and so many other wonderful drugs. They have contributed heroically to medical progress. Take away the medicines introduced in the United States during the 30 years of my business career, and we would be returned to what would seem to us the dark ages of disease, epidemic, and plague.

And yet an incredible change seems to be taking place. This process of change began before thalidomide, although it was undoubtedly accelerated by reason of that disaster.

We find that the golden age of medicine is being replaced by an age of destruction. Fear is replacing confidence in therapeutic agents. The values that won universal plaudits for medicinal preparations, established and new, are being overlooked as, more and more, it becomes popular to accentuate the negative. The power of these agents to protect health and preserve life is being lost sight of as concern about side effects overshadows the on-balance benefits of even long-recognized and proven therapeutic agents.

None of us would minimize side effects. The memory of thalidomide is still green. But it is equally a disservice to the public to overstate the medical signficance of side effects when the preponderance of clinical evidence—often accumulated over years and years of clinical experience—argues against such emphasis. I suggest that the age of destruction, which affects nonmedicinal products as well as drug preparations, is a cause for national concern. The sooner we return to accentuating the positive, the better for the national well-being.

In one area of communication—advertising—we are perhaps unwittingly undermining public confidence in home medication as manufacturers compete for a larger share of the market. The advertising of his products to the public is important to the manufacturer of home remedies, as it is to any manufacturer of consumer goods. For this reason the manufacturer must take great pains to assure that his advertising message is believable and truthful. To advertisers in other fields this problem of supporting advertising claims with incontrovertible proof may not be as perplexing. When his products are medicines, however, he is subject to the uncertainties of science and to the vagaries of the human body—for he is dealing with many variables and areas that are still largely matters of opinion. Uncertainties abound and will continue to abound. The fact that certainty is difficult to attain, however, constitutes no license to abandon the effort.

As cautious and careful as we must be concerning the truthfulness of the claims we make for our own products and ingredients, so much more cautious and careful must we be concerning the truthfulness and accuracy of the comparisons we make with competitor's products and ingredients used by competitors. And one who presumes to disparage a competitor's product or the ingredients used by a competitor assumes a still greater burden. For such advertising tends to erode confidence not only in the competitor's product but also in his own and, indeed, in all products in the advertised product classification—if not in the entire range of home remedies. It may be sound business sense to forego disparagement of this type regardless of the status and weight of the evidence.

As I said at the outset, the primary public responsibilities of the manufacturer of home remedies are to earn, hold, and build public confidence in his products, in home medication, and in the industry. Public confidence translates into good will. Good will is what makes tomorrow's business more than an accident. The public deserves home medication products; the public interest demands it. Let us, as manufacturers, work unceasingly to earn, hold, and increase public confidence in home medication even as we compete with one another for a larger share of the home medication market.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MOVES AGAINST LOAN SHARKS

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, I am happy to announce that the Department of Defense, on August 27, issued a directive establishing a positive policy on credit unions serving Department of Defense personnel. This directive will be an important element in the Department's welfare and morale programs. Basically, it establishes that within the Department of Defense, credit union operations will be encouraged to promote thrift, combat usury, provide family financial counseling, and to provide participants with experience in organization management and administration.

The subject of the Department's position on credit unions was discussed during hearings before the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency in June. My subcommittee was conducting hearings into the practices of Federal Services Finance Corp., a worldwide lending institution dealing primarily in personal and automobile loans to the military.

INTEREST RATES OF NEARLY 100 PERCENT

A review of Federal Services' record revealed shocking abuses in the treatment of its customers. The subcommittee learned of instances where servicemen were charged interest rates that amounted to nearly 100 percent on a 2-year loan. The former legal assistance officer of an Army installation on the west coast reported numerous cases where Federal Services was involved in sharp practices against servicemen.

It quickly became apparent to the members of the subcommittee and myself that action by the Department was necessary in order to protect servicemen against camp-following finance companies. One of the best ways of combating loan sharks is the credit union. And members of the subcommittee and myself urged the Department of Defense to do all in its power to provide credit union services to its military and civilian personnel.

I view the Department of Defense directive on credit unions as a strong endorsement of the views expressed by members of the subcommittee and myself. I am not entirely happy with the directive, primarily because it makes no reference to overseas personnel. The subcommittee investigation has brought to light the fact that some of the worst abuses take place overseas. However, the issuance of the directive is a long step in the right direction and is not to be discounted.

DIRECTIVE DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE

I am sure that representatives of the camp-following loan sharks will vigorously protest to the Department of Defense that the new directive discriminates against their operations. I think a look at the record of our subcommittee investigation will show that whenever loan sharks are permitted to operate without competition from credit unions, the servicemen suffer. Thus, rather than discriminating, the directive sets out to provide a healthy competition in the credit field. Once the directive is implemented, servicemen in the continental United States will be permitted to choose among sources of credit—they will still be free to go to the camp-following loan sharks and pay 36, 42, or 100 percent on loans. This is a right which no one can deny them. At the same time, the serviceman will be able to make use of a credit union where the maximum rate, inclusive of all charges incident to making the loan, can be no more than 12 percent per annum.

I think it is a tribute to the Department of Defense, to Cyrus Vance, Deputy Secretary of Defense, who issued the directive, and to Norman S. Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower, who will carry out the directive, that in face of the certain opposition of the loan sharks the directive was issued. I wish to commend them for their public spirited action and to express my support for the position they have taken which can only lead to financial peace of mind for servicemen.

The directive follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE

Subject: Credit unions serving Department of Defense personnel.

(a) Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C., 1751 et seq.).

(b) U.S. Government Organization Manual.

(c) DOD Directive 7330.1, "Voluntary Military Pay Allotments," December 12, 1956.

(d) DOD Instruction 1330.3, "Space Criteria for Providing Religious, Welfare and Recreational Facilities," September 4, 1963.

I. PURPOSE

This directive:

(a) Sets forth Department of Defense (DOD) policy on cooperation and relationships with credit unions serving military and civilian personnel in the United States, the District of Columbia, the possessions of the United States, the Canal Zone, and Puerto Rico;

(b) Prescribes the extent of logistical and administrative assistance to be uniformly provided by DOD components; and

(c) Assigns responsibility for the policy direction of the credit union program.

II. APPLICABILITY

The provisions of this directive apply to all DOD components.

III. RESPONSIBILITY

Subject to the direction, authority and control of the Secretary of Defense, the (ASD(M)) shall administer the provisions Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) of this directive and assure its effective implementation throughout the DOD.

IV. POLICY

A. Credit unions encouraged in the Department of Defense.

1. Federal Government policy (references (a) and (b)):

(a) To establish convenient credit union facilities as cooperative organizations created for the purpose of stimulating systematic savings and creating a source of credit for provident or productive purposes.

(b) To emphasize self-help and wise management of resources, thereby raising the standard of living, strengthening the family unit, and increasing the self-reliance of the member.

2. Department of Defense policy.

The DOD:

(a) Recognizes the right of all military and civilian personnel to organize and affiliate with credit unions, without restriction or discrimination, formed pursuant to reference (a) or other duly constituted authority.

(b) Will provide appropriate guidance and assistance in conduct of credit union operations.

(c) Permits and encourages the operation of one credit union at each DOD installation without charge for accommodations when space is available; *Provided,* The commander responsible for allocating the space has determined that the credit union permits membership for all qualified military and civilian personnel without discrimination including, but not limited to, grade, rank, race, component, etc. At those installations where the credit union will not meet the foregoing standards of membership, commanders may encourage the formation of a second credit union which will meet the standards, and thereby receive the benefits of this directive. With the approval of the membership involved and the regulatory authorities (subsection IV. C.), mergers may also be accomplished to better serve the total defense community stationed on the installation.

B. Recognition of and assistance to credit unions: Credit unions organized by and for Defense military and civilian personnel are to be recognized and assisted at all echelons as important morale and welfare resources, and organized by law and regulation as cooperative associations for mutual benefit and self-help by:

1. Encouraging the accumulation of savings and the granting of loans for provident purposes at reasonable rates of interest;

2. Inculcating habits of thrift;

3. Combating usury or the patronage of lenders who charge exorbitant rates of interest;

4. Analyzing consumer credit problems including the true costs of installment buying;

5. Counseling in family financial planning; and

6. Providing experience in organization management and administration.

C. Organization of credit unions serving DOD personnel:

1. Federal credit unions: Credit unions organized as Federal credit unions are incorporated and operated under the authority granted by the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended (Reference (a)), are legal entities with specific powers and authorities as approved by law, and are examined periodically by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

2. State credit unions: Credit unions organized under State credit union laws operate on the same general principles as Federal credit unions. Generally, State credit unions are under the jurisdiction of the State banking departments.

V. CREDIT UNION OPERATIONS IN DOD

Credit unions organized by and for DOD military and civilian personnel may be provided with the property and logistic support contemplated by section VI. below, provided operating policies are consistent with the following:

(a) Lending: In accordance with proven credit union practice, lending policies should be as liberal as possible and still be consistent with the interests of the credit union and the individual member. To be avoided are unnecessarily restrictive, unreasonable, or out-of-date rules on the size of loans, type, and amount of security, or waiting periods before loan eligibility can be granted. Special attention should be given to the youthful military member in pay grades of E-1, E-2, and E-3 in assisting such member to secure necessary loans for provident purposes.

(b) Counseling: Skilled counseling service, without charge, should be made available to Defense credit union members with every effort made to help the members, particularly the youthful and inexperienced serviceman and the young married families, to solve money problems, to budget, and to continue assistance and instruction until they can solve their problems without guidance.

(c) Savings: Members should be encouraged to participate in a regular savings plan:

1. with reasonable limitations as to amounts which may be deposited at any one time or the total amount which may be held in shares; and

2. by a reasonable dividend or return on savings.

(d) Relations:

1. Exchange of information: Cooperation, liaison and exchange of information between credit unions of all DOD components will be observed.

2. By credit unions: All credit unions serving DOD personnel will cooperate with the installation commander, keep him advised of the credit union operation, including submission of a copy of the monthly financial report, other credit union publications, and invite him or his designees to attend annual meetings and other appropriate functions.

3. By installation commanders: The support and symapthetic understanding intended by this directive is not to be construed as control or supervision by installation commanders.

VI. PROPERTY AND LOGISTIC SUPPORT

(a) Credit unions serving DOD personnel will be afforded advertising space in appropriate publications, the use of bulletin boards for promotional or information purposes, and other appropriate facilities to further the aims of the organization.

(b) Station clearance forms will provide a block reserved for the credit union to be executed by personnel on permanent change of station.

(c) DOD military personnel and credit unions are encouraged to use the service allotment privilege permitted by reference (c).

(d) The transaction of credit union business during duty hours will be permitted providing there is no interference with the performance of official duties.

VII. UTILIZATION OF MILITARY REAL PROPERTY AND SPACE

(a) When available, the furnishing of office space and related real property to credit union tenants will be governed by section 1770 of reference (a).

(b) All other services such as telephone lines, or long distance toll calls, space alterations, etc., provided credit unions, resulting from assignment of military real property or space for these purposes will be subject to reimbursement by the credit union tenants.

(c) Assignment of existing space facilities or construction of new space facilities (when authorized) to credit union tenants will be in accordance with the criteria specified in reference (d).

(d) The erection of structures at credit union expense may be authorized if such proposals are first reviewed and approved for conformity to long range master utilization plans by the appropriate military departments and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics). Credit unions submitting such plans for consideration must also agree to be financially responsible for the maintenance, utilities, and services furnished.

(e) Land required for approved construction at credit union expense shall be made available only at fair rental by lease, provided that structures erected thereon will be conveyed to the Government without reimbursement in the event of installation inactivation, closing or other disposal action, liquidation of the credit union, or the lease is revoked.

VIII. IMPLEMENTATION

Within 30 days from the date of this directive, the Secretaries of the military departments (and other DOD components, as applicable) will submit to the ASD (M) for approval, their proposed implementing regulations.

IX. EFFECTIVE DATE

This directive is effective immediately.

CYRUS VANCE,
Deputy Secretary of Defense.

"CORRESPONDENT" BANKING IS VIGOROUS

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, traditionally, the system of correspondent banking has provided a solid framework for small and large banks to cooperate in providing flexibility to our banking system.

There is a tendency in some quarters to look down on correspondent banking as old fashioned and out of step with the current trend toward concentration of banks and extensive branching.

During the last Congress the Banking and Currency Committee conducted an extensive survey of correspondent banking in this country and, when the returns came in, we were very pleased to see that this time-proven system is vigor-

ous and healthy. It permits the smaller banks to maintain their independence while at the same time allowing them the opportunity to improve their services and flexibility through correspondent relations with larger banking institutions.

In preparing and processing our questionnaire and assessing the results, the Banking Committee was aided by Prof. Ira O. Scott, Jr., of the Graduate School of Business at Columbia University. It was Dr. Scott who supervised our extensive inquiry, which involved some 3,000 banks. Dr. Scott has subsequently written an article summarizing in very succinct fashion some of the main findings of that survey, and it is gratifying to note that his article has been printed in the Banker, a British financial journal.

The article follows:

[From the Banker, August 1965]

"CORRESPONDENT" BANKING IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(By Ira O. Scott, Jr.)

The unique characteristic of the banking system of the United States is the unusually large number of commercial banks that it embraces. Whereas in Canada, for example, there are only 11 chartered banks and in England and Wales only 11 clearing banks, the United States today has more than 13,000 individual banks. This figure refers to separately chartered banking corporations. The total of all banking offices, including branches and other subsidiary places of business, is more than twice as large, as will be seen from the table on page 521; but this comparison serves to emphasize how relatively small is the role of branch banking in the United States by comparison with almost every other advanced community.

The origin of correspondent banking in the United States, and of the important part it has come to play in the functioning of this mainly "unit" banking system, lies essentially in the legal restrictions on the establishment of branch banks. Fourteen States prohibit the establishment of new branches altogether, while in only 10 States and the District of Columbia are commercial banks entirely free from statutory limitations governing the establishment of branches. In no case, moreover, is a commercial bank permitted to establish branches across State boundaries. The range of these prohibitions by the several States, and of the broad categories of restricted freedom for branching, is clearly shown in the tabulation on page 522. These legal limitations that have prevented the establishment of nationwide branch networks have led in the United States to the evolution of the correspondent relationship as a substitute for the usual head office-branch relationship characteristic of banking systems in other parts of the world.

The original, and still the primary, purpose served by a correspondent relationship is to facilitate the clearing of checks and other cash items. A system of commercial banks that have unlimited branching privileges can manage its clearings without a nationwide network of correspondent relationships. But in a country in which nationwide branching is prohibited and statewide branching is severely restricted, a network of connecting links is necessary for the operation of a checkbook money system.

Bankers' balances, therefore, are the heart of the correspondent banking system. Commercial banks in the United States hold assets in the form of deposits at other banks amounting to almost 10 percent of their own demand deposit liabilities. On June 30, 1964, aggregate balances held by banks with other domestic banks amounted to $12,693 million, exclusive of reciprocal bank balances. At the same time, "adjusted" demand deposits (that is, excluding demand deposits held for other domestic commercial banks and for the U.S. Government, and also after deducting cash items in process of collection) amounted to $122,537 million.

TABLE I.—*Number of commercial banking offices in the United States at June 30, 1964*

	Total	Member of Federal Reserve System			Nonmember		
		Total	Nationally chartered	State chartered	Total	Insured by FDIC	Noninsured
Banks (head offices)	13,669	6,180	4,702	1,478	7,489	7,215	274
Branches, additional offices, and facilities [1]	14,016	11,032	7,752	3,280	2,984	2,936	48

[1] Facilities are provided at military and other Government establishments through arrangements made with the Treasury Department.

Source—Federal Reserve Bulletin. All nationally chartered banks must be members of the Federal Reserve System and must insure their deposits with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC). All nonmember banks are, therefore, State chartered, as are noninsured banks.

The number of banks with which correspondent relations are maintained naturally varies with the size of the bank, as does the amount of the demand balances kept with correspondents. It will be seen from the first section of table III that, on the average, banks having total deposits of $100 million or more each had links with 32 correspondents if they were unit banks, and only slightly fewer than this if they were branch systems.

The same section shows that only minor proportions of the banks in each category hold time deposits with their correspondents. The paucity of such accounts reflects the fact that the maintenance of deposit balances is usually the principal means of compensating the city bank for services rendered; there is, therefore, a general reluctance on the part of such banks to pay interest on correspondent accounts. In the United States, commercial banks may pay interest on time deposits, but not on demand deposits.

To an important extent the establishment of the Federal Reserve System in 1913–14 provided the network of banking connections required in the operation of the clearing mechanism. But the Federal Reserve System only supplements—it did not supplant—the correspondent banking system. Despite the existence of 12 Federal Reserve banks and 24 branches, U.S. commercial banks still rely heavily upon their correspondents as clearing agents. Large banks process over 40 percent of their out-of-town checks through correspondents, while small banks process over 90 percent of such items in this manner (see second section of table III). The clearing mechanism may also involve a two-way relationship. Thus, city banks sometimes keep balances on deposit with their country correspondents. Such connections are especially popular with large banks, reflecting the mutual character of clearing arrangements as the banks involved become relatively large.

TABLE II.—*Status of branch banking in the United States*

State or district	New branches prohibited	New branches permitted		
		Within the State without restriction	Within the State with restriction	Within a limited area
Alabama				X
Alaska				X
Arizona		X		
Arkansas				X
California		X		
Colorado	X			
Connecticut			X	
Delaware		X		
District of Columbia		X		
Florida	X			
Georgia				X
Hawaii				X
Idaho			X	
Illinois	X			
Indiana				X
Iowa				X
Kansas	X			
Kentucky				X
Louisiana			X	
Maine			X	
Maryland		X		
Massachusetts				X
Michigan				X
Minnesota	X			
Mississippi				X
Missouri	X			
Montana	X			
Nebraska	X			
Nevada		X		
New Hampshire	X			
New Jersey				X
New Mexico				X
New York				X
North Carolina		X		
North Dakota				X
Ohio				X
Oklahoma	X			
Oregon			X	
Pennsylvania				X
Rhode Island		X		
South Carolina		X		
South Dakota			X	
Tennessee				X
Texas	X			
Utah			X	
Vermont		X		
Virginia				X
Washington		X		
West Virginia	X			
Wisconsin	X			
Wyoming	X			
Total	14	11	7	19

Source—Arnold H. Diamond, "Comparative Regulations of Financial Institutions," Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, 1963.

Correspondent banks are preferred to the Federal Reserve banks in the performance of the clearing function because correspondents may provide services not normally supplied by the Fed. Such services include the following: (1) Accepting "loose" items (i.e., those not grouped according to destination) without limitation, (2) permitting a late close-off time, (3) clearing "nonpar" cheques (those paid only at a discount), (4) handling foreign items, (5) microfilming out-of-town clearings, (6) accepting noncash items, (7) providing immediate credit, and (8) offering short-haul services (carriage of cheques and currency over short distances).

CREDIT ACCOMMODATION

A second correspondent banking service, which is not nearly so prevalent as cheque clearing, but which may be of considerable importance, is the provision of credit accommodation. Although these arrangements vary with bank size and organizational structure (see the third section of table III), almost 10 percent, on the average, of the "country" banks have established credit lines with their "city" correspondents. Such credit arrangements are usually made with only one or two correspondents and they vary in size from $100,000 to almost $8 million.

Borrowing may be short- or intermediate-term purposes. Typically such borrowing arrangements call for the provision of collateral, with U.S. Government securities by far the most popular form used.

An alternative means of obtaining funds from a correspondent is through the sale of an asset. Thus, "country" banks may sell mortgages, municipal bonds, or even consumer loans, to their "city" correspondents. These sales assume the nature of a loan when they are made, as they sometimes are, with provisions for repurchase by the seller, or for recourse to him by the buyer in certain circumstances. Finally, a bank may borrow through its correspondent by purchasing Federal funds arranged for or provided by the correspondent.

Usually a bank cannot make a loan to any one borrower for an amount greater than 10 percent of its capital and surplus. Thus, a "country" bank may be squeezed on the one hand by lending limits and on the other by expanding loan demands from the branches of regional and national corporations as well as local businesses. In this situation, the "country" bank is subject to a pressing need for loan participation by the "city" correspondent. Such participations promote the centrifugal flow of capital, from national and regional centers, to outlying areas. Typically, in such cases the amount of a particular loan held by the "city" correspondent exceeds that retained by the originating bank (see third section of table III).

Funds also flow in centripetal fashion from outlying areas to regional and national centers. Thus, "country" banks may participate in loans originated by their "city" correspondents. As measured by the number of loans, the centripetal flow appears to be dominant. However, from the point of view of dollar volume, no clear-cut picture emerges of the direction of the net flow of funds. In addition to providing an outlet for excess funds of "country" banks, participations in correspondent-originated loans may be a potential source of liquidity for them. Thus, a "city" bank may agree to repurchase, at its "country" correspondent's request, a portion of a loan it has originated.

The range of miscellaneous services offered by the "city" correspondent bank is extremely wide. It includes the following:

1. Provision of new lending opportunities and deposits through the referral of new customers.
2. Investment advice.
3. Management advice on accounting systems, operational procedures, data processing and trust administration (in some cases with a cofiduciary relationship).
4. Assistance in the recruitment and training of personnel.
5. Facilitation, as agent or dealer, of transactions in Federal funds, U.S. Government securities, municipal securities, commercial paper, bankers' acceptances, and negotiable time certificates of deposit.
6. Safekeeping of securities.[1]
7. Assistance in setting up group insurance and retirement plans for bank employees.
9. Bank wire (teletype) services.
9. Collections.
10. Provision of credit information as well as forecasts of economic activity and trends in the money and capital markets.
11. Absorption of the cost of wrapping and shipping currency and coin.
12. International banking services, including the provision of letters of credit, purchase, and sale of foreign exchange, handling foreign collections, and remittances, arranging for export-import credits and supplying foreign credit information and forecasts of business conditions abroad.

The extent of utilization of the more important of these services is indicated in the final section of table III.

The "country" bank as already noted, normally "pays" for services rendered by maintaining a deposit balance with its "city" correspondent. There appears to be no uniformity in the method of determining the proper size of the balance. In some instances the "city" bank may set a minimum balance base, for example, on an evaluation of the cost of clearing transactions. In other cases the "city" bank appears to accept as sufficient whatever the "country" correspondent deems to be a necessary working balance. "Country" banks generally favor this system of remuneration because some minimum balance is required in any case for clearing purposes. State nonmember banks have an added inducement to favor the balance system, since bankers' balances typically satisfy legal reserve requirements (see table IV).

[1] Member banks of the Federal Reserve System keep securities on deposit with their respective Federal Reserve banks so that these securities will be conveniently available as collateral at the discount window and for U.S. Treasury deposits.

SPECIFIC CHARGES

In addition to the minimum-balance system of remuneration, specific fees are now being increasingly adopted for particular correspondent services. Services especially suitable for the assessment of specific charges include: domestic collections, foreign collections, nonpar check clearance, dispatch of securities, provision of amortization schedules, providing letters of credit, remittances, arrangement of export-import credits, provision of foreign drafts, safekeeping of securities, provision of wire and cable services, foreign exchange transactions, data processing services, handling collateral on brokers' day loans, advice on systems of operation or control of expenditure, advice on service charges, handling securities transactions, posting, foreign transactions, employee training, and acting as trustee for retirement fund.

From this account of the recent surveys it can be seen that the correspondent system in U.S. banking deserves to be rated a unique form of financial institutional innovation in response to a specific legal and economic environment. The vast complex of business interrelationships over the broad expanse of the U.S. economy demands a financial counterpart in the area of banking services. There is, therefore, a natural tendency for the banking sector to gravitate toward a branch system. This tendency, however, has been effectively contained through the erection of barriers to widespread branching. These barriers have been circumvented through the establishment of the correspondent banking system.

TABLE III.—*Characteristics of correspondent banking*

	Banks with deposits totaling—$100,000,000 and over		Banks with deposits totaling—$50,000,000 to $100,000,000		Banks with deposits totaling—$25,000,000 to $50,000,000		Banks with deposits totaling—$10,000,000 to $25,000,000		Banks with deposits totaling—Under $10,000,000	
	Unit banks	Branch systems [1]	Unit banks	Branch systems [1]	Unit banks	Branch systems [1]	Unit banks	Branch systems [1]	Unit banks	Branch systems [1]
Deposits with correspondents:										
Average amount of demand balances (million dollars)	12.2	10.1	4.8	3.9	2.7	2.2	1.3	1.2	0.4	0.6
Average number of correspondents	32.0	30.0	18.0	12.0	13.0	10.0	8.0	.7	5.0	6.0
Percent of banks also holding time deposits with correspondents	9.0	7.0	13.0	6.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	7.0
Clearing: Average percent of out-of-town checks cleared through correspondents [2]	43.0	45.0	50.0	73.0	79.0	79.0	87.0	87.0	93.0	92.0
Credit and related services: Percent of surveyed banks which reported—										
Credit lines with correspondents	3.0	8.0	5.0	13.0	8.0	11.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	10.0
Average number of credit lines	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
Average (million dollars)	.4	7.8	1.0	1.7	1.2	1.3	.8	.6	.1	.2
Borrowed from correspondents for short or intermediate purposes [2]	2.0	5.0	5.0	15.0	11.0	12.0	8.0	16.0	7.0	7.0
Obtained funds from correspondents through sale of assets [2]	3.0	5.0	----------	4.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	8.0	1.0	2.0
Purchased Federal funds through correspondents [2]	78.0	75.0	68.0	58.0	35.0	46.0	19.0	31.0	23.0	28.0
Correspondent participated in loans of depositor bank	88.0	85.0	80.0	63.0	65.0	64.0	55.0	60.0	35.0	55.0
Percent of dollar amount held by correspondent	53.0	50.0	55.0	62.0	54.0	78.0	61.0	61.0	60.0	69.0
Participated in correspondents' loans	92.0	89.0	74.0	75.0	59.0	55.0	52.0	37.0	24.0	28.0
Average participation (million dollars)	11.9	12.0	1.5	1.2	1.1	.6	.4	.3	.2	.3
Selected additional services: [2] Percent of banks using correspondents' services for—										
Safekeeping of securities	97.0	85.0	91.0	94.0	93.0	87.0	91.0	84.0	77.0	77.0
Bank wire service	87.0	79.0	80.0	90.0	86.0	83.0	80.0	86.0	47.0	53.0
Data processing	58.0	58.0	48.0	50.0	38.0	28.0	24.0	16.0	9.0	18.0
Accounting advice	44.0	38.0	35.0	41.0	32.0	33.0	34.0	35.0	19.0	28.0
Investment advice	45.0	51.0	58.0	67.0	68.0	67.0	68.0	61.0	68.0	72.0
Transactions in U.S. governments	71.0	61.0	73.0	67.0	78.0	63.0	81.0	75.0	75.0	84.0
Transactions in municipals	44.0	39.0	51.0	38.0	51.0	36.0	47.0	44.0	39.0	43.0
Transactions in commercial paper	16.0	9.0	18.0	22.0	18.0	15.0	19.0	15.0	20.0	15.0
Foreign exchange	98.0	90.0	92.0	92.0	94.0	87.0	74.0	78.0	41.0	47.0

[1] Banks having 1 or more branches.
[2] During preceding 12 months.

Source: Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, "Business Conditions," March 1965.

TABLE IV.—*State reserve requirements for U.S. commercial banks*

State or district	Percent of demand deposits			Percent of time deposits		
	I [1]	II [2]	III [3]	I [1]	II [2]	III [3]
Alabama	0	15.0	0	0	4.0	0
Alaska	0	20.0	0	0	8.0	0
Arizona	0	10.0	0	0	4.0	0
Arkansas	0	15.0	0	0	15.0	0
California	6.0	6.0	0	1.0	0	4.0
Colorado	0	0	15.0	0	0	15.0
Connecticut	2.0	8.0	2.0	0	0	0
Delaware	0	11.0	0	0	4.0	0
District of Columbia	0	16.5	0	0	4.0	0
Florida	0	0	20.0	0	0	20.0
Georgia	0	15.0	0	0	0	5.0
Hawaii	0	12.0	0	0	5.0	0
Idaho	0	10.0	5.0	0	10.0	5.0
Illinois	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indiana	0	12.5	0	0	3.0	0
Iowa	1.05	5.95	0	.45	2.55	0
Kansas	0	12.5	0	0	5.0	0
Kentucky	2.33	4.67	0	1.0	2.0	0
Louisiana	0	20.0	0	0	0	0
Maine	0	11.0	0	0	5.0	0
Maryland	0	15.0	0	0	0	4.0
Massachusetts	2.25	6.75	6.0	0	0	0
Michigan	0	12.0	0	0	0	12.0
Minnesota	0	12.0	0	0	5.0	0
Mississippi	0	15.0	0	0	7.0	0
Missouri	0	12.0	0	3.0	0	0
Montana	0	10.0	0	0	10.0	0
Nebraska	0	12.0	3.0	0	4.0	1.0
Nevada	0	11.0	0	0	5.0	0
New Hampshire	0	7.2	4.8	0	0	5.0
New Jersey	0	12.0	0	0	4.0	0
New Mexico	0	6.0	6.0	0	2.0	2.0
New York	0	11.0	0	0	4.0	0
North Carolina	0	15.0	0	0	5.0	0
North Dakota	0	10.0	0	0	5.0	0
Ohio	0	15.0	0	0	4.0	6.0
Oklahoma	0	15.0	0	0	5.0	0
Oregon	0	15.0	0	0	5.0	0
Pennsylvania	0	7.2	4.8	0	2.4	1.6
Rhode Island	6.0	9.0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	7.0	0	0	3.0	0
South Dakota	0	7.0	10.5	0	7.0	10.5
Tennessee	0	10.0	0	0	3.0	0
Texas	0	15.0	0	0	5.0	0
Utah	0	12.0	0	0	4.0	0
Vermont	0	12.0	18.0	0	3.2	4.8
Virginia	0	10.0	0	0	3.0	0
Washington	0	15.0	0	0	6.0	0
West Virginia	2	8.0	0	1.0	4.0	0
Wisconsin	0	8.0	4.0	0	8.0	4.0
Wyoming	0	20.0	0	0	10.0	0

[1] Vault cash.
[2] Vault cash or deposits with other banks.
[3] Vault cash, deposits with other banks, or securities.

Source: "Compilation of Federal and State Laws Relating to Reserves in Banking Institutions," Federal Reserve System, 1964.

POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee has asked me to inform him of anything I find wrong with the poverty program.

In glancing through a magazine named "DAV: Official Voice of the Disabled Veterans of America," I, to my horror, came across a statement that with 15,000 eligible veterans on their waiting lists, Veterans' Administration hospitals have been thrown open to Job Corps members.

Immediately the question arose in my mind: Are the new inductees of the war on poverty to take precedence over the veterans of Vietnam, Korea, World War II and World War I?

I investigated and found out that there has indeed been an official circular issued by the Veterans' Administration authorizing initial physical examinations of Job Corps applicants and "short-term hospital care"—whatever that means. My investigation also disclosed that this order was issued very quietly on January 18—exactly 5 days after the Executive order for mass closings of VA hospitals.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars informed me that there were "close to 15,000 veterans on waiting lists to be admitted to VA hospitals" and further, that "it is illegal to take care of merchant seamen in VA hospitals." These seamen participate in keeping the American flag flying on the seas from Vietnam to the Dominican Republic.

I am for the poor. I am so strongly for them that I would like to protect them from the swarm of bureaucrats who are taking the Federal money they should be getting and who seem to be making a shambles of the program for the poor.

But surely the National Health Service and other Federal or private agencies, or even volunteer physicians, could examine newcomers to the Job Corps.

It makes anyone wonder whether this administration is not putting the voter—who is getting the taxpayer's aid at home—above those who have fought for our country and those who are today being wounded in its battles.

The circular follows:

CIRCULAR 10-65-13,
January 18, 1965.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Department of Medicine and Surgery, Washington, D.C.

Subject: Physical examinations of Job Corps applicants and short-term hospital care for Job Corps members.

To area medical directors, directors of VA hospitals, domiciliaries, and VA outpatient clinics, and managers of regional offices with outpatient clinics.

1. General: Section 102, Public Law 88-452, Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, established the Job Corps. To assist in the physical examination of applicants and the provision of short-term hospitalization of enrolled members, VA hospitals and clinics may be used to the extent that there is no interference with the care and treatment of veterans.

2. Request for service: When such services are necessary, Job Corps or its designated agent will authorize the nearest appropriate Federal medical facility to arrange for physical examination of an applicant. Travel costs to and from the VA medical facility will not be paid by VA.

3. Clinical reports: The results of physical examinations performed in accordance with instructions attached to the letter of authorization will be recorded on SF-88 (original and two) and SF 89 (original and one). Explanatory information provided on an examination is often of key significance in determining medical clearance for an applicant. Special attention should be given, therefore, to complete item 40 of SF 89. The proper completion of SF 88 includes the signature of the reviewing physician who certifies that the report is adequate and that instructions have been complied with. Field stations will transmit completed reports promptly to the requestor, who will forward them to the Job Corps.

4. Charges: Charges will be made in accordance with instructions contained in D.M. & S. Circular 10-64-218 for Federal agencies.

5. Billing: Requests for reimbursement for services rendered should be made on standard form 1080, Voucher for Transfers between Funds and Appropriations. The original of the authorization from the Office of Economic Opportunity, Job Corps, must accompany the standard form 1080. These forms should be mailed to: Budget and Finance Division, Office of Economic Opportunity, 1200 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

By direction of the Chief Medical Director.

M. J. MUSSER, M.D.,
Deputy Chief Medical Director.

THE CASE AGAINST THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an address delivered by Mr. Charles T. Reeser on August 11, of this year.

Mr. Reeser ably presents the case against the United Nations and our involvement therein. There is an arising awareness of the futility of relying on the United Nations as an instrument of international peace. The successive failures of the United Nations in this field are ample evidence of the need for more dependence on our own country, and less interdependence upon any world organization.

The address follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY CHARLES T. REESER, AUGUST 11, 1965

Mr. Chairman, members of the Las Vegas Breakfast Lions' Club, and fellow guests, I'd be embarrassed by that wonderful introduction if it weren't for the fact that I so richly deserve it. As you can see, modesty in all things is another of my more admirable qualities.

Seriously, though, I can assure you that I have tried never to make a boring speech, and I think I have been successful. This doesn't, of course, mean that I haven't from time to time addressed some pretty sleepy people. Although a good speaker tries to tell a funny story about now, I am handicapped through happening to favor a joke that requires exactly 32 minutes to tell. I believe, though, the subject of my speech will, due to the official position of the Lions, be hilarious to some, maddening to others, and at least disturbing to the remainder.

I can't help wondering, as I look at our American flag and hear you give the Pledge of Allegiance, what you would think if Congress were to ask your approval of establishing a foreign nation, complete with its own government, its own courts, and its own military forces on American soil? I also wonder what you will think when I tell you that not only has this already been done, but has been done without your consent, advice, or even knowledge. I am, of course, referring to an international enclave, situated on American soil, in which no level of American government has any jurisdiction. The boundaries of this "Nation within a Nation" are from

46th Street to 49th Street, and from 1st Avenue to the East River, in New York City. Our own newspapers and magazines have already told us that murderers, rapists and spies can, and have, taken refuge in the sanctuary of this enclave, thereby evading the punishment which is visited on all other criminals who reside within the environs of our Nation.

The New York City police have no jurisdictions within this enclave; the New York State troopers have no jurisdiction there; the Federal marshals have no jurisdiction there; the FBI can't even enter on official business, nor can the mayor of New York City, the Governor of New York State, or the President of the United States—without the express permission of the person in charge—Mr. U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations.

Since this information may be somewhat startling to some of your companions (and even to you), let's review the legal aspects of our "great and wonderful" U.N. affiliation. Our first mistake was in ratifying the United Nations Charter. In so doing, we bestowed treaty status on that worthy document and then, just to be certain of our entanglement, we proceeded to supplement the ratification with the treaty which gave the United Nations a physical portion of our Nation.

Now, let's see what the Constitution of the United States says of treaties: "Article 6, section 2; this Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." This includes Executive agreements made by the President without the consent of the Senate (and certainly without your knowledge), and was recently clarified by a decision of the Supreme Court of California which accepted the previous interpretations that treaties supersede the provisions of the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

As you can see, the plot is beginning to thicken already. But, let's look at this U.N. Charter which is, in fact, a treaty which, in turn, supersedes our own Constitution:

"Chapter 1, article 2; All members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter." Let me again remind you to keep in mind at all times during this speech, that we are bound to the provisions of this charter by the very same Constitution it supersedes. With this thought in mind, let's just see what we are bound to. For instance, some logical questions should come to mind at this time. One such question is: Might we be denied the "rights and benefits resulting from membership"?

The answer is found in chapter 2, article 5 of the U.N. Charter: "A member of the United Nations against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council may be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of Membership by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

Thus, the Security Council, composed of 11 members (reference ch. 5, art. 23, sec. 1) which may convene whenever it pleases (ch. 5, art. 30) and wherever it pleases (ch. 5, art. 28, sec. 3), and needs only 7 affirmative votes to carry a proposal (ch. 5, art. 27, sec. 2), can deny us the so-called protection of the U.N. machinery. The Security Council has, in the past, met and acted without the presence of the U.S. member, and it could do so again. Even if we were present, the potential protection of our veto power is little more than a myth, since members who are parties to any dispute are not allowed to vote in their own behalf under the terms of the very same charter we ratified. Treaty status, remember?

Another section which is frequently cited as offering us protection is chaper 1, article 2, section 7. It says: "Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter * * *." What is seldom pointed out is the punctuation used here, and what follows. The punctuation is a semicolon, and what follows is: "but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter Seven." This is what brings us down to the meat of things.

Chapter 7, article 39, says, "The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace." Now, although the Hungarian revolt apparently didn't qualify as a threat to the peace, I can't help again wondering if such bits of Americana as race riots and violent strikes (which the Communists are constantly trying to initiate) might not meet the stringent United Nations criteria? Suppose, for a moment, that such things did constitute a threat to the peace according to the U.N. What could this Security Council do to us? As an interested party to the issue, we could not vote in our own defense, and chapter 7, article 42, says that: "The Security Council may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to restore peace." Such action would, under the provisions of chapter 2, article 5, deprive us of our right to object to such an invasion of our land. Cute? No, it's merely treaty status—remember?

Now, I don't intend to leave you wondering how we got suckered into such a trap, because the story is too interesting not to tell. Let's go back a few years, to the 1943–44 period of our history. Our wartime Department of State, and in particular, the Office of Special Political Affairs, was responsible for planning the U.N. as it is today.

The man who directed that office was a real go-getter. He was the most active person in setting up the 1944 Dumbarton Oaks Conference. As a matter of fact, he was a member of the agenda committee at Dumbarton Oaks; a member of the document drafting committee at Dumbarton Oaks; an alternate on the armament committee at Dumbarton Oaks; executive secretary for the American delegation at Dumbarton Oaks; a secretary in the general conference, secretary of the steering committee, and responsible for the administrative arrangements of the Conference. All this activity at Dumbarton Oaks, where the first drafts of the U.N. were drawn. These plans were later completed at Yalta in early 1945.

Our go-getter was a member of the committee which prepared for the Conference at Yalta, and attended it as a special adviser to the President and according to reputable sources, sitting at the President's side during many of these meetings. The United Nations was formally launched in 1945, at the Conference in San Francisco. Our boy was not content, naturally, to merely attend the Frisco meeting. He was secretary of the organizing group on arrangements, and Secretary-General of the International Secretariat—literally running the show. It was also he who, after the Conference, brought the original text of the Charter (which now fetters our freedom) back to Washington with him. Now, don't be misled. Despite all of this activity, he is not "Jack Armstrong, the all-American boy." Care to take a guess at his identity?

Well, I'll tell you. Alger Hiss, who later served time in a Federal penitentiary for perjuring himself in testifying about his communistic activities. This is the man who, almost single handedly, built the United Nations. Is it any wonder that we now face a marked and stacked deck in the U.N.? Even the wildest Las Vegas gambler (and I know some wild ones) wouldn't play against odds like these.

Another question comes to mind. Just why was the United Nations located in the United States in preference over such traditional site of international mediation as Geneva or The Hague? Let's let the first man to serve a full term as Secretary-General of the U.N., Mr. Trygve Lie, answer that question. In his book, entitled "In the Cause of Peace," Mr. Lie says: "The Americans declared their neutrality as soon as the Preparatory Commission opened its deliberations. The Russians disappointed most Western Europeans by coming out at once for a site in America. Andrei Gromyko, of the U.S.S.R., had come out flatly for the United States. As to where in the United States, let the American Government decide, he had blandly told his colleagues. Later, the Soviet Union modified its stand to support the east coast."

Obviously, there was no incentive for the Communists to infiltrate Geneva or The Hague, but the United States was another matter entirely. Arch enemy of tyranny and communism. World leader in atomic power. Symbol of freedom, and may God grant we remain so, to the entire world. But, guarded against illegal entry by the immigration and customs departments, and by the FBI. Is it all starting to add up? What could be better than to base the United Nations in America, and flood the country with trained spies protected by diplomatic immunity? Treaty status, remember?

But this is only a very small peek into the diabolical treachery which faces us from the U.N. What of our own people there? What of the American employees upon whom we might rely to protect and defend American interests in the face of an international threat? As one of the conditions of their employment, all Americans employed by the United Nations must take the following oath, and I quote it without alteration or abridgement.

"I solemnly affirm to exercise in all loyalty, discretion, and conscience the functions entrusted to me as a member of the International Service of the United Nations, to discharge those functions and regulate my conduct with the interests of the United Nations only in view, and not to seek or accept instructions in respect to the performance of my duties from any government or other authority external to the Organization."

Sounds like a Mafia oath, doesn't it? Yet, we rely on the integrity of men and women bound by this oath to deter U.N. subversion in America. I ask you, how stupid can we be? And, there's more yet. Let's look into the background of the people who aren't bound by this oath. In doing this, let's also switch our sources of authority and fact. Let's switch to Department of State documents, House Committee on Un-American Activities reports, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee reports, public laws that are even now in effect, and a perfect jewel of a Government publication commonly known as Index Nine.

Despite the things you may have heard about Index Nine, it is simply a compilation of names of men and women who have, knowingly or unknowingly, served the Communist conspiracy, and documentation of how and how often they did it. If there is any doubt as to whether the actions described were conscious or not, a little commonsense will serve to resolve that doubt.

We have already met Mr. Alger Hiss, and if you want more information on him, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities, between them, have published or caused to be published, several hundred thousand pages of reports in which Mr. Hiss' patriotic activities are prominently noted.

We had, and still have, a Deputy Ambassador who took over temporarily on Mr. Stevenson's death. His name is Francis T. P. Plimpton. You can check both the spelling of his name and a portion of his past activities in Index Nine. A note of interest might be brought out here by mentioning the fact that our new Ambassador, the past Supreme Court Justice, Mr. Arthur Goldberg, also has a few notices in Index Nine. The only woman on our first U.N. delegation was the late Miss Virginia Gildersleeve (no relation to the "Great Gildersleeve") who also received a rave notive in Index Nine. We have a Mr. S. M. Keeny, Director of the Asia Regional Office for UNICEF—he has three pages in Index Nine.

Now, I could understand such cases as (and listen to these good Irish names) Valentin A. Gubitchev, Aleksandr P. Kovalev, Rotislav Shapovalov, Victor Ivanovich Petrov, and Cristache Zambeti. Gubitchev was, of course, the Russian U.N. employee who was arrested with Judith Coplon for espionage against America. Miss Coplon, by the way, has never paid for her treason. She is still free on bail, married, and the all-American mother of four rapidly growing little patriots.

Kovalev and Shapovalow were both members of the Soviet mission to the U.N., and covered by diplomatic immunity. As a result, all we could do was declare them persona non grata and let Russia ship them home.

Petrov was an employee of the U.N., and very wisely skipped the country one day before the FBI was due to collar him. Zambeti, a member of the Rumanian legation, was another example of diplomatic immunity. We were forced to allow him to depart with no stronger action than stating officially that he was an "unwelcome person" to translate the Latin. Such cases as these, even without detailing the unprincipled methods they used, are understandable, and even to be expected, as long as we harbor the U.N. on our shores. These people are dedicated Communists, from Communist nations, working to achieve Communist objectives. Obviously, despite what our State Department says to the contrary, a Communist, like a leopard, cannot be expected to change its spots. What is more difficult to understand, though, is the self-declared American who caters to these totalitarian ambitions.

To better understand this problem, we must first understand the significance of "pleading the fifth amendment." If I may digress for a moment to quote from a House Committee on Un-American Activities Report on hearings held in Los Angeles in 1962. The witness is a Mr. Ben Dobbs—a high-ranking Communist Party member. Committee Counsel, Mr. Tavenner, asks the question, and I quote from the record: "Let me read to you a paragraph appearing on page 30 of the report, the title of which is 'Dobbs, Ben.' Dobbs is administrative secretary for the Communist Party's southern California district as well as a member of the executive board of the southern California district council. He attended three Communist Party conventions during the first quarter of 1957."

From there, the testimony continues with two paragraphs detailing Mr. Dobbs' Communist activities. At the conclusion of this itemized record, Mr. Tavenner offers Mr. Dobbs the opportunity to refute these facts. Bear in mind, please, that a false denial opens Mr. Dobbs to a prison sentence for giving false testimony before a congressional investigating committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. "Now will you tell the committee, please, whether any statement contained in that report relating to you is in error?"

Mr. DOBBS. "I am going to refuse to answer that question on the grounds already stated; namely, on the first and fifth amendment."

This, friends, is fifth amendment innocence at its best. If he admits the evidence, he admits being a Communist, and if he denies it, he goes to jail for perjury. Mr. Dobbs is, however, protected from possible embarrassment by the entire weight of the Communist Party hard selling the American public on the idea that it is the patriotic thing to hide behind the fifth amendment; that it is the American way to protest against the horrible HCUA.

Such examples of the truth as this are many, and I hope that none of you will ever be fooled into believing the Communists on this point. Now, with an understanding of the real significance of "pleading the fifth," let's progress in our investigation into the ethics, morals, and operation of the United Nations.

Remember an agency called UNRRA—the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration? Like a flame, it drew such red moths as David Weintraub—pleader of the 5th amendment, and identified by the SISS as an active Communist agent. Harold Glasser—pleader of the 5th amendment. Communism is a family project with Mr. Glasser, and even his wife receives notice in Index Nine. Sol Lashinsky—5th amendment Communist. George Perazich—5th amendment Communist, and others literally too numerous to name.

How about the IMF—International Monetary Fund? It's characterized as one of the most important of the U.N. specialized agencies, with nearly eight billion dollars (contributed principally by you and I and the rest of the American suckers) to use in the international stabilization of currencies. Important? Sure, it's important, and the recurring devaluation of the once solid British pound is a good example of its success. The IMF was conceived, founded, and first administered by Harry Dexter White, and if the name sounds familiar, it should. He was later proven a Communist agent, and supposedly committed suicide rather than face the SISS—but, that's another story * * * He was, in turn, succeeded by Virginius Frank Coe—also identified in Senate hearings as a Communist agent. Please bear in mind that, for each person I name, there are at least a dozen more who time limitations prevent me from praising properly.

The list is both impressive, and shocking. Particularly in that, for a variety of reasons, it has not been more widely publicized. It includes such Index Nine celebrities and 5th amendment Communists as: Frank Carter Bancroft—U.N. Documents Control Division—5th amendment Communist, and 13 pages of activities in Index Nine. Ruth Crawford—publications officer for UNICEF—that's the U.N. kiddy emergency fund. She is another 5th amendment Communist.

Abraham H. Feller, U.N. General Legal Counsel.

Joel Gordon, Chief of the U.N. Trade Analysis Division.

Irving P. Schiller, U.N. Registrar.

Alexander H. Svenchanski, U.N. information officer.

Alfred J. Van Tassel, Chief of U.N. Special Economics Projects.

Eugene Wallach, U.N. Reporter.

David Zablodowsky, in charge of the U.N. Publishing Division.

Herman Zap, U.N. training officer and on, and on, and on, ad infinitum, ad nauseum.

This would, at least to me, appear to bear out the sworn testimony of various Communist diplomatic officials who have defected to the West that, and I quote: "the headquarters of * * * the United Nations are centers of Communist espionage activity." This appears in House Document 119, free upon request.

Perhaps, to progress, you have heard rumors about a U.N. agency known as UNESCO—United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Whatever you may have heard, if it's bad—it's true. UNESCO is probably the most insidious of the U.N.'s proliferous specialized agencies. This is the agency which is right now attacking you through the minds of your own children. Hard to believe? Shouldn't be. Despite the almost total control of news media in America, the facts have been made a part of the public record, for you to use. These are provable facts, just as are the 14 Index Nine Citations earned by only 4 of the people who prepared the first draft of the U.N. Charter. It is a widely known tenet of world communism, and a true one, that the subversion of only one generation will result in the victory of communism over freedom. Ladies and gentlemen, UNESCO is attempting that subversion right now. Paul Harvey summarized UNESCO very well when he said: "American children are being indoctrinated to live under one world government while Russian children are being taught to run that world government."

Hard to swallow? Just write to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in Washington, and ask for information on the U.N., UNESCO, and UNICEF. You'll receive a small assortment of pamphlets containing what they apparently must feel is mild propaganda. If these pamphlets are mild, I would certainly like to see some of the material they withdrew from circulation as obsolete 3 years ago.

Let me quote a bit. This is from one entitled, "Do You Know the Facts About UNESCO and UNICEF?" "From time to time, doubts and questions are raised about UNESCO and UNICEF. Long laid to rest, they still reappear, and others—some so irresponsible as to be called misrepresentations—spring up. Here, briefly, are the misstatements, answered by the facts. (Statement) UNESCO literature is slanted away from the traditions of the United States and toward a nebulous one-world government. The facts: Since its creation in 1946, UNESCO has published millions of pages of literature, out of which only two pamphlets discuss world citizenship but do not promote world government in any way. (Statement) UNESCO seeks to indoctrinate American school children with ideas contrary to American ideals and traditions, and seeks to influence teachers by placing materials and texts in the classrooms of America. The facts: UNESCO publishes only a limited amount of material suitable for classroom use, and supports this production only at the request of member states. The United States has never requested such assistance, and there is no known instance of schools using UNESCO books and manuals in this country."

Oddly enough, I have no intention of refuting the body of either contention, because they are both true—as far as they go. I will, however, attack both U.N. statements on the grounds of incompleteness. Point No. 1: The U.N. does publish only a limited amount of material suitable for classroom use. However, such alternative and external sources as: The National Education Association's Committee on International Relations, the American Association for the U.N., Stanbow Productions, U.S. Committee for the U.N., World Publishing Co., Doubleday & Co., Fisher and Rabe Plays, Inc., Franklin Watts Co., E. P. Dutton & Co., Oceana Publications, and numerous others, make it unnecessary for the U.N. to engage in large scale publication of textbooks.

In point of fact, it is not UNESCO materials which are being used in our schools, but privately produced materials which accomplish the same goals. And, if you doubt the efficient job this material is doing on our children, just consider two—only two—facts. (1) The increasingly restricted amount of patriotic materials used in our schools. (2) The same kids who are rioting on college campuses, tearing up their draft

cards rather than fight for imperialism and practicing (unsanitarily at that) free love to the accompaniment of filthy speech—these are the same kids who have matured during the period of U.N. existence. Point No. 2: The UNESCO published material does not promote world government per se, because the private productions are doing it for them.

There is another pamphlet, entitled "The World in Your Classroom—Suggestions for Teachers for U.N. projects." It covers elementary, intermediate, and high school grades. It suggests for elementary grades; "A classroom scrapbook project on the U.N." "A play or skit, emphasizing cooperation." (and I assume that includes the commies) "Study of the customs and life of children in other lands." Now, this is not the all encompassing Geography which we studied, but the study of foreign customs to the exclusion of our own national traditions. "Discussion of How UNICEF benefits other countries." Not discussion of the U.S. "CARE" program, nor how America benefits other countries, but UNICEF. "Class participation in the "Trick or Treat for UNICEF project. And, the best one of all, which I quote verbatim: "When your class talks about health, food, aviation, farming, and other topics, explain the work of the people at the United Nations in these fields. Use the stories of the U.N. Intergovernmental Agencies to give graphic pictures of these worldwide efforts." Now, if that doesn't suggest a really comprehensive program of brainwashing, I don't know what does. Emphasizing the U.N. over our own nation, and suggesting that it is only "people" rather than a fully organized international pseudo-governmental organization with world conquest as its goal.

This program continues through the intermediate grades; "Use audio-visual aids, filmstrips, etc. Name a student to lead class discussion on the subject being viewed. Student's participation is very important." "Art class assignment to draw posters on specific U.N. themes. The school newspaper should call attention to the project." Assign students during the year to keep a U.N. bulletin board. Set up a U.N. bookshelf in the school library." If you are now getting a feeling that there is some contradiction between what UNESCO says it doesn't do, and the suggestions I have just quoted, it just shows that you've been paying attention. And don't think that the high school grades get away without attention.

"Present a model U.N. Assembly session with students acting as delegates" (that's a good idea, providing they can find a school with enough students to portray all the Communist roles.) "Establish U.N. clubs in your high school." "Arrange for the school dramatic society to present a play with a U.N. theme—show a U.N. film after the play." And, here's another goodie—"Schedule a class debate on important issues such as the U.N. decade of development, international police force, disarmament, etc." How does that affect your digestive processes?

And, what resources and materials do the teachers use—since the UNESCO doesn't provide them? The U.N. offers a list of recommended materials which ought to make the hair stand up on your head—no offense to any baldies present. "People and Places," by Margaret Mead—who, strangely enough, is cited for Communist front activities in index 9. "The United Nations in a Developing World," by Vera Micheles Dean—cited in index 9. U.N.: "The First 16 Years" by Clark M. Eichelberger—one of the founders of the U.N., and cited in index 9. Seven citations, in case you were wondering. "First Book of the U.N.," by Edna Epstein—cited in index 9. "Radio Plays for Young People To Act," by Rose Schneiderman—a real, true-blue American—with only 21 citations in index 9. This is a good one, because in plays, the kids have to memorize the commie propaganda.

Is it any wonder that, after 20 years of this, we are today faced by: the W. E. B. Du Bois Clubs, Mario Savio's free and filthy speech movement, the May 2d movement, the progressive labor movement, students for a democratic society, the Young Communist Party, and the rest of the growing list of Communist youth organizations?

Now, I've been hitting my subject hot and heavy, and just touching on the high points of the glorious history of our U.N. I've avoided getting tangled up in the U.N. role in Katanga, where they deliberately raped and pillaged an orderly, Christian, anticommunistic country and turned it over to a chaotic, cannibalistic, communistic, antichrist dominated Congo. I haven't mentioned how the U.N. deliberately allowed the Russians to send in tankloads of Mongols to massacre the Hungarian Freedom Fighters, and then blocked a motion to officially condemn the action. I have tried to limit my comments to the U.N. threat to America which we support through treaty status—remember?

Now, some of you might ask what difference Communists make in the U.N. Let me cite the answer of Mr. Jay Sourwine, a veteran of 15 years with the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, graduate of National University Law School, and legal counsel to the Senate Judiciary Committee. Mr. Sourwine explains that, "every member of the Communist Party has been indoctrinated. Each member has been put under discipline, has been accepted by the party as loyal and reliable, and has accepted as one of his personal obligations to the party the responsibility of using any position he gets for the furtherance of the party's purposes and objectives. This he does on his own initiative where he is not given instructions, and does in strict accordance with party instructions when instructed. The whole job of the Communist is to do those things which will help the party obtain its objective, advancing its propaganda, and making new recruits for the party."

To paraphrase, you can trust a Communist to be and act a Communist, no matter what the situation, and no matter what he says to the contrary—and the U.N. is full of Communists.

Please believe me when I say that lack of military strength is the only reason this conglomeration of Communists and cannibals hasn't yet tried us, and this is rapidly being changed. I wonder, and I would like to have a show of hands if possible, how many of you are familiar with State Department document 7277? How about Public Law 87-297, Public Law 89-27, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 32?

Well, since your business, your freedom, and your very life may literally depend on the effect of these documents, you might be interested in learning more of them: 7277, 87-297, 89-27, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 are the combined laws, pending laws, and official proposals which are intended to strip us of our arms, and to turn our military forces over to the United Nations.

Coincidentally, such a move would put our Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under the direct authority and control of Evgeny Suslov, the Russian Communist who is the Assistant Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs.

Don't look so startled. Under the terms of a verbal agreement between Americans Alger Hiss and Secretary of State Stettinius, and Russians Molotov and Vishinsky, and described in detail by Trygve Lie, the men who have controlled the U.N. military activities (including the Korean conflict) since the formation of the U.N. have been:

Arkady Sobolev, 1946 through 1949, from Russia.

Konstantine Zinchenko, 1949 through 1953, from Russia.

Ilya Tchernyshev, 1953 through 1955, from Russia.

Dragoslav Protitch, 1955 through 1957, a Yugoslavian commie for a change.

Anatoly Dobrynin, 1959 through 1960, from Russia again.

Georgy Arkadev, 1960 through 1962, from Russia.

Evgeny Kiselev, 1962 through 1963, from Russia.

Vladimir Suslov, from 1963 through the present day, from Russia.

Don't you just know that, with our Armed Forces under such leadership, we wouldn't have a single thing to fear from the United Nations? Since we are confronted by Soviet domination of U.N. military affairs, it would pay us to take a closer look at the documents I have mentioned. First, State Department Document 7277, entitled "Freedom From War—The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." This proposal duplicated, almost point for point, a similar Russian disarmament proposal. Proposing accomplishment in three stages, the document suggests that all nations participate, but also suggests that it would not be impractical for the United States to "set the pace" for other nations by initiating unilateral disarmament.

Now 7277 makes the initial proposal, and Congress passed Public Law 87-297 to implement these proposals. It was Public Law 87-297 that created the infamous U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and it was Public Law 89-297 which extended the power of that Agency for another 3 years, and which gave them another $33 million to spend while rendering us defenseless; 7277 states, and let me go back to quoting directly: "In order to make possible the achievement of 'complete disarmament,' the program sets forth the following specific objectives toward which nations should direct their efforts. The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal peace and for contributions to a United Nations peace force."

The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations peace force and for maintaining internal order. The establishment and effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations to insure compliance at all times with all disarmament obligations: "The negotiating states are called upon to develop the program into a detailed plan for general and complete disarmament and to continue their efforts without interruption until the whole program has been achieved. To this end, they are to seek the widest possible area of agreement at the earliest possible date. At the same time, and without prejudice to progress on the disarmament program, they are to seek agreement on those immediate measures which would contribute to the common security of nations and that could facilitate and form part of the total problem."

Of the three stages, the first stage is described as follows: "All states would have adhered to a treaty effectively prohibiting the testing of nuclear weapons." Gentlemen, we have actually done so, but the Russians haven't.

"The production of fissionable materials for use in weapons would be stopped and quantities of such materials from past production would be converted to nonweapons uses." You should have seen this for yourselves in the newspapers. The Department of Defense stated that America has ceased to produce additional nuclear weapons materials because our present stockpiles were adequate.

It further stated that the larger warheads presently in our inventory were, under current strategy, "obsolete," and were being converted for use in peaceful applications. Russia, on the other hand, is doing just the opposite—constructing ever larger warheads, and increasing their production to the limit of their capability. "States owning nuclear weapons would not relinquish control of such weapons to any nations not owning them, and would not transmit to any such nation information or material necessary for their manufacture." Gentlemen, could not this be the reason why we haven't armed our NATO allies? "Strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles of specified categories and weapons designed to counter such vehicles would be reduced to agreed levels by equitable and balanced steps; their production would be discontinued or limited; their testing would be limited or halted." We've done this too, but Russia hasn't.

We have been led down the garden path by fuzzy headed legislators who believe that man is intellectually and spiritually mature enough to capitalize on the United Nations; who believe that Communists are human enough, and trustworthy enough (in a Western concept) to do unto us as we are doing unto them. One of the local papers carried an item on July 16, stating that both Secretary of Defense McNamara, and Secretary of State Rusk had admitted to practicing unilateral disarmament in the hope (and I quote) "that other nations would follow suit." And, if you still don't believe that we have been disarming, in every sense of the word, just ask yourself what happened to:

The Thor missile, the Redstone missile, the Jupiter missile, the Atlas missile, the Skybolt missile, the Mobile Minuteman missile program, the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile, the Davy Crockett missile, the Pentomic Army plan, the fleet of nuclear aircraft carriers, the fleet of nuclear missile frigates, the B-47 program, the B-52 program, the B-58 program, the B-70 program, our overseas bases and men, our domestic bases and men, including Stead Air Force Base, right here in Nevada. It has been claimed on the floor of Congress that we are fighting the Vietnam war off the shelf. What happens when our shelf stocks of weapons are used up?

I say that every time we close a base and Russia opens one.

I say that every time we scrap a plane and Russia builds one.

I say that every time we dismantle a missile and Russia assembles one.

I say that every time we discharge a soldier and Russia drafts one.

I say each of these—no matter how "economical" our Government tells us it might be—each step puts us one step closer to surrender to a Communist dominated United Nations.

Now, I've already spoken longer than I should, and I've barely skimmed the surface of a conspiracy so massive that the mind boggles at its magnitude. Each of the charges I have made, each of the conclusions I have drawn, and each of the quotes I have cited can be borne out by public documents. If there are any of you who would like to ask some questions on this subject, I will be glad to stay around for a short while after the meeting. If you would like to do your own research, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee will be happy to provide you with all the free literature and reports you want. In summation, let me say this: if you love America just half as much as I do, you will make it a point to become familiar with the truth for a change. The time is long overdue to get the United States out of the United Nations, and the United Nations out of the United States. Benjamin Franklin once said that, "I believe in Faith, but it is Doubt which provides education." Seek out the truth, base your opinions on the truth, and then express your opinions to your elected Representatives in Washington. It's up to you. Thank you very much.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my support for H.R. 2580, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, which recently passed the House of Representatives.

I believe that legislation of this nature is long overdue and that its eventual enactment has been a foregone conclusion for some time. I should like to congratulate and express my appreciation to the members of the Immigration Subcommittee for the constructive work they have done in formulating this bill. It is the product of many months of hard work on their part.

I have supported this bill because I feel that it will place our immigration selection system upon a more rational basis and one which will better serve the needs of this country. The existing national origins quota system has resulted in an unfair distribution of immigrant visas that has been having some countries allotted many more than their needs require while other countries have built up huge waiting lists. The normal forces of supply and demand cannot function under such a system.

The basic inequities in the existing quota system have impelled Congress to enact numerous laws during the past dozen years to meet emergency conditions. These have included laws for the relief of refugees and the victims of natural disasters and to assist in the reunification of families with some of their members barred from entrance by oversubscribed quotas.

The bill that passed the House is designed to take care of problems like these as well as to incorporate other improvements in the law. This legislation emphasizes the importance of reuniting families and at the same time, includes safeguards to protect the American working people from unfair competition and the lowering of wages.

While I supported the bill, I felt that it could have been improved by the adoption of the so-called McGregor amendment limiting the volume of immigration from the Western Hemisphere. Since one of the purposes of the legislation is to eliminate discrimination based on place of birth, I think that we should complete the job by eliminating preference based upon the hemisphere in which a prospective immigrant happened to be born.

The dire predictions that have been made claiming that this legislation will swamp the country with a new wave of immigration are completely without foundation. The bill would make a moderate increase in the total number of immigrants admissible. At the same time the qualitative controls, excluding certain types of immigrants such as subversives and those likely to become public charges, are retained and even strengthened by the bill.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I supported this legislation.

CLEVELAND SAYS "WELCOME ABOARD" TO DEMOCRATS URGING PAUSE IN HEADLONG LEGISLATIVE PACE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as one of the growing number of Members of Congress who, along with many news commentators and private citizens, is deeply concerned by the effects of the headlong pace of this Congress, I welcome similar expressions of concern from the Democratic side. It was with particular gratification that I read of the letter sent today to the President by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] calling for a pause in the pace of legislation in order to give the country time to digest the massive new programs enacted and, indeed, to find the means of paying for them during a period when we shall have to meet increasingly heavy military obligations.

When we Republicans raise these points, the tendency is to dismiss our commentary as partisan carping, in spite of the gravity of the issue to the Nation. So, it is very good to see that similar concerns are being voiced by Members of the majority. Perhaps the views of the gentleman from Indiana, who is president of the organization of first-term Democrats, will receive a more sympathetic hearing. I say to the gentleman, "Welcome aboard." While I hope that my endorsement of his position does not weaken his case with the powers that be, I must say that I think he was absolutely right when he wrote the President that:

> It is time to pause. We must take time to work out the most efficient administration (of these programs). Budgetary limitations must be kept in mind, especially with the uncertain costs of continuing our effort in Vietnam.

FEDERAL SALARY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on September 13 I sent a letter notifying all Members that I proposed to offer an amendment to the Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965 eliminating the 11-step pay structure for employees of Members of the House of Representatives. I now have the amendment prepared, and, in order that every Member may have the opportunity to read it before it is offered, I have asked that it be printed in full here along with the text of my September 13 letter, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 13, 1965.

DEAR COLLEAGUES: Simplification of Members' staff salary allowance will be the subject of an amendment I will submit on the floor when H.R. 10281, the Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965, is considered during the week of September 13.

The ridiculously complicated and confusing salary system should be repealed. Many Members in voicing criticism have expressed the opinion that the purpose of the present system was to make our staff salaries appear smaller. Aside from this being a reflection on the Congress, no one is fooled by it. The press has repeatedly attacked it as deceptive and has reported the gross allowance used by each office as well as the gross pay received by individual employees.

Eleven steps of computation are now needed to convert basic pay into gross pay. The increase for congressional employees in section 114 of H.R. 10281 would install a 12th step.

My amendment will provide that a gross staff salary amount be established. The allowance under my amendment will be equal to the maximum now attained by any combination of basics plus the 4.5-percent pay raise in H.R. 10281. Each Member may then adjust the gross salaries in his office at his discretion. It will set a precedent for future raises to increase the total allowance rather than individual salaries.

The amendment will set the maximum payable to any one person at the present gross limit plus 4.5 percent. It will not change the limits on total number of employees allowed. It applies solely to those employed on the office staff of individual Members. However, it is obvious that your support of this amendment would encourage the Committee on House Administration to take similar action in behalf of other employees of the House of Representatives.

I hope you will join with me in eliminating an archaic, cumbersome feature in our disbursing methods and gain greater flexibility and simplicity in the operation of our individual offices.

Sincerely,

JOEL T. BROYHILL.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROYHILL OF VIRGINIA TO H.R. 10281

(Amendment fixing on an aggregate (gross) rate basis the clerk hire allowance of House Members and the compensation rates of employees in House Members' offices; and providing that salaries of employees of House Members be fixed in all cases by action of the individual Member rather than by law and paid from clerk hire)

Page 29, immediately following line 4, insert: "This subsection shall not apply to any employee paid from the clerk hire of a Member or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives."

On page 29, immediately following the period at the end of line 14, insert: "This subsection shall not apply to the compensation of any employee paid from the clerk hire of a Member or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives."

On page 30, immediately following line 14, insert the following:

"(f) Beginning with the effective date of this section—

"(1) the annual rate of compensation of each employee paid on such effective date from the clerk hire of a Member or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives shall be a single per annum rate in an amount which is equal to the sum of the annual basic compensation of such employee in effect immediately prior to such effective date and the rate of his additional compensation in effect immediately prior to such effective date; and

"(2) the annual rate of compensation of any employee paid from the clerk hire of a Member or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives whose compensation is fixed or adjusted on or after such effective date shall be a single per annum rate constituting his total rate of compensation.

"(g) Section 11(a) of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (2 U.S.C. 60g-1), is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the clerk hire of each Member and Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives shall be at a single per annum (gross) rate, as follows:

"'(1) in the case of each Member and Resident Commissioner the population of whose constituency is less than five hundred thousand (as currently estimated by the Bureau of the Census), such single per annum (gross) rate shall be $69,130.69; and

"'(2) in the case of each Member and Resident Commissioner the population of whose constituency is five hundred thousand or more (as currently estimated by the Bureau of the Census), such single per annum (gross) rate shall be $75,827.74.

No person shall be paid from such clerk hire at a single per annum (gross) rate in excess of $19,303.51. Not more than one person shall be paid at a single per annum (gross) rate of $19,303.51 from such clerk hire at any one time.'

"(h) The amounts specified in section 11(a) of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended by subsection (g) of this section, shall each be increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase provided by subsection (a) of this section.

"(i) The amendment made by subsection (g) of this section shall not be construed to—

"(1) reduce the amount of clerk hire which any Member or Resident Commissioner is receiving immediately prior to the effective date of such amendment;

"(2) limit or otherwise affect any authority for the making of any appointment to, or for fixing or adjusting the compensation for, any position for which the compensation is paid from the clerk hire of a Member or Resident Commissioner;

"(3) affect the continuity of employment of, or reduce the compensation of, any employee paid from such clerk hire; or

"(4) affect the authority provided by H. Res. 294, Eighty-eighth Congress, as continued by H. Res. 7, Eighty-ninth Congress, for the employment of an additional clerk by any Member or Resident Commissioner."

HOME RULE LEGISLATION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, as the result of a petition discharging the Committee on the District of Columbia from further consideration of home rule legislation, the Committee on the District of Columbia had to bring the hearings to an abrupt close.

There were many, many witnesses awaiting the opportunity to testify on this important subject who were unable to have the benefit of oral testimony and cross examination.

Some of these individuals and organizations did submit their statements for the record which I hope the Members will take the time to read. However, there is one particular statement, submitted by John M. Kyle II, executive vice president of the Kalorama Citizens Association of the District of Columbia, which I would like to read here and urge that all who read this RECORD note carefully.

Colonel Kyle's statement reads as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN M. KYLE II, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, THE KALORAMA CITIZENS ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Chairman, I am John M. Kyle II, executive vice president of the Kalorama Citizens Association. The association was organized in 1919 and there are about 25,000 people in the area served by the organization. By profession I am a legislative research consultant. I have been a citizen of this area for more than 39 years. From 1919 to date our association has supported the present form of District of Columbia government.

I have been a student of retrocession all during my residence here. I supported the Kyle retrocession bill in the 88th Congress and I now support the Broyhill bill, H.R. 10264. I may also say that for the past several years I have been preparing a source book of District of Columbia history.

Mr. Chairman, I support retrocession of the District to Maryland because it is the only lawful way under the Constitution to provide self-government for the people of the District of Columbia. Any other means would require a constitutional amendment. Once fully informed, however, I seriously doubt if the people of this country, or the several States, would ever consent to placing the vast complex of the National Capital under a local government, regardless of form, to rule over it.

There can be no question, however, about the legality of Mr. BROYHILL's plan. We have the unshakable precedent of 1846 when the Virginia portion of the original District was retroceded to Virginia. That was 120 years ago. In the 88th Congress there was considerable support for the Kyle bill in this committee and even the present president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia placed the entire Commission on record as having a favorable attitude toward the bill.

As was to be expected, however, the Commissioner's favorable remarks touched off violent newspaper opposition, and one paper editorialized that every public official in Maryland was against the bill. But when the editor was asked to furnish the names of such officials the request was not granted. The facts are that the people of Maryland nor the general assembly thereof have never had an opportunity to pass upon the question and the recent curbstone remarks of the Governor of that State, while a bit witty, have no meaning.

Then the Attorney General of the United States stepped in and furnished the committee a voluminous adverse report on the

Kyle bill and upon which the opponents of the Broyhill bill now rely. That biased and colored report filled throughout with trivia and nonsequiturs is a scare document and it is little more than picayunish argument.

He cites numerous instances, in disregard of the 1846 precedent, where retrocession might be illegal or unconstitutional once it is placed before the courts, but in another place, and apparently to save face, he tells the Committee that the Department of Justice is not passing on the constitutionality of the bill since such must be left to the courts.

One argument against the Kyle bill was that retrocession would make Silver Spring a larger city than Baltimore. This was thrown in, no doubt, for Baltimore's consumption; but how does the Attorney General know that Maryland would not fragment the ceded territory by constituting one or more new counties and by chartering new cities and towns in the ceded territory? Certainly Georgetown would ask for the restoration of its 1764 charter. The report is as silent as death on the fact that retrocession would give Maryland two or possibly three additional seats in the House of Representatives and many more seats in the Maryland General Assembly not to mention that the tax revenues paid by an additional half million people.

In the report the Attorney General attempts to throw out another scare by pretending that the status of wills and title deeds would be legally affected. But he doesn't say how? Does he not know that these have never presented any trouble with the transference of other jurisdictions during our long history?

As another scare he pretends that the transference of public utilities corporations might bring on fatal consequences.

Although Mr. Broyhill's bill would make that question moot the Attorney General points out that it would be necessary for the District to obtain a permit from Maryland to put on an inaugural parade—as if such parades hold status in law. The indication is, I suppose, that Maryland might not issue the permit so that we couldn't inaugurate a President.

In justification of the report the Attorney General claims that with its three electoral votes the District of Columbia holds a life or death stranglehold over the election of a President. He cites the three instances of presidential elections being thrown into the House of Representatives. How stupid does he believe you gentlemen to be? Since when has the most arduous partisan ever claimed that the District has a tie-breaking status? And if the same three electoral votes should be transferred to Maryland could the result not be the same in any close election? How can any Attorney General foresee the result of any election when the most noted pollsters have often been wrong? Perhaps the Attorney General has been reading some old preelection copies of the Literary Digest.

Actually the most energetic opponents of retrocession have not scored a single point against Mr. Broyhill's bill, for the simple fact that law, precedent, and history are against them. Do the opponents really want complete self-government plus real voting representation in the Senate and the House of Representatives or do they rather not seek to set up an illegal single party government in the District of Columbia with an unconstitutional method of financing it as contemplated by the Senate-passed bill, S. 1118? Do they not intend to establish a political machine with all the evils of a spoils system?

If the Senate-passed bill should become law what may we expect?

The bill does not provide employment security for the thousands of present District employees. It authorizes the new government to institute its own merit system. It is generally known that those who would control the new government are bitter enemies of our police department and this means the ultimate destruction of that force and its replacement with loyal machine but inexperienced personnel and civilian review boards such as are advocated by race agitators, bleeding hearts, and do-gooders about the country.

If the crime situation is bad now, what are we to expect under the new government?

Although proponents of the Senate bill claim that employees of the new government will be protected by the Hatch Act, such simply isn't the case. These employees will, to all intents and purposes, become cogs in the political machine—if they are to survive. As the bill is drawn this is inescapable.

The city government payrolls will be doubled in less than 2 years. There is no limitation so that the city council can create as many new positions as it sees fit.

There can be no question about it, the new government will institute and enlarge welfare and poverty programs that will practically make every District resident eligible for some form of relief or handout. The man in the house will be here to stay. Prostitutes, homosexuals, and dope pushers could ride the relief roles without detection. There will be no sincere effort to promote training programs looking to the rehabilitation of the unskilled and placing them in self-respecting and gainful employment. The outright dole will be the order of the day.

The National Capital Planning Commission will not have veto power over the new zoning commission; the Federal Government which owns one-half of the District land area will have no representation on the city council nor the zoning commission. This is absolutely preposterous. To protect the Federal interest it will be vitally necessary for the Congress to intervene from time to time. Not only should at least two members of the city council be representatives of the Federal Government, at least two members of the zoning commission should also be Federal officials. Under this impossible situation but little imagination is required to envision the numerous conflicts that are certain to arise.

Spokesmen for the Senate bill have indicated that the new government will emerge on a public housing program that staggers the imagination. Apparently such housing and rent subsidies are to be provided for all applicants regardless of means. The "impoverished" have been led to expect this utopia and thus we are to have a welfare city on a scale beyond the wildest dreams of the most dedicated Socialist.

What about the elected school board provided for by the Senate bill? What have the potential leaders in the new government led us to expect?

This board will scrap the present progressive building program and will launch its own program that would break the treasury of a Croesus or of any ancient Persian prince.

The people who would make up this new board are pledged to abolish the track system so that gifted pupils will be compelled to waste their time and talents while grouped with those of less brilliance. There is nothing new or revolutionary about this system. It just makes for commonsense.

Those who will control the new board would eliminate discipline in the schools by pulverizing corporal punishment for which there is no known substitute.

They will immediately gerrymander the school districts and start bussing schoolchildren from one side of the city to the other to promote school integration which no law or court decision now requires.

The Superintendent of Schools will no doubt be required to put on a chef's apron and operate a chain of restaurants to feed every "hungry" pupil in the city, including breakfast as it is to be presumed that there is no food for them in their homes. More than that, the city welfare program is certain to provide shoes and clothing for schoolchildren whose parents or guardians cannot or will not provide them. There are also proposals to pay dropouts to attend school.

Regardless of experience, ability, or academic attainment, those who will control the board will see to it that school administrators are chosen according to race, however, low it may be necessary to fix standards. The same criteria will also be applied in the selection assignment and promotion of teachers.

The present method of appointing the school board by Federal judges with lifetime tenure and, therefore, free from pressures, is one of the finest in the world. Yet the Senate bill would destroy it. "The angels wept and justice took a holiday."

How do those who support the Senate bill propose to finance the new government? According to the chairman of the District of Columbia Democratic Central Committee there will be a soak the rich and skin the poor policy. That chairman says that District of Columbia income taxes will be raised on those in the higher income brackets and on real estate—a scheme which if carried out is certain to chase the most substantial citizens to the suburbs of Maryland and Virginia.

Another home rule source proposes outlandish increases in the sales tax including groceries which the poor must also pay.

Then, of course, there is the scheme to levy a payroll tax on nonresident employees in the District. The same home rule boosters at the same time cry "taxation without representation." If this crazy scheme should be effected Maryland and Virginia are certain to retaliate. So whose ox will be gored? Now listen.

Perhaps the most unconstitutional and ridiculous proposal to be submitted to the Congress since the late President Roosevelt submitted the AAA and NIRA legislation, which the Supreme Court voided, is the brazen device to permit the new government to tax Federal property without the necessity of congressional appropriations. The Constitution emphatically states that no money will be paid out of the Treasury without congressional appropriations. Not only is the language emphatic it is indefeasible. Yet the Department of Justice contends that the proposal is perfectly legal. But did not that Department's lawyers also argue for the constitutionality of the AAA and the NIRA and other Roosevelt reforms which were struck down by the Supreme Court?

If by some miracle the Congress should be pressured into this delegation of its control over the spending of the Nation the end of representative government will be close at hand. The situation will be akin to that of King Lear after he gave his kingdom and all of his property to his eldest daughters. As Shakespeare relates it, Lear was chided by his jester who told him that he became a weakling "Whence thou made thy daughters thy mother, gave them the rod and lowered thy breeches." Then in answer to Lear's question "Think you me to be a fool?" the jester replied: "All thy other titles thou hast given away that thou wast born with."

There is always the possibility, however, that the presently constituted liberal Supreme Court would uphold this provision and thereby open a Pandora's box to hasten the end of constitutional government as it was known in America for more than 150 years.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, will the Congress be pressured into illegally setting up a one party government with a poisonous political machine in the District of Columbia with no protection of the Federal interests? Can the Congress be blackjacked into delegating its constitutional power to appropriate the public moneys to satisfy the demands of

a temporary majority? Shall Congress turn its collective back upon all reason, sanity, and prudence, to keep misinformed constituents "off our backs"? If the people of the District of Columbia really want self government Mr. BROYHILL's bill will provide it. I hope that it will prevail.

How can any conscientious citizen support a bill such as S. 1118 which is made to order for the machine politician? Political machines breed corruption, graft, and special privilege. Who does not know that presidential elections are now largely decided by less than 10 such machines? In some States, however, the big city machine vote can be considerably offset by the downstate vote as in New York and Illinois, but this could never be so here. For voting purposes we would simply have a one party vote delivered by a machine. The evil of the big city machines are too well known to repeat here. The dangers of one party government have been sung throughout the land by the political reformers for 100 years; but so far as can be ascertained no responsible political leader in the District of Columbia has uttered a word against the Senate bill.

Indeed the chairman of the local Democratic Central Committee has freely admitted that political machines are bad; "but," says he, "we must have democracy at all cost and regardless of the consequences." And this man will, no doubt, be the political czar here should the Senate bill become law. Do the ends justify the means?

Although the Constitution is clearly against them, proponents of the Senate bill cite James Madison as their authority for the institution of "home rule," as they call it, here. Whatever Mr. Madison's views may have been, let us note, they did not prevail in the Constitutional Convention; nor is any such "promise" found in his notes nor in the official proceedings of the Convention as recorded by Mr. Tomson, the Clerk. But lawyers long ago found Madison to be a weak reed. Over 30 years ago a Federal district judge actually relied on Madison's notes when he declared the 18th amendment to the Constitution to be invalid. In a unanimous decision, however, the Supreme Court nullified that ridiculous decision. The Madison "authority," let us note, is found in the Federalist which was written after the Convention. Does it not follow, therefore, that his opinions were merely his own and that they could not have changed the Constitution in the slightest degree. Moreover Mr. Madison's utterances on this subject were arguments addressed in support of the Constitution. To cite them now is something like a drowning man grasping for a straw. Madison was allied with the leading Federalists of the day such as John Jay and Alexander Hamilton who believed that "the people who own the country should run it," which is a far cry from what those who quoted Madison now advocate for the District of Columbia. It is noted that even the President has fallen for this Madison "authority."

Before people can lead they must learn to follow. All during our history it was always the national policy to grant statehood to territories only after proper organization and a demonstration of capability to govern. This policy was firmly laid down in the Ordinance of 1787 or 2 years before the Constitution was adopted; and within the memory of most of us we know that Hawaiian statehood was withheld for at least 25 years with a breakdown of law enforcement there in the early 1930's, but the crime rate there—as bad as it was—was insignificant when compared with the present crime rate in the District of Columbia and before the President undertook to promote home rule here he should have augmented the local police force with enough soldiers and marines to clean up the city—as Andrew Jackson or Theodore Roosevelt would have done. In the Ordinance of 1787 we find the following: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, they shall be forever encouraged." And this admonition is said to have come from the pen of Thomas Jefferson.

RAPS VEEP'S VISIT TO POLISH EMBASSY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is much emphasis these days, despite Soviet and satellite government support of the war against freedom in Vietnam, on the President's policy of "bridges of understanding." Stripped of its double talk, the administration's policy is to appease the Communist tyrants of Europe in the vague hope that they will somehow be moderate rather than militant Communists.

This administration policy is typical of the completely misdirected and self-defeating administration conduct of foreign affairs.

Since one of the greatest spokesmen for "bridges of understanding" has been the Vice President, it is practical for us to note public reaction to his attempts at liaison with Communist governments. Columnist John Switalski, of the Polish American, a Chicago publication, had a detailed, penetrating commentary in his column of September 4 on a recent visit of the Vice President to the Polish Communist Embassy here in Washington, which I include at this point:

RAPS VEEP'S VISIT TO POLISH EMBASSY

At the Third of May Constitution Day rally in Chicago's Humboldt Park, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY told more than 100,000 Polish Americans that the U.S. Government fully supports their demands for Poland's freedom. Less than 2 months later—and during Captive Nations Week—HUMPHREY went to the Polish Communist regime's Washington Embassy to take part in the 20th anniversary of the Communist takeover in Poland.

When spokesmen of Polish and other groups protested HUMPHREY's incredible action, he tried to explain that he was merely expressing his friendship for the people of Poland. HUBERT HUMPHREY is not that politically naive.

However, in fairness to the Vice President, we must state that his action was undoubtedly dictated by the White House. And President Johnson unfortunately leans heavily on the advice of State Department officials who see nothing incongrouous in sending American boys to fight and die in a war against communism in Vietnam while giving all kinds of aid that helps keep Communist regimes in power in Poland.

I can think of no more constructive way for Polish Americans to protest HUMPHREY's Captive Nations Week behavior than to suggest that he read the "Letter From Poland" in the August 16 issue of the New Leader. This is a translation and condensation of articles that appeared in the Parish Polish exile magazine Kultura under the pseudonym of "Gaston de Cerizay." A July 31 dispatch to the New York Times stated that the Gomulka regime denounced Stanislaw Mackiewicz as the author.

I wonder what Mr. Johnson, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk would say about Mackiewicz-Cerizay's opening statement that the regime has no followers and "obviously, if there are no followers, 99.99 percent of the people hate the people's republic."

"The bureaucracy and white-collar groups," Cerizay-Mackiewicz writes, "are undeniably privileged. They constitute the ruling social class, because the peasants and the industrial workers have no say at all in our people's republic. This bureaucratic class has a considerable majority in the United Polish Workers Party. But anyone who imagines that the party members are Communists by conviction, probably believes in the stork as well. Imperial Russia was supported by pillars of bureaucracy and officialdom, yet the mere fact that a man held an official position did not make him automatically a czarist monarchist as well.

"Membership in the party is peculiar. It is important chiefly to the educated white-collar worker. No one refuses membership. Afterward, one sleeps at party meetings, unless one chooses to indulge in party intrigues or in illicit business speculations facilitated through party connections."

"Ironically," the article continues, "the one class which is most hostile to the regime, and which hates the very term 'working man' were faced with the type of socialism represented, say, by the Socialist Party of Sweden." But in Poland, socialism means nothing but a completely nationalized economy. Industrial workers' councils do exist and a certain, though not overly large, a number of workers does belong to the party. But a worker who is a member of these organizations would never dare speak up for a wage increase. That would be an antigovernment act, an act of presumption upon the budget. The representatives of labor in the so-called capitalist countries protect the working man's interests; in Poland they serve to keep a tight grip on the workers, to make sure that he neither complains nor strikes, but keeps clapping his hands and remaining obedient toward the superboss and sole capitalist, the Polish state itself. Labor is indeed the most dissatisfied and exploited class in Poland.

"The Polish worker is industrious, able, and above all, not stupid. The comic inconsequence of the Government's actions is all too apparent to him. The doctrinaire harangues at meetings, the trashy, propagandistic newspaper articles all abound with predictions of the impending demise of capitalism—despite the strength of capitalist money in our marketplaces. Right here in Warsaw certain kinds of liquor can be bought for dollars only; wherever exchange is possible Polish currency is shunned, downgraded, while capitalist currency is eagerly sought.

"People are human, and want to live like human beings. The Polish worker receives packages from his relatives in the United States and West Germany. He knows that the working man in capitalist countries earns more, and pays less for what he buys. And he draws the appropriate conclusions."

The Kultura-New Leader article tells how Government suppression of religious observances has results exactly opposite to those desired. Instructed to shun the church, young people at summer camp run off to the church services en masse. "Even the sons and daughters of party dignitaries, who parade at mass rallies with antireligious slogans, are caught up in religious fervor."

Mackiewicz-Cerizay relates how when the Government ordered removal of crucifixes from the rooms of the sick, the hospital staffs refused to carry out the order. "This display of resistance was enough; the regime

was frightened, and it retreated. Now, just as before, crucifixes hang above the beds of the sick."

The late President Kennedy used to read the New Leader. I hope Mr. Johnson does, too. He might then realize that while Vice President HUMPHREY's attendance at a Communist celebration in the Polish Embassy was dismaying and repugnant to both Polish and non-Polish Americans, it was nauseating and demoralizing to the freedom-loving people of Poland who were betrayed into Communist hands by their World War II allies in London and Washington.

FEDERAL AID INEVITABLE FORERUNNER OF FEDERAL CONTROL

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on June 1 of this year I addressed this body on the subject of Federal aid as inevitably a forerunner of Federal control.

On many many occasions over the past few years, and indeed back into history to the time of the Magna Carta, men have spoken of the dangers inherent in a paternalistic central government.

When a national bureaucracy undertakes the role of provider, and benefactor, then it moves into the role of counselor. From there it is just one short step further to the role of policeman and dictatorship.

There seems to be little concern for this, especially in academic communities. There appears to be little worry that an overly powerful central government might present a threat to liberties we cherish, such as academic freedom.

As many of us have said: there is a threat, there is a serious cause for concern, not just for some of us, but for all Americans. We have today a Washington bureaucracy directed by a very ambitious political administration engaged in expanding its authority and devising new plans for imposing itself on the American people as a master, rather than as a servant.

In today's Washington Post newspaper, the column by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak brings to light some startling facts regarding proposals within the executive branch of the Government to embark on influencing the publication of textbooks for use in American schools. This must never happen.

I include the text of the column in the general interest:

THE FEDERAL TEXTBOOKS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Tentative plans are quietly being made inside the Federal Government for a long-range pressure campaign on local school boards and publishers to give the Negro better treatment in history textbooks.

Although no final decision has been made, the top brass of the Community Relations Service—created by the 1964 Civil Rights Act to help mediate racial disputes—is leaning toward adoption of the plan. Indeed, it has already been spelled out in some detail in a confidential memorandum drafted by Ben Holman, head of the Service's media relations office.

Although the goal of giving the Negro his rightful place in history books is commendable, there is considerable doubt whether the Community Relations Service is empowered by law to perform this function. The 1964 act is to "provide assistance to communities and persons" in settling racial disputes—and nothing more.

More fundamental, however, is the danger of the Federal Government getting into the business of editing the Nation's school books. The authoritarian implications of Washington officials censoring what Johnny reads in school disturbs even some officials at the Community Relations Service who look at the textbook project with some misgivings.

The Holman memorandum on textbook revision begins by stating the problem: "Negroes usually are ignored in textbook illustrations, and the Negro's role in history is either ignored or inaccurately presented."

Consequently, Holman concludes, the Community Relations Service should mount "a massive educational and informational campaign" directed at "publishers, school administrators and boards, parents and teachers groups" to get the textbooks changed. Though this scarcely falls within the agency's statutory mission, it seems generally inoffensive.

But the Holman memo goes on to suggest the beginnings of Federal high pressure: "Once the educational and informational campaign is solidly under way, we should conduct a systematic effort to contact all publishers and school boards to encourage their publication and adoption of textbooks conforming to established standards."

The term "established standards" has a particularly ominous ring. The intervention of many State legislatures (particularly throughout the Deep South) in textbook selection is ominous. But the idea of the Federal leviathan with its incomparable powers of coercion getting into the textbook business is enough to make publishers break out in a cold sweat. It smacks of rewriting of history in Orwellian style.

Actually, the textbook project is only the most far-reaching of the Community Relations Service's digressions from its legislative purpose.

The Service was originally conceived in 1960 by then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson as a counterpart in racial relations to the Federal Mediation Service in labor relations. The proposal went into the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

In operation, however, the Service has relegated mediation to a secondary role. Only a handful of mediators are in the field while a Washington-based staff dreams up projects such as the textbook scheme.

Holman also has in preparation elaborate programs of improving the treatment of the Negro in the press, establishing mobile exhibits for use at fairs and exhibitions and influencing Hollywood.

In a memorandum, Holman has suggested:

"We ought to mount a specific project aimed at Hollywood film makers to produce films for purely entertainment purposes that would help further the cause of better human relations * * * the current Negro revolution and the crescendo of the civil rights movement provide a wealth of material for fiction story plot. Plots centered on the problems of intergroup relations are as legion as those for westerns."

This is Government propaganda—a domestic "Voice of America"—at its worst. No matter how deep the need, the Federal Government has no right to try to shape the thinking of Americans in such insidious ways. Besides, there is a surplus or work for practical conciliation in every city in the Nation for the Community Relations Service.

If textbooks need rewriting, the educators are the people to do it.

THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF FEDERAL GRANTS ON SCIENCE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, since 1953, expenditures for science in this country have increased at an average rate of 13 percent a year to the point where we will spend nearly $21 billion—3.2 percent of our gross national product—on research and development this year. By far the leading contributor has been the Federal Government, which has increased its expenditures at a rate of nearly 20 percent a year since 1953. Federal funds now account for two-thirds of the contributions for scientific research and development. Since Federal laboratories carry out less than 15 percent of the work, a large part of federally financed research and development falls to our colleges and universities.

An article in the July issue of the Scientific American, by Dael Wolfle, points out some of the problems that have arisen as a result of the large contributions by the Federal Government to research and development projects in colleges and universities. One unwanted result has been a maze of rules and regulations governing fiscal and administrative details and reports which universities and individual scientists must deal with in order to benefit from Federal grants. Simplification and standardization is called for here to reduce wasted effort and confusion.

The impact that massive Federal contributions have on the relationship of the college or university to its faculty members also deserves increased attention. Project grants are presently nominally made to a university or other institution but in reality are awarded to an individual. The scientist and Government official frequently deal directly with each other on both substantive and budgetary matters, largely excluding the university administration from any important role in reaching decisions about the research done in the university. As a consequence, the faculty member's loyalty and attention are apt to shift from the institution to his project and the source of his funds. In addition, there is a substantial body of opinion that, while education at the graduate level has improved as a result of the availability of better equipment and more competent staffs, teaching on the undergraduate level has suffered. If this continues, we are apt to face a deficit of well-trained scientists in the future.

Not only may the institutions where research is carried out be affected by massive Government support, science itself may be affected. According to Dr. Wolfle, of all the money spent for basic research in the U.S., only about one dollar in five comes from a source that does not have specific goals in mind.

The danger is that research will be increasingly directed along the lines dictated by "mission oriented" Federal agencies, stifling and starving those projects which do not fit into any Government program but which may be valuable nevertheless. The possibility of shifting the responsibility for research decisions from the supporting agencies to the universities or the National Science Foundation, which is free from any special mission, should be studied.

Mr. Speaker, early in this session I introduced a bill, (H.R. 3791), that, if enacted, would permit tax credits to individuals and corporations for their contributions to basic research. This approach, designed to encourage private contributions to basic research projects of the individual's or corporation's own choosing, would supplement the Government program by inducing support of the smaller but very valuable basic research programs, as well as research of an interdisciplinary nature, which involves teams of scientists from many different and seemingly unrelated fields. Both of these areas are presently neglected by the Government's emphasis on large-scale, single field projects. I think that Dr. Wolfle's recommendations and my bill point the way to vastly improving contributions to research and development programs and their impact on science and technological progress.

I include Dr. Wolfle's article in the RECORD at this point:

THE SUPPORT OF SCIENCE IN THE UNITED STATES

(The sharp and sustained increase in funds has improved research and has benefited the investigator. Nevertheless, serious questions are being raised about the financing of research in universities.)

(By Dael Wolfle)

This year in the United States nearly $21 billion—3.2 percent of the gross national product—will be spent for research and development. Some two-thirds of the funds will be supplied by the Federal Government. "Research and development" includes basic research, applied research and engineering, design and even the development of prototypes; it is a broad category, but it does encompass all forms of scientific research. Not long ago the support of science was primarily the business of the colleges and universities and some voluntary agencies; before World War II the Federal Government's contribution was largely in agricultural research and the work of such agencies as the U.S. Geological Survey and the Naval Observatory. It was not until 1942 that the country's expenditures on science reached $1 billion. A steady growth in the support of science continued through the war and afterward; beginning in 1953 there was a sharp and sustained rise of huge proportions. Since 1953 the country has increased its expenditures for science at an average rate of 13 percent a year. The most striking rise has been in the contribution of the Federal Government, which has grown at a rate of nearly 20 percent a year. Although spending for development is leveling off, appropriations for academic research will continue to increase at about the present rate for some years.

The funds spent for scientific work during the past two decades have provided research opportunities on a scale previously unimagined. All fields of science have benefited from the better equipment, special facilities, greater freedom from constraints and larger number of workers made possible by the increased budgets. The award of Nobel prizes is one measure of the growing strength of basic research in this country; in the 1930's Nobel Prizes were awarded to nine American scientists, in the 1940's to 13 of them and in the 1950's to 27. Meanwhile the economy of the country has gained enormously from the upsurge in technological research and development. In 1953 research and development accounted for 11 percent of all industrial investment; in 1962 research and development absorbed about 25 percent.

The subject is nonetheless surrounded by disquiet. In Congress and in the Executive branch, in the universities and learned societies and foundations questions are being raised about the manner in which science is financed. Most of the questions deal not with the adequacy of the national effort but with the effects of the massive Federal contribution on the course of science and in particular on the conduct of basic research in the universities.

Evidence of this concern is found in a rapidly growing list of policy studies and program analyses. The National Academy of Sciences is midway in a series of reports dealing with various aspects of the scientific enterprise. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has advocated the establishment of a national review body that would decide on major new programs. Two committees of Congress—the House Select Committee on Government Research and the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development—have reviewed many aspects of the Federal program, and their reports have become valuable sources of detailed information. Moreover, Congress has begun to insist that executive agencies prepare special reports on certain areas of investigation such as oceanography so that the Federal effort can be examined as a whole instead of in its budgetary and departmental fragments. The White House Office of Science and Technology has appointed a blue-ribbon committee of industrial, scientific and educational leaders to review the policies and programs of the National Institutes of Health. The Bureau of the Budget has taken the lead in reexamining the administrative practices of the Federal agencies that support basic research. The National Science Foundation has reorganized and strengthened its staff sections responsible for studies of scientific policy, planning and resources. "Science policy" has become the topic of a number of university seminars and analyses.

All this ferment of analysis and reexamination makes it clear that major changes in policies governing the support of science are underway or in the offing. These analyses have also served to provide reassurance that many of the past policies and practices are sound and should be continued. The magnificent achievements of recent decades are evidence that the support system has been a fundamentally healthy one.

Support for research and development comes from many sources; some contribute only a few dollars, other billions. Some 300 firms provide 80 percent of the industrial money that goes into research and development; another 13,000 firms provide the remainder. Some 200 private foundations grant significant amounts to science and medicine. Universities and many colleges provide research talent, laboratories, and financial help. A number of private research institutions finance their own investigations. State and local governments conduct a variety of research programs. Four agencies are responsible for 95 percent of the Federal funds: the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In addition to these giants there are another four agencies that account for 4 percent of the Federal total: the Department of Agriculture, the National Science Foundation, the Department of the Interior and the Federal Aviation Agency. The remaining 1 percent of Federal research and development funds is spent by 21 other agencies.

In the 12 years from 1953 to 1965 every major source of research and development funds increased its support substantially. Federal funds are five times what they were in 1953. Industrial support has tripled, and the universities have done almost as well. The other nonprofit institutions are contributing 6 times their 1953 amount.

Just as the amounts of money supplied by these 4 sectors vary greatly, so do the amounts they use. The Federal Government supplies two-thirds of the funds, but Federal laboratories carry out less than 15 percent of the work. Industry contributes a third of the funds but conducts three-fourths of all the work (mostly with Federal funds). The colleges and universities provide about a tenth of the funds, and the other nonprofit institutions about a fortieth. (The universities' contribution is underrepresented in the financial reports, perhaps by several hundred million dollars a year; they provide substantial additional support, in the form of laboratory facilities and faculty time, that is not budgeted explicitly for research.)

From 1953 until 1960 about 8 percent of the Nation's research and development budget was devoted to basic research. The percentage has been rising since 1960, reaching almost 12 percent in 1965. As for the Federal Government's funds, in 1953 less than 7 percent went for basic research. The figure has been rising since 1960, to about 11 percent in 1965. The universities are relatively much more prominent in basic research than in the total research and development effort, being responsible for almost half of all basic research. In contrast the industrial laboratories, which dominate in development activity, conduct only about a fourth of the basic research.

Development activity is directly associated with identifiable industrial, economic, military or other practical objectives. Its cost and the cost of any associated research are therefore justified and budgeted in terms of its expected contribution to the attainment of specific objectives. In the case of basic research the situation is quite different. The ultimate beneficiaries of basic research are many, but they are hard to identify in advance. As a result the costs of basic research tend to be shared widely. Some basic research of notable quality is done in industrial laboratories, but most of it is conducted in universities with support from public funds. In some cases this public support involves Congress directly in decisions on priorities. Modern basic research sometimes calls for large-scale facilities such as particle accelerators, oceanographic research vessels and astronomical observatories. Such big science enterprises are so expensive that they must be considered individually at top Government levels, where the cost and promise of each can be compared with those of other claimants for available funds.

On the other hand, little science, typically the work of a university faculty member and his assistants and advanced students, will continue to be budgeted on an a priori basis and to be supported by means of a large number of project grants. Little science, the principal subject of the remainder of this article, is an area of central concern to science as a whole, not least because it involves the education of future scientists. It is the kind of science that is most characteristic of academic research and hence is most often involved in Government-university relations. It is also the area in which those relations are most likely to change.

Sustained scientific work of high quality requires the effective union of three elements: a self-renewing population of able scientists; appropriate research facilities with the necessary supporting structure for

institutional management; a source of money. In a few well-endowed research institutions all three elements are happily present in an almost totally self-contained and self-supporting organization. Such unity, however, is rare. More commonly under present conditions there is a scientific staff, a university with multiple obligations, and an external source of funds. All three sides of this triangle are interested in science, but their interests differ in detail; tensions arise and compromises become essential. The scientist must serve three masters: the internal logic and the opportunities of his own discipline, the policies and requirements of his institution, and the customs and wishes of his financial supporter. The university must meet the demands of science, of its many other endeavors and of the agencies that provide support. The Government agencies have an equally complex problem: in supporting a large number of individual scientific projects they must also consider the general welfare of the universities and be mindful of the wishes of Congress and the public it represents.

One useful change in the interrelations of scientists, universities and Federal agencies would be the simplification and standardization of what has grown to be a maze of rules and regulations governing fiscal and administrative details and reports. The complexity of grant administration was summarized last year by the House Select Committee on Government Research: "One of the ironies of the research grant is that while it is sometimes itself a simple one-page (if not a one-paragraph) document, it is accompanied by a bulky manual of instructions, explanations, and amendments. For example, although the NIH (National Institutes of Health) grant form is a 1-page instrument, it incorporates by reference the NIH grant manual, which runs to more than 100 pages."

The National Institutes of Health manual of course explains only NIH procedures and requirements; other agencies have adopted different rules and procedures. Congress has sometimes added to the confusion by setting arbitrary limits on the amounts that some agencies can pay to reimburse an institution for the indirect costs of conducting research. This overhead rate varies, moreover, depending on the agency that grants the funds. Sometimes overhead can be paid on some budgetary items but not on others, or at one rate on some items and at another rate on other items. The multiplication of administrative redtape slows decisions, harasses both agency and university personnel and puts the emphasis on form rather than substance. Fortunately these difficulties are widely recognized, and simplification and standardization would bring such obvious advantages that they will surely come about.

Standardization of procedures will be welcome, but more fundamental changes are required. Project grants are nominally made to a university or other institution, but in reality they are awarded to an individual. The scientist and Government official frequently deal directly with each other on both substantive and budgetary matters, largely excluding the university administration from any important role in reaching decisions about the research done in the university. Not all of the consequences have been happy ones.

When a faculty member looks outside his university for the major sources of support for his work, his interest and loyalty are likely to go where the dollars are. When the continuation of his work depends on his maintaining good relations and an effective record with private foundations and Washington agencies, and when his professional reputation depends primarily on his research productivity, he is likely to devote more and more of his time to writing project proposals and reports and to supervising the increased number of research assistants that liberal grants enable him to hire. Correspondingly less of his interest and loyalty go to the university that happens to be his home for the present, and less of his time is devoted to teaching and to doing actual laboratory work with his own hands.

There are many contentions that the increase in research has been bought at the expense of a depreciation of teaching. The research programs at most colleges and universities are not large enough to have an adverse effect on teaching. In the universities with large research budgets, however, complaints are heard that there is a schism between the teachers and the researchers; that the ablest graduate students are research assistants, whereas the less able ones become teaching assistants; that the big-time research operator has become the admired model in the eyes of graduate students; that in return for the explosive growth of research we are building up a deficit in the training of future scientists and in the general education of other students in science. There is a substantial body of opinion to the effect that whereas education at the graduate level has improved as a result of the availability of better equipment and larger and more competent staffs, undergraduate teaching has suffered.

The emphasis on research supported by outside funds on an individual-project basis has also tended to strengthen the divisive forces and weaken the integrative forces that are always at work on a university campus. By and large faculty scientists like the change to off-campus support; it means that each researcher is judged by colleagues in his own field of specialization. Physicists judge physicists, biochemists judge biochemists, and geologists judge geologists. A man can take pride in the fact that specialists from other institutions have judged his work and found it worthy of support.

Bringing new funds to the campus enhances the scientist's prestige and gives him some freedom from local control. He can buy equipment or hire a secretary, travel to a national meeting to discuss work with other people in his field, and even invite a man from another institution to pay him a visit—with expenses paid—to consult on research plans. And he can do all this without having to ask his dean or president for permission, because the grant is his. (That is, he can pay for these extras if he has had the foresight to provide for them in his project proposal. If not, it may take weeks for a busy office in Washington to let him know whether or not he can transfer $100 from one budget category to another.

The result of all this is that the project-grant system undoubtedly weakens the scientist's ties with his own university. It means that many decisions about the research conducted on a campus are made in Washington instead of at the campus level and are made piecemeal rather than with full account taken of all the other programs and responsibilities of the university. A university is not solely a group of individualistic faculty members. It is a community of scholars and of students who wish to learn from them. It includes a central administration responsible for the development of the entire university, not simply the uncoordinated expansion of individual units or empires. Professor X would rather entrust his research proposal to the judgment of his professional colleagues on a Washington reviewing panel than to what he may consider the uninformed or biased decisions of his own dean and president. President Y, however, would prefer to have a larger measure of control at the university level, because he remembers that the university is responsible for teaching as well as research, for history and philosophy as well as physics and biochemistry, for the library as well as the observatory—and he wants funds that can be used in the best interests of the university.

Not only may the institutions in which research is carried out be changed by the methods of support; science itself may also be affected. One cannot help worrying about what subtle distortions in the course of scientific progress may result from the fact that nearly all the Federal support now comes from mission-oriented agencies. The National Institutes of Health are interested in certain diseases, the Atomic Energy Commission in nuclear energy, the Department of Defense in weapons systems and countermeasures. Each supports basic research, but each selects projects in terms of its own mission. Of all the Federal grantmaking agencies, only the National Science Foundation is free from this necessity. To be sure, many researchers have secured support from the mission-oriented agencies for exactly what they as scientists most wanted to do. The fact remains that, of all the money spent for basic research in the United States, only about one dollar in five comes from a source that does not have specific missions in mind. It is still a matter of opinion whether or not this fact is threatening the future health of basic science, but there is a widespread feeling that the National Science Foundation should assume a greatly increased share of the responsibility for supporting basic research.

Certainly agencies with special missions will continue to support basic research; funding decisions will often be controlled by immediate objectives; projects will continue to be supported largely on the basis of their individual merits and those of the scientists involved. Yet basic improvements in the system are possible. Now that massive Federal support is accepted as an obligation, the most necessary change is to shift a substantial amount of the decisionmaking responsibility closer to the point of research. The fact is that decisions that should be made by the executive agencies are now being made by Congress. Decisions that should be made by the universities are being made by the agencies.

In Great Britain, Parliament avoids political and governmental control of science and education by making block grants to the University Grants Committee, which in turn allots funds to the British universities. For a number of reasons this mode of operation is not feasible in the United States. Don K. Price of the Harvard School of Public Administration has pointed out that Congress takes a very different attitude toward the relation between ends and means than Parliament does. Parliament is content to decide on the ends, authorize the necessary funds and leave the details of the means to administrative agencies and the civil service. Congress, on the other hand, pays much attention to the means by which national objectives are to be attained. It reviews the budgets of Federal agencies in great detail, sometimes instructing an agency that no more than (and occasionally no less than) a stipulated amount is to be spent on a particular kind of activity. Congress is not likely to surrender its control of means as well as ends but it might well give the agencies a freer hand with the details and subcategories of their research budgets.

There will have to be, in turn, a substantial shifting of responsibility for research decisions from the supporting agencies to the universities. Some of the Federal agencies are now supplementing the project grant with newer forms of support that will help the universities to regain this responsibility: general-research support grants; program grants that support an established group of research colleagues not for a specific project but for work in an area in which they have demonstrated their

competence; institutional grants that can be used in whatever way the university officials believe will best advance science on the campus; grants to help with the construction or equipping of laboratories, and the new science development grants to help selected institutions that are already quite good take a major step up the quality ladder.

These newer forms of grants will help to shift responsibility back to the campus, but the universities also have some work to do. A university's functions include both teaching and research; it has to maintain a reasonable balance between the two and also decide on the kind and amount of research that make sense in the context of its total program. The university president will sometimes say wearily that he knows these are his responsibilities but that his hands are tied—that there is no way to stop the very competent Professor X when he wants to start a new project because half a dozen other universities are eager to have the professor, willing to take him on his own terms and confident that plentiful grants will follow him to his new home. If the president lets his hands remain tied, the project grant will continue to be the dominant form of research support. It now seems likely, however, that universities that develop strong institutional controls and excel in the management of research funds can expect to receive a larger amount of support in more flexible forms.

Both the Government and the universities need to reconsider their interrelation. The makers of science policy must recognize that the Nation is as dependent on the universities as the latter have come to be on the Government. The universities are institutions with major responsibilities for the Nation's future and not just for its present eminence in science; institutions with a broad role in the Nation's intellectual life and not merely laboratories qualified to solve current problems.

The universities have always adjusted their policies and programs to changing social and economic requirements, and they will have to continue to do so. The universities cannot, however, merely respond to outside forces. They must also be independent innovators and stubborn conservators of old values. The weight of history urges that control of the universities by any one benefactor must be prevented if they are to preserve their independence, play their full roles as critics, conservators, and innovators, and retain control over their own destinies.

RULE XV—ON CALLS OF THE ROLL AND HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I think we would all agree that one attribute we in this Nation have always had that divides us from many other nations is the fact that most of our citizens believe we are and should be a nation of laws and not men.

Certainly in this deliberative body, we have felt from our earliest days in history that we in the House of Representatives represent a House based on the rule of law and not the rule of men. This means that from the various beginnings of Jefferson's rules, Cannon's rules, and down through the rules of the House that we have today, we are a House of Representatives based upon our rules.

This is essential, even when we find that our rules are inconvenient, even when we find that our rules may delay. It has been the position of both parties that our rules must be adhered to. Certainly I think we all agree to that.

I see a parallel in another body today, in the United Nations, where a particular rule is being flaunted by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has said, "We do not chose to obey this rule," and our nation has agreed that since we cannot enforce the rule, they do not have to obey the rule. We have said that this is a precedent, and no longer do we, the United States, have to obey the rule.

Many scholars have said that the failure to obey these rules may destroy the United Nations. Similarly, if we fail to obey our rules we may destroy this great House of Representatives.

There is no point in having a rule which we do not obey, no matter whether the rule seems outworn or whether it seems trivial. Whatever the rule is, it should be enforced if we have it.

I want to speak now of a particular rule which has been enforced more by its violation than by its enforcement since I have been a Member of the Congress. It is not a petty rule. It is not a trivial rule. It is a basic rule set out by our Constitution as to how we shall vote each and every time there is a constitutional rollcall vote.

I should like to read the pertinent portion of rule XV, which has to do with calls of the roll and House. It is shown on page 376 of the House Rules and Manual, section 765. It says:

> Upon every roll call the names of Members shall be called alphabetically by surname—

Continuing with the pertinent portion—

> and after the roll has been once called, the Clerk shall call in their alphabetical order the names of those not voting; and thereafter the Speaker shall not entertain a request to record a vote or announce a pair unless the Member's name has been noted under clause 3 of this rule.

And clause 3 refers to something not pertinent here. The rule is clear. The Clerk will call the roll alphabetically once. He will call the roll alphabetically twice. At the end of that time, if the Member has not voted, he shall not be permitted to vote.

However, during the history of the House, an exception has been made to protect a Member from the possibility that the Clerk might have failed to call his name. So there has been a precedent handed down through the years which says that a Member under certain specified conditions may qualify to vote after both roll calls have been completed. These conditions are very specific. They are spelled out in detail in the rules and the precedents of the House, which every Member of the House is given in each session of the Congress.

I quote from section 765, on page 387:

> But when a Member declares that he was listening when his name should have been called and failed to hear it, he is permitted to record his vote. In order to qualify to vote the Member must have been within the Hall, and listening when his name was called, and it is the duty of the Speaker to qualify a Member asking to vote at the end of the roll, but it is for the Member and not the Speaker to determine whether he was in the Hall and listening when his name was called, and unless he answers categorically in the affirmative he may not vote.

This means that three things must happen each and every time a Member says he qualifies. All three must happen.

First, he must state he was within the House when his name was called. Second, he must state he was listening to the Clerk when his name was called. Third, he must state he failed to hear his name called.

In other words, the only way a Member may be expected to qualify is for the Clerk to make a mistake and fail to call his name.

The ruling on this has been so specific in the past that when a Member in the well of the House said, "Mr. Speaker, I was present, I was in the House, I was listening but my colleague interrupted me and I did not hear the Clerk call my name," past speakers have ruled the Member not qualified to vote. As I say, it is very specific as to what "qualify" means.

It has come down that this rule, as I said, is not obeyed at all. Members almost indiscriminately come to vote in the well of the House on constitutional votes almost the same as they do on automatic votes, when it is not necessary to qualify.

In saying what I am about to say I certainly do not impugn the motives of any Member here. I believe it is only natural for Members to know that this rule has been violated so many times that it is really just not a rule.

When I first came to the Congress and asked about it, I was told immediately, "All you need to do is to go in the well of the House and vote if you miss the roll call."

Many Members sincerely believe this. As a matter-of-fact, yesterday on one of many of the rollcall votes, when I was watching the Members stand to qualify to vote in the well, a man came up to me, who has been in the Congress for five terms, and laughed and said, "Do not put my name down on your list. I qualify. I was in the House at the time my name was called." I said, "Did you hear your name called?" He said, "No." I said, "Were you listening?" He said, "No, I was talking on a bill that is coming up."

He did not qualify under the rules of this House, yet he genuinely thought he did.

Let me cite some examples as to what happened only yesterday. I am speaking of only 1 day in the history of Congress, to show the kinds of violations that each of us see every day in this House.

One Member of Congress, when his name was called alphabetically for the second time, looked directly at the Clerk and indicated he did not want to vote then, but wanted more time to think about the issue. He came down into the well of the House at the end of the rollcall and said that he qualified. Clearly he was under some misunderstanding about the rule, because he could not qualify according to the rules as they are stated.

Another man I saw came down to the well of the House and said that he qualified to vote on three separate occasions. I think it is highly unlikely that any one man should have been listening to his name on three separate occasions on three separate rollcall votes and have failed to hear it on three separate times.

As a matter of fact, yesterday more than 100 Members of the House came to say that they were sitting here and failed to hear their names called 100 times yesterday alone. That is why I say the rule is followed more in the breach than in the observance.

The main reason that Members "qualify" is because they are late arriving on the floor of the House, and were not present during the rollcalls. They are looking after the affairs of their constituents. Their offices are remote from this room, and many times the Members stay with their constituents or in their offices too long.

In line with this reasoning, I thought it was interesting to check on something. Yesterday I took the names of the Members who said that they qualified to vote in the well, and I divided them into groups, one being composed of Members whose names occur in the first half of the alphabet and the others those whose names occur in the second half of the alphabet. By the law of averages, there should have been an equal amount of those in the first half and those in the second half. However, I found that by a margin of 2 to 1 those in the first half of the alphabet outnumbered those whose names occurred in the second half of the alphabet. This is understandable only if it is true that many Members arrive on the floor after their names are called and still say they qualify to vote. Such is obviously the case. Those with names near the beginning of the rollcall must arrive sooner and are thus more likely to be late. I am no statistician, but I feel certain that this kind of ratio did not happen by chance. Now, we know it is a disadvantage to Members whose names occur early in the alphabet, but as one who has such a name, I have no complaint about it. The person to whom it is a real disadvantage is the Member who refuses to go in the well and to say that he qualifies, because he knows the rules and will not say that he qualifies when he does not.

This morning I spoke to one of the senior Members of this House and his name incidentally is near the very first of the alphabet. He told me that he had never once gone into the well to qualify and on one occasion it was an extremely important vote that he had to miss. Only yesterday the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] came into the well of the House and asked the Speaker whether he could qualify or not. He asked what the rules were, and the Speaker told him quite correctly what they were. Mr. ICHORD said, "Mr. Speaker, I cannot qualify." At the time around him were some 15 people who were saying they did qualify. Obviously this was a disadvantage not only to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] but all of his constituents who sent him here to Congress, who were deprived of their vote.

Another flagrant violation of the rule occurred yesterday. On the first constitutional vote of the day, a number of Members presented themselves in the well after the roll had been called twice. Each of them was allowed to vote without the usual warning of "On this vote Members must qualify." Members just voted "yea" or "nay" without even saying whether they qualified. This is in spite of the requirement that each Member must "answer categorically in the affirmative" that he qualifies in order to vote.

At the time I attempted through a parliamentary inquiry to clear this matter up, and the Speaker quite properly ruled that I was not in order at that time. I was not allowed to ask him my question until all of the voting was over. After the vote was over I asked my parliamentary inquiry of the Speaker, and, he said I was correct in that Members had to qualify and he could only assume that each Member had so qualified even though they never so stated.

Let me say again I do not impugn the motives of any single Member here, but I do think if we have a rule and one where a Member must state a fact to be a fact, we should either enforce it or we should abolish it.

I have talked to hundreds of Members of this House and found the overwhelming opinion to be that we should enforce our rules. Several have said I should have some recommendation on what should be done. I do not think it is up to me to tell the House what should be done, but it is up to me to point out what I see that is wrong.

However, there are several things that could be done, and certainly the Committee on House Administration is capable of considering them. Several have been suggested to me. One is to treat the constitutional vote the same as the automatic rollcall, which would mean that anyone could vote in the roll at the end of a rollcall without "qualifying" or making any statement. This would solve the problem of the rules, but it might cause other problems.

This afternoon, I am told, on one automatic rollcall vote, 95 Members came to the well to vote. No doubt this would continue to occur under such a rule change and there might be a problem of delay.

I would suggest that this subject be studied for the future Congresses but in the meantime I think every day we go along and see our rules violated, that this is 1 day too long. I would suggest in the meantime that several things might be done.

In the past, various Speakers have individually qualified Members by asking them one by one, as the Member comes up to vote, "Were you present in the House when your name was called?" And the man would have to say, "Yes." And the Speaker would say, "Were you listening to the Clerk when your name was called or should have been called?" And he would have to say, "Yes."

And then he would ask, "Did you fail to hear your name called?" And the Member woud say, "Yes." On that basis the Speaker would say that the gentleman qualified and that he could vote If this were pointed out by the Speaker to each and every person who comes to the well to vote the problem would be solved. Certainly in this case no Member would say that he qualified unless he in fact did. Failing this another suggestion might be merely to put the names of those who say they qualified in the RECORD. As it is now, there is no record kept of this. I have had to keep my own records for the last few months.

I was not trying to single out any Member but was merely trying to see if it was actually true that this rule is being violated wholesale. I can say that on each and every rollcall we have had since I have been in Congress, in my opinion, this rule has been violated. I think it is an absolute "must" that we should uphold our rules. Otherwise the integrity of the House is challenged, if we do not stand by our rules. I ask the leadership of both parties in the House to work together with the Members of Congress so that we may take some action either to enforce the rules that we now have or to change the rules, so that we will not be violating them every day.

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

Mr. CALLAWAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Georgia who has made this study. Certainly he has brought to the attention of the House that the House must properly govern itself and not bend or fracture the rules by which we proceed. I should hope that none of us will look on individual rules to the point of exasperation of other Members, that we be not obstructionists but, as the gentleman has said in offering his prescription here, that we be constructive in maintaining those rules, to emphasize their importance, so that we may work coequally and together to maintain the functions for which our Republic was founded.

Mr. Speaker, particularly I want to comment on the statement of the gentleman concerning some of the frustrations on rollcalls and the so-called constitutional votes, because this has been a matter that has been constantly before the House and Senate Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress and its Relation to Other Agencies. I appreciate the work that the gentleman in the well has done with that committee on this subject.

This involves the entire gamut of the question of electronic voting, which is present in many of our State legislatures at this time. It would solve the problem, but it would bring up other inherent problems; for example, how long before we come to punch the button would the Member be required to be on the floor for a constitutional vote? Would they be alerted ahead of time? How long a delay could there be? All of these things are being considered, and certainly the comments of the gentleman are most commendable and I, for one, appreciate them and thank him for what he is doing.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and for the

courtesy he extended to me when I testified before his joint committee on this subject. I would like to say that some others have testified before that committee and some have disagreed with me on one point about this. They have said to me, "Let us wait until this committee reports and perhaps they will come up with a rule which will solve this problem."

Mr. Speaker, I have said, however, that each and every day we see a basic rule violated and it is not stopped on that very day, then we have seen the dignity of the House of Representatives go down a little bit that day.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important right now that something be done to either enforce this rule or to change it so we can have a rule that can be enforced.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PROBLEMS CONCERNING THE UNREASONABLY HIGH COST FOR THE USE OF MONEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WELTNER. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I submitted to the Members of the House an initial report outlining some problems concerning the unreasonably high cost for the use of money. These problems are properly the subject of study by a Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, recently appointed by our chairman, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas.

In appointing the subcommittee, Mr. PATMAN designated also another field for inquiry—the loan shark.

Today loan sharking is a $1-billion-a-year racket. It operates outside the law through an invisible structure, staffed by the bosses of the underworld. Usury laws do not apply—only the going rate of 5 percent per week. There is no court procedure, only a mobster court known as the "sit down."

There is no sheriff's writ for collection of debt, only the underworld's unique enforcement procedure. No collateral is required of the borrower—except his body.

The New York State Commission of Investigation spent the better part of 2 years in a detailed study of loan sharking in New York City.

It reports that of the five criminal syndicates in greater New York City—Genovese, Gambino, Colombo, Luchese, Bonanno—no less than 121 top mobsters were engaged in loan sharking during the year 1964.

The appeal of loan sharking to the underworld is quite plain. It is as profitable as gambling. It can be conducted without the complicated system of writers, wire rooms, and horse parlors, and without the additional expenses of avoiding scrutiny by authorities.

In addition, there is usually no criminal penalty involved, no matter what terms are forced upon the helpless borrower. It is a lucrative way of diverting excess racket money.

Loan sharking has its own hierarchy. A top racketeer will turn over to trusted lieutenants a large sum of money, requiring "vigorish," or interest of 1 percent per week.

These men in turn will place the money in the hands of retailers, requiring of them 2 percent weekly. This third echelon lends the money at "vigorish" of 5 percent per week. Thus, $1 million produces $50,000 per week, or $2,600,000 a year. Almost half of this amount is paid to underworld superiors.

Although there is no license, practical considerations seem to require connection with established syndicate bosses. Otherwise, the independent—known in the trade as an "overlook"—is unable to hide his money, or move it through covering fronts, or obtain experienced distributors who can be relied upon to return his capital plus 52 percent annual profit.

The New York Commission's report details some frightening aspects of the loan shark racket.

In an effort to avoid death or disfiguration, many victims are forced into criminal acts, such as operating a bookie joint in a previously legitimate lunch counter; converting a securities business into a "boiler room," or illicit stock operation; shipment and storage by a trucking firm of stolen goods; and embezzlement to meet loan shark demands.

Even banks have not been immune. Earlier this year, our committee held hearings concerning persons of unsavory background who extended their influence into two banks, as far apart as Virginia and Long Island, to manipulate them to their great profit and to the banks' ultimate collapse. Bank loans were arranged, accompanied by huge "finder's fees" to the arrangers, constituting merely a polite form of "vigorish."

In another case, a bank in the garment district of New York City was so corrupted as to steer desperate borrowers to loan sharks, for which the officers and agents of the banks regularly received compensation.

Admittedly, usurpation and infiltration of banking institutions are rare. Yet, a single instance serves in some degree to undermine public confidence in commercial banks. Swift remedies and adequate controls are essential.

Thus far, the specific instances of loan sharking have been related to the Nation's largest city, New York. As previously noted, all five of the major "families" in the criminal network of that city are heavily engaged in lending money at unconscionable rates of return..

It should not be assumed that loan sharking is confined to New York City. The facts are quite the contrary.

The subcommittee has in its files the names of the leading loan sharks in 12 major cities over the country. Our preliminary inquiry has disclosed that established loan sharks are operating in major cities across the country. The cities, and the number of identified racketeers involved, are as follows:

Boston	13
Buffalo	5
Chicago	12
Cleveland	3
Detroit	1
Kansas City	3
Los Angeles	4
Milwaukee	4
New Jersey area	8
New York City	21
Philadelphia	21
Miami	8

Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department has for years attempted to cope with organized, interstate crime. This includes all kinds of rackets which move across State lines—gambling, narcotics, prostitution, protection, bootlegging, and stolen goods. Loan sharking is an interstate racket, along with the others.

So far, New York State alone has given any real attention to the special need for protection of the public. The investigation of the New York commission resulted in the passage of a statute defining a new offense, criminal usury. Enacted June 7, 1965, the law provides felony punishment for anyone lending money at an annual rate in excess of 25 percent. Additional provisions are designed to prevent bodily assault in connection with collection efforts, and to prohibit the possession of records pertaining to criminal usury.

New York has acted. No other State has yet made the effort. Yet, doubtless the same underworld elements operate in other cities. The same criminals employ the same ruthless methods to extort the same vigorish from hapless borrowers. The same side effects occur—corruption of legitimate businesses, desperate efforts of the insolvent borrowers, and ruin of honest lives and careers.

Mr. Speaker, there are many indicated areas for inquiry here. What connections exist between the New York criminal syndicates and loan sharks in other cities? What means are adopted for transferring loan shark money? What interstate communications are employed? What financial institutions or financial channels contribute to loan sharking? To what extend do "finder's fees" enter into bank loans?

The officer of a bank in Texas recently advised an applicant that he was ineligible for credit, but offered to introduce him to someone who could help him. The borrower closed the loan, paying a substantial "finder's fee." The fee went to the bank officer. The money for the loan came from the same bank, through the lender. Is this transaction covered by the Federal usury statute?

Should there be a Federal loan sharking statute, limiting any transaction subject to Federal jurisdiction to a maximum rate of interest, similar to the 25 percent per annum criminal usury law of New York State?

These, and other questions, naturally arise from consideration of a $1 billion racket.

Loan sharking, along with usurious consumer practices, complete the province of our special subcommittee. Again,

I solicit the cooperation of all concerned citizens in this endeavor.

BANKS IN VIOLATION OF ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I have previously introduced six private bills concerning six banks which are either in violation of our antitrust laws as determined by the courts—including the Supreme Court—or have antitrust suits pending against them. Retroactive exemptions from prosecution of these six banks is granted by S. 1698, presently being heard in the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance. I believe each of these cases should be examined separately and on its own merits, rather than being included in legislation dealing with overall antitrust policy for the banking industry.

These six pieces of private legislation were referred by the Parliamentarian to the Judiciary Committee, which traditionally examines and reports upon legislation giving special relief to individuals or corporations which have suffered injury by the application of the law.

Today I have introduced a bill which modifies the nonspecial interest portion of S. 1698 to overcome certain generally agreed-upon omissions of that bill, as presently written. My bill would do the following: First. Retain the 1960 Bank Merger Act criteria for bank mergers and retain authority for the supervisory agencies to approve mergers; second, retain application of our antitrust laws to the banking industry, except that they would be subject to a 90-day statute of limitation insofar as the given merger transaction is concerned—this is a portion of the so-called Proxmire amendment extended to 90 days rather than 30; third, provides that if an anti-trust suit is brought, a restraining injunction against consummation of the merger is automatic and remains in effect until the suit is resolved; fourth, exempts the merging transactions of all banks which have merged in the past, except those six cases which have been challenged in court, from the antitrust laws.

Let me deal with these points, one by one.

First. As a result of the hearings before our subcommittee, there seems to be a general consensus that the bank supervisory agencies should continue to have the power to deny merger applications to banks when the proposed merger is not in accordance with good banking practice, even though it may not be in strict violation of the antitrust laws. This was the power granted to the supervisory agencies by the 1960 Bank Merger Act, as a result of a rash of uncontrolled bank mergers in the 1950's.

Second. S. 1698 as it reached the House retained the authority of the courts to finally determine whether or not a merging transaction was in violation of the antitrust laws. This provision is retained in my bill. Although the wording of S. 1698 was, in my view, vague, it is interpreted by some to prohibit antitrust action for any cause, including collusion and price fixing, against a merged bank once the 30-day statute of limitations provision expires. To correct this ambiguity, the wording of my bill makes it clear that a bank, by merging, is not by that action exempted from future violations of the antitrust laws.

Three. To prevent the difficulties for the banks of unscrambling mixed assets, my bill provides that merger transactions cannot be consummated pending resolution of an antitrust suit, should such a suit be filed, in the manner of the Proxmire amendment.

Fourth. My bill further provides that mergers unchallenged in the past shall not be challenged in the future, thereby allaying the fears of some 2,000 previously merged banks that their mergers will be subject to an antitrust suit. The Attorney General, in his testimony before the subcommittee, has stated that he does not plan to bring suits against these banks unless there have been misrepresentation of fact. This provision would make his intention a point of law, not subject to change by a policy decision of his successors.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will contribute to a resolution of the issues before our subcommittee, so that proper action on the bank merger problem can be taken, which is in keeping with our independent and competitive banking system.

BIRTH CONTROL AID

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important speech of the year by an administration official was made in New York on September 9. Katherine Oettinger, head of the Federal Children's Bureau, declared that family planning information and birth control services should be available to all parents—and I would emphatically add "prospective parents"—as a matter of right.

I congratulate her and the administration on her forthright and courageous statement. It is a logical outgrowth of the concern of our President for those in our society who are not receiving its full blessings of knowledge and understanding.

The hearings which have been conducted by Senator GRUENING have fully established the desires of our citizens who now are not receiving family planning and birth control information to acquire it. Instances of mothers collapsing because of their inability to care for their unspaced children, of child abandonment in desperation, and of other heartbreaking acts which result from impossible pressures are commonplace. They would have been avoided if family planning information had been available.

The OEO should fully heed Mrs. Oettinger's words. For she makes it perfectly clear that we have no right to withhold the right to this information from those who want and need it, and that this right to information is most frequently denied to the families of the poor.

Portions of a report on Mrs. Oettinger's speech in the Washington Post of September 10 are called to the attention of the Members as follows:

INCREASED FEDERAL ACTION PLANNED—BIRTH CONTROL AID IS A RIGHT, SAYS HEW OFFICIAL

(By Eve Edstrom)

A Children's Bureau spokesman said the conference was attended by the Nation's top public and voluntary health and welfare officials who exchanged information on public family planning services.

Until Mrs. Oettinger's speech, HEW had emphasized population research, and had usually parried questions about Federal support of direct birth control services. They have insisted that it is "entirely a matter of State discretion" whether Federal matching funds are used for family planning.

But last night, Mrs. Oettinger revealed that the Children's Bureau is beginning this year to ask all States for the numbers of persons receiving family planning services. These data will be used to determine whether additional new approaches may be needed if existing programs are unable to serve all persons requesting advice.

Mrs. Oettinger said HEW was the appropriate Federal agency to carry forward research, training and service programs in the family planning field. She all but told local public health and welfare agencies to include birth control services.

"The conviction has grown that education and instruction in effective family planning should be an essential component of both the health and welfare agencies responsible for the payment of health services for dependent families," she said.

"For it is the families of the poor who too long have suffereed spiritual dejection and demoralization after bearing successive babies without hope of these children being able to achieve their full potential or breaking the cycle of poverty."

Mrs. Oettinger then spelled out the family planning services that could be paid for with Federal matching funds available through the public relief programs of the Social Security Act.

"Such services," she said, "may include inpatient and outpatient hospital services, physicians' services, clinical services, prescriptions for drugs and devices, and other preventative and rehabilitative services associated with a comprehensive program for family planning."

If family planning is a useful tool in providing better health for children and mothers, Mrs. Oettinger declared that "it should be available on a universal basis as a right to parents, without coercion, but with a genuine and sympathetic attention to the needs of each human being." She emphasized that individuals from all faiths should determine freely the family planning methods "morally acceptable to them."

HALL COUNTY, TEX., CELEBRATES ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday and Sunday the good citizens of Hall County, Tex., in the district I have the honor to represent, are going to celebrate the 75th anniversary of the founding of their county. They will pay tribute to the pioneers who settled on the trackless prairie late in the 19th century, to the settlers who forged the bonds of local government with formal organization of the county in 1890, and to those who have brought Hall County to its present high state of development.

I am looking forward to attending a highlight of the weekend jubilee, the barbecue to be held at noon Sunday in the Memphis city park. A number of other interesting and pleasureful events are planned as part of the festival.

The full story of Hall County is a long and fascinating one. It is the kind of story told many times over as our United States grew to maturity. A most interesting account of the early beginnings of Hall County, its organization, and its position today has been prepared by Bill Combs, Paula Sherry, and Cliff Farmer of the staff of the Memphis Democrat, one of the finest newspapers in the State of Texas. The publishers of the Memphis Democrat, J. Claude Wells and Herschel Combs, have given impressive leadership in the development of Memphis and the Hall County area, and their city, county, State, and Nation are the richer for their distinguished service.

I am pleased to be able to share the Hall County story:

The first white settlers in Hall County were ranchers and cowboys who found the hardy grass covering the rich rolling plains ideal for fattening their herds of longhorn cattle. Land where buffalo roamed became a cattle paradise. Improved beef breeds, mostly Herefords, soon replaced the lanky longhorns, and by the end of the 19th century vast herds of beef cattle were being marketed from this fertile land. Estelline and Giles became the largest cattle shipping points on the Fort Worth & Denver Railroad.

Hall County became the headquarters for several famous early-day ranches. The Shoe Bar, the Mill Iron, and other well-known brands headquartered in this area before Hall County was formally organized. In fact, the Shoe Bar headquarters west of the present city of Memphis was the meeting place of settlers May 4, 1890, when a petition to organize the county was signed.

The fine grassland was destined to become farmland. When the Shoe Bar ranch was sold in small tracts the plow took over where the buffalo and longhorn had grazed. Cotton became the first choice of the settlers as a cash crop.

In the latter part of 1889 Hall County residents began to consider self-government. Several mass meetings were held. In April 1890, a petition for organization was written. As time passed feeling became bitter between the towns of Memphis, Salisbury, and Lakeview, since all three were contestants for the county seat. Salisbury was the oldest town in the county and the only railroad town, since Memphis had not been able to induce the Fort Worth & Denver Railway Co. to stop trains there; Lakeview was located near Goat Island, the geographical center of the county. Each town employed its own lawyer for the fight. When it became evident that Memphis would control the majority of votes the promoters of Salisbury influenced a number to erase their names from the petition and thus delay organization. J. C. Montgomery of Memphis, accompanied by several other citizens, went to Salisbury and demanded the petition, which S. A. Simpson, a druggist, was glad to deliver. Final details were completed at a May 4 mass meeting at the Shoe Bar headquarters on Oaks Creek.

The election was set for June 17, 1890. The date was preceded by another month of strife and excitement. Newspapers at Salisbury and Memphis took up the fight. Bloodshed was narrowly averted. Each town began a building program. Laborers were brought into Salisbury, whose votes the promoters expected to control. Memphis gave town lots to all cowboys who would promise to vote for that town. Lakeview had invited former citizens to return and participate in the election and based its claim on location. On election day all voting boxes were closely guarded by representatives from each contesting town and great excitement prevailed, but the day passed without serious trouble. The final tabulation was Memphis, 84; Lakeview, 43; Salisbury, 19.

Since Memphis was located in the extreme northeast corner of the county special legislative acts were necessary to sustain the election.

The first Commissioners' Court of Hall County met in Memphis June 24, 1890, and continued thereafter until all pressing needs of the newly organized county were served. The following officers were present at the first meeting: Judge J. H. Lafferty; Commissioners P. N. Wolffarth, J. B. Pope, P. M. Harrison, and J. H. Drury; County Clerk S. A. Simpson, and Sheriff C. A. Embree.

Hall County was named in honor of Warren D. C. Hall, Texas patriot, who fought for Texas during the Mexican revolution and who played an important part in Texas government during its life as an independent republic and early statehood. Hall's two outstanding contributions to early Texas life were his activities at the San Felipe convention in 1832 and his services to the Republic as second in command of the Texans in their battle for civil rights at Anahuac in the same year. Hall was born in 1788 and died in 1867.

Hall County has been moving forward during the past several years. Two important industries have been established in Memphis, the county seat. It is the headquarters of the division offices of General Telephone Co. of the Southwest. Two years ago, Burlington Industries, Inc., established Hall Plant, Postex Mills, in Memphis. The plant now employs approximately 150 men and women.

Cotton is the leading product of Hall County, with from 25,000 to 50,000 bales grown annually. Small grains, alfalfa, and other field crops are grown. With cotton, they make up three-fourths of the county's agricultural income. Beef production, dairying, and poultry production account for the remainder. Hall's annual agricultural income is approximately $9 million.

Memphis, the county seat of Hall County, had an estimated population in 1962 of 3,260. Other Hall County towns are Turkey, Estelline, and Lakeview. Small communities are Newlin, Parnell, Leslie, Brice, and Plaska. In 1962, the estimated population of the county was 7,888. Memphis is the market and banking center of the county, with grain and cotton processing and storage its leading industry. Turkey serves the productive farming and livestock area in the southwest part of the county. Estelline is a farm commercial center at a highway junction in the eastern part of the county.

Irrigation in recent years has become important in Hall County, adding to the producing ability of the good soil. There are now approximately 200 wells; more are to be added. One of the promising possibilities is the development of vegetable production.

Hall County citizens are looking to the future with optimism. Among goals is the establishment of a huge dam upon the Prairie Dog Town fork of the Red River to provide a major recreation center. The pioneer spirit still prevails, and its residents foresee a bright future as Hall County advances in step with the rest of our Nation.

LAKE ERIE-OHIO RIVER CANAL PROJECT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable FRANK M. CLARK, our colleague from the 25th Pennsylvania District, held a press conference on a very important subject.

The question discussed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania dealt with the long debated Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal project.

While there have been many statements pro and con on this controversial subject the discussion by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is important in that it brings fresh arguments to an old argument.

Coming from western Pennsylvania, I am fully aware of the many questions this project raises. Whether or not it will even be built will depend upon action by the Congress.

Before Congress acts upon the proposal every Member ought to read the

attached statement by the Honorable FRANK M. CLARK, of Pennsylvania:

STATEMENT OF FRANK M. CLARK, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE 25TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON THE PROPOSED LAKE ERIE-OHIO RIVER CANAL, AUGUST 27, 1965

I have called this press conference, my first one in six terms in Congress, because I feel that my constituents, taxpayers all, are vitally concerned about the proposed canal between Lake Erie and the Ohio River. Until now I have reserved judgment on the proposal, as I am a member of the House Public Works Committee, which is responsible for waterways development projects and deals with all types of flood control, rivers and harbors projects for the good of all parts of the country. But today, before the project comes to my committee, I feel it is my duty as your Congressman to outline my position and to discuss the facts which have brought me to that position.

The feasibility of the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal project is now being considered by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. This is a step in its progress through the Corps of Engineers which is the executive agency responsible for waterway development. The project was found to be economically feasible by the Pittsburgh District Engineer in his review of reports, and the division engineer in Cincinnati, Ohio, concurred in this finding, although reducing the benefit-cost ratio from the district engineer's estimate of 2.2 to 1 to a slightly, less optimistic 1.8 to 1.

Since the publication of the district engineer's review of reports on March 3 of this year I have been giving careful consideration to all sides of this highly controversial project. I have studied the engineer's review of reports. I have met with proponents and opponents alike and have heard their arguments, read their written presentations and discussed with them the issues presented. I read in the newspaper the other day that the Army Engineers are swamped with written opinions, pro and con, approximating 100 letters from individuals, 106 letters and booklets from organizations and 38 letters from State and Federal legislators. This indicates the wide public interest in this project.

Up until now I have not taken a stand for or against the canal, desiring to have the benefit of public reaction, of opinions of experts, and of my own conclusions from reading the material presented to me.

I feel that now is the time to express publicly my position with regard to the canal project.

My decision is not political. I am a Democrat, and was elected to the 84th Congress in 1954 and since then have continually served all the people in my district to the best of my ability. I am a member of the House Public Works Committee and of its Flood Control, Roads, and Watershed Development Subcommittee and its ad hoc Subcommittee on Appalachia. My good friend and political colleague, MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, is the principal congressional advocate for the canal. I have the greatest respect for Mr. KIRWAN. However, in this country of ours we have the right and duty to disagree, without being disagreeable, when we feel that a proposal is not in the best interest of those most directly concerned. I am fulfilling this duty today.

My decision to oppose the canal is not a rash one, nor one considered in haste. It was arrived at after much time-consuming effort and considerable thought. I have had the benefit of my many years' experience on the Public Works Committee where we consider the needs of the whole country, and weigh the merits of thousands of projects presented to us for authorization. I am naturally most interested in my own district and in the welfare of my constituents who have seen fit to elect me to this important job.

With this in mind I wish to set forth my reasons for opposing the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal.

The costs which must be borne by local interests in my district are enormous and will result in financial chaos. As an example, the Army Engineers have estimated the cost of relocating the Beaver Falls Municipal Water Authority facilities at $383,705. This figure itself is staggering. The authority was naturally interested, and hired the highly respected engineering firm of Michael Baker, Jr., Inc., to review the engineers' report, and to file its own report with the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

This was done on June 24, 1965. The Michael Baker report concludes that the relocation costs of the Beaver Falls Municipal Water Authority facilities will not be $383,705 as estimated by the Army Engineers, which is bad enough, but will be $764,300.

This is just one example and relates to only one local interest.

The city of New Castle is presently expanding its sewage treatment plant. The Corps of Engineers estimate that costs of alterations to that plant would amount to $395,442. What will be the actual cost to New Castle in view of the underestimation found at Beaver Falls?

Other substantial costs to local interests in my district, using the Army Engineer's own figures, are: $123,151 to the city of Beaver Falls; $7,734 to Taylor Township, Lawrence County; $302,334 for Beaver County bridges; $179,284 for Lawrence County bridges. These figures alone rightly throw a scare into any municipality which must raise the money. Considering costs which have not been mentioned and the probability that the actual costs will be much higher, the prospect is alarming. The local cooperation which would be required not only for construction but also for maintenance and operation of the project would in some instances be impossibly burdensome.

The pollution problem will be worsened by the proposed canal at a time when citizens are earnestly striving to improve a dangerous and troublesome condition. The Army district engineer's report itself calls attention to a conclusion in the study of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, that construction of the canal "would have a substantial adverse effect on water quality control in the Mahoning River. This would result from the formation of substantial slack water pools which would reduce the aeration of the water normally obtained when flowing in a natural stream channel." The district engineer says this adverse effect will be offset by the benefit resulting from improvement in the quantity and temperature of the water supply for industrial use. This benefit, if true, will not apply to my district. This adverse effect, which is accepted as a fact by the Army Engineers themselves, will apply to my district.

It has been asserted that the steel industry will obtain a great lift from this canal. My district is a steel district with several large steel plants being located there. I am vitally interested in their prosperity and am aware of the problems they are encountering today. I am very apprehensive of increasing amounts of foreign steel being delivered via the canal into this area and its adverse effect on the steel industry and the economy of the district.

I am not convinced that the steel companies would benefit by reason of reduced transportation costs of iron ore which are claimed for the canal. We must look at the facts as they exist today. The iron ore which the proposed canal might carry to the Pittsburgh and Youngstown districts is today received via the ports of Cleveland, Ashtabula, and Conneaut on Lake Erie. The ore then goes by rail either to Youngstown, or else to such vital industries in my district as United States Steel Corp., multimillion-dollar sintering plant at Saxonburg, Butler County, Pa., Jones & Laughlin at Aliquippa, and Crucible Steel at Midland, as well as to mills important to other parts of my State. These port, railroad, and sintering facilities represent a huge investment. They are in use today and do an effective job. I doubt that even free barge transportation on the canal would induce steel companies to change their ore movement systems. To do so would involve, among other costly actions, the abandonment of the Saxonburg plant, and a drastic reduction in the scale of operations at Conway, where the Pennsylvania Railroad has the largest classification yard in the Nation. These effects of the canal would certainly be an enormous loss to my district, and must be taken into account as offsetting the benefits claimed for this proposal.

If, despite my doubts, transportation savings were to develop along the lines expected by the district engineer, the benefits would accrue principally to Youngstown, to the disadvantage of steel plants in my district. A study for the engineers estimates that Youngstown's transportation savings per ton of steel making raw materials would be twice as much as at Pittsburgh. This distortion of the comparative economics of location could only be detrimental to the steel companies in my district and to their employees.

As a member of the ad hoc subcommittee on Appalachia and as a Congressman, I am naturally interested in improving the economic atmosphere of my district. Harm to two major industries and to their employees will becloud the atmosphere and run counter to the very purpose of the Appalachia program. I am speaking of the steel and railroad industries. I do not have to tell anyone how important these industries are and have been and will be in the future to my district. I am grateful for the support from so many steel and railroad employees residing in the 25th district and I assure them that I shall work to protect their jobs. In opposing the canal, I am doing just that. It has been estimated that in the State of Pennsylvania 2,700 railroad workers will lose their jobs if the canal is built and handled the tonnage projected by the U.S. Engineers in their report. Whatever the actual figure is, it is too much.

I was very much impressed with the letter which was sent to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on June 28, 1965, by the Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission. This commission represents six counties in Pennsylvania, two of which, Beaver and Butler, are in my district. Its primary purpose is planning. After consideration of this project, it has found it must oppose the same. The letter points out several weaknesses in the engineer's report. A serious problem which it calls to the board's attention is that local interests are required to provide assurances that they will not withdraw water for consumptive use or divert water around the locks from the water supply provided by the project works. It emphasizes that this requirement could have serious consequences upon the water supply problems of Beaver County. I concur in the commission's concern about this.

In conclusion, after several months of studying the matter I find that I must oppose the canal project as being against the best interests of my congressional district. In my opinion, it would be detrimental both to local government and to industry, and therefore, to the people of my constituency. Industries which have invested so much

money in improving their plants would be hurt tremendously by the competitive advantage which would be unfairly handed to the Youngstown-Warren area. The steel industry in the district I represent has invested no less than $40 million that I know of during just the past 2 years. I will protect such investment in the future of my district.

Every municipality or local government and county government would be assessed beyond its taxing ability. Even if we wanted the canal, my investigations have found that supplementary funds will not be available under the Appalachia or similar Federal programs to ease the local burden. It is therefore unrealistic to think that the local responsibility could be shifted to the Federal Government.

I thank all of you for attending this meeting, and if there are any questions I will try to answer them.

RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, September 9, Vice President HUMPHREY delivered a stirring speech to the thousands of people attending the Eastern Iowa Rural Electric Show which was held at Wilton Junction, Iowa, located in my congressional district. I would like to extend my compliments to Mr. HUMPHREY for his perceptive recognition of the great contributions that the rural electric cooperatives have made to brighten rural lives on the domestic scene. I thought it especially fitting that the Vice President also recognized the tremendous contributions of the rural electrics overseas—helping to build a better, peaceful life abroad as well as at home.

Following is the text of Vice President HUMPHREY's address of last Thursday:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, 30TH ANNUAL MEETING, THE BARBECUE AND ELECTRIC SHOW, WILTON JUNCTION, IOWA, SEPTEMBER 9, 1965

It is a genuine privilege for me to participate today in the 30th anniversary meeting of the largest rural electric cooperative in the State of Iowa.

The Eastern Iowa Light & Power Cooperative was one of the first organizations of rural people to make use of financing from the Rural Electrification Administration.

Later you were joined by more than 1,000 other cooperatives and public bodies in 46 States and Puerto Rico. Through your efforts and the force of your example, you have lifted the proportion of electrified farms in this country from less than 11 percent in 1935 to more than 98 percent today.

Your rural electric cooperatives have revolutionized life in rural America.

You freed the farm housewife from a lifetime of bondage to the handiron and cookstove, the washboard and hand pump.

You showed people how to farm more productively, how to use electric power for hundreds of different farm chores.

You put electric lights and running water in the schoolhouse, and you have put an end to the old one-room school, so rich in sentimental memories but so poor in educational facilities.

You have generated thousands of new jobs for rural America and have opened up the countryside to social and economic development and improvement.

And you helped erase forever that sharp line of demarcation that used to separate country people from city people.

President Roosevelt established the REA 30 years ago as part of a broad, emergency relief program. A year later the late and revered Speaker Sam Rayburn and that great Nebraskan, Senator George Norris, guided through to passage the Rural Electrification Act. Few people at that time shared these men's vision of a completely electrified rural America. And fewer people still foresaw that the first small, struggling cooperatives—operated by farmers who weren't supposed to know anything about running an electric company—would grow into strong, progressive power suppliers and establish themselves within a few years as a permanent segment of the American power industry.

But that is precisely what has happened. And it has happened without a single handout from the Federal Government, without a penny's worth of grants-in-aid. The cooperative rural electrification program in the United States has been financed entirely on the basis of loans—loans repayable to the Government with interest. And the credit record of REA-financed cooperatives is probably the best of any business of any kind in the country.

You in the rural electrification program have written one of the best success stories in history.

But rural electrification means more than lights in the farmhouse and milking machines in the barn. And it also means more than a local rural success story.

President Johnson stated it well when he said, and I quote, "the rural electrification program was from the beginning the foundation program for the success of our national effort to strengthen the whole economy by strengthening the agricultural economy * * * we have through REA made our Nation stronger and made the horizons of today's generation broader."

Your President has been a champion of REA since its beginning in 1937 when the Pedernales Electric Cooperative in Johnson City, Tex., applied for a REA loan. Several times the REA had to return the application because there were not enough consumers signed up for service.

President Johnson, then newly elected to the House, worked in the fields with the Pedernales sign-up workers and awarded western hats to those who got the most people to sign up.

This extra effort proved successful and in September 1938 the Pedernales Cooperative received an REA loan for $1.3 million. This cooperative serves that area today.

President Johnson is well aware that the lessons of history, both here and abroad, make it clear that there can be no firm foundation for an enduring national prosperity as long as the rural economy limps along far behind the urban economy. For 50 years, since World War I, there has been a continuing struggle to win parity for rural people. It still is our goal to win parity of income and parity of opportunity for our farm people.

It has dawned on many only gradually that it is equally important that rural people achieve parity of certain vital community services—such necessities of modern life as pure drinking water, electric and telephone service, and health, recreational and educational facilities.

These, too, form a part of our battle for parity.

It is proper concern of all Americans that all of our people, whether they live in town or country, enjoy an equal opportunity to contribute to a developing economy. But parity of opportunity continues to be denied to far too many people today simply because they happen to live in rural areas. In a number of places in the country, pockets of poverty and pools of economic stagnation continue. It is the Johnson administration's firm resolve to make a definite improvement in these conditions.

It is an unpleasant fact that while only one-third of all Americans live in rural areas, fully one-half of the families which we classify as impoverished live in the country.

No matter what the general level of prosperity—and that level has never been higher than it is in the United States today—our economy is not operating anywhere near its capacity as long as even part of our rural life is characterized by poverty, blight, and hopelessness. With the help of our rural electric cooperatives we can step up the pace of economic development in these areas of the country.

If all America is to participate fully in our future economic growth, it is essential that utility services, which in large measure represent tools for commercial and industrial development, be provided to rural people under rates and conditions comparable to those available to people residing in our towns and cities.

In the rural electrification program, the barriers to parity are offset to some degree by the provision of long-term, low-interest loans and technical assistance by REA. These are essential to eventual parity of electric rates and services.

But parity in American life will only be reached if we work on many fronts, in many places.

We can find ways to continue to improve and develop the American countryside, just as you found ways to organize your cooperative, set the first poles, and string the first lines.

We can slow down the migration of our young people from rural areas by opening up new opportunity for rural youth through better education and training.

We can find ways to encourage more rapid expansion of business and industry in rural areas, to provide more off-the-farm employment for our young people and for others displaced from agriculture.

We can strengthen the family farm pattern, helping families to apply new technological innovations to their operations, while making sure that increased efficiency does not mean less income to the producer.

We can readjust rural land use to make more land available for outdoor recreation and open spaces.

We can continue to press for adequate public facilities and services in rural areas.

And we can help all rural people to adjust to the rapid changes taking place in America today.

As you pursue these broad national goals for the fuller development of rural America, you will receive the strongest possible support for your efforts from this Administration. But you must define your problems. You must initiate the action and seek the solutions.

In doing this, you should start with a feeling of optimism. You have so many resources in rural America that already are in short supply elsewhere. You have open space and fresh air. You can offer people freedom of movement and a nearness to the beauties of the natural countryside.

You can offer relaxation and recreation, and you can offer that most wonderful resource of all—the neighborliness of the rural community.

You may not realize it, but what you already have accomplished shines forth as a lamp of hope for people everywhere. The pattern of cooperative rural electrification developed in the rural United States today is being widely studied and imitated by the underdeveloped nations of the world.

In South Vietnam, a six-man team of rural electrification experts from the United

States has just staked out that Nation's first three rural electric cooperatives, under contract from the Agency for International Development. Actual construction is scheduled to begin in November under supervision of an American engineer, and the first rural system will be energized next April.

The size of the task faced by these men is a big one. More than 11 million of South Vietnam's 14 million people are without electricity. And fewer than 100 of its 3,000 villages have any means of generating power. But we should remember that in the 30 years that your cooperative has been in existence, more than 5 million farmers and other rural consumers in this country have obtained electricity through rural cooperatives.

The contribution that cooperatives can make to the social and economic development of other nations is recognized in the Humphrey amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. This is the act which established the Agency for International Development and I sponsored that amendment while serving in the Senate.

At the time, there were no cooperative development programs being carried out through private groups as part of our foreign aid program. My amendment declared it "to be the policy of the United States * * * to encourage the development and use of cooperatives, credit unions, and savings and loan associations."

Today a Cooperative Advisory Committee of 13 nationally known leaders of the American cooperative movement assist the Administrator of AID. One member is Clyde Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Under a contract which NRECA signed with AID, rural electric systems in the United States are providing advisory, organizational, and managerial services to the emerging countries of the free world in their efforts to obtain electric service. So far, more than 40 rural electric have been recruited by NRECA under this contract to provide help in 21 countries abroad. These include many of our neighbors in Latin America as well as in the Philippines and Thailand. The application of the REA pattern already has established new rural electric cooperatives in Ecuador and Nicaragua.

Exporting the REA-cooperative pattern is not limited to sending engineers, managers, and other technicians abroad. The University of Wisconsin, with AID assistance, now offers an International Cooperative Training Center, where officials and potential cooperative leaders from all parts of the free world are studying. They are studying what you have built here in these counties of eastern Iowa. They are learning about member-owned cooperative enterprises and how they can be used to serve the needs of people everywhere.

Because of the efforts of rural people like you, the cooperative rural electrification program has become a symbol, both in this country and abroad, of the great things that can be accomplished through the helpful cooperation of local people and their government.

Let us keep working together to build a better life in rural America and in the world.

AUTHORITY OVER INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, recent revelations from Singapore and Washington dramatize once more the total inadequacy of executive and congressional authority over intelligence operations.

For at least 10 years, it has been clear that the distinction between the gathering of raw information and the implementation of actual policy is a tenuous one. An intelligence agent assigned to a mission with considerable resources and influence cannot help but make moves carrying high political significance. It is the very nature of such operations that information and policy become almost indistinguishable. It is likewise clear that intelligence operations can sometimes tend to reinforce the image of America as an indiscriminate agent of intervention all over the globe. I, myself, find it difficult to believe that the value of such intensive and systematic intelligence offsets the increase in ill will which is its inevitable result. It seems to be clear that contemporary world politics obliges some sort of system of intelligence from the great powers. I am prepared to accept the argument that such a system, properly controlled and executed, can often be an agent of necessary international stability. I am less convinced of the need for extensive operations in countries, mainly those of the "third world," where American interests and American competition are not so clearly at stake.

If those responsible for the conduct of American diplomacy judge that intelligence is a crucial mechanism for security, and if they can exercise restraint and sensitivity to the intense political and psychological implications of this activity, then the case for intelligence operations can be made with reason and effect. It is intolerable, however, that intelligence activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and other organizations be free from rigorous democratic review. And this is clearly the case now.

Since the outset of the cold war, and the growth of the intelligence community, individual public servants and special expert commissions have urged the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Operations. The Hoover Commission, for example, put the case strongly over 10 years ago. The report stated:

> The task force is concerned over the absence of satisfactory machinery for surveillance of the stewardship of the CIA. It is making recommendations which it believes will provide the proper type of watchdog commission as a means of reestablishing that relationship between the CIA and the Congress so essential and characteristic of our democratic form of government, but which was abrogated by the enactment of Public Law 110 and other statutes relating to the Agency. It would include Representatives of both Houses of Congress and of the Chief Executive. Its duties would embrace a review of the operations and effectiveness, not only of the CIA, but also of all other intelligence agencies.

The report continued:

> Although the task force has discovered no indication of abuses of powers by the CIA or other intelligence agencies, it nevertheless is firmly convinced, as a matter of future insurance, that some reliable, systematic review of all the agencies and their operations should be provided by congressional action as a checkrein to assure both the Congress and the people that this hub of the intelligence effort is functioning in an efficient, effective, and reasonably economical manner.

From time to time, special study commissions have been assigned to overlook the general structure of the intelligence community. Thus, after the Bay of Pigs, President Kennedy established machinery for extensive review of the CIA. Temporary oversight, however, is not the answer, particularly when it is forced to operate in an atmosphere of disquiet and recent crisis. What is needed is deliberate, calm, and most important, continuous review of our intelligence activities. In short, a congressional committee.

No one need be reminded of the significance of intelligence in foreign affairs. Nor should it be necessary to remind ourselves that the oversight of administration and executive operations is a crucial function of the legislative branch. These two points, supplemented by extensive evidence of disorder in the intelligence community, provide an air-tight argument for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Operations.

I am today submitting legislation designed to meet such a goal. Congress long ago recognized the peculiar importance of atomic energy policy, and, therefore, established the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has been remarkably effective and vigilant. The Joint Committee on Intelligence Operations should be patterned after this success. It would be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives and seven Members of the Senate, selected by the Speaker of the House and by the President of the Senate on a bipartisan basis. The committee would be instructed to initiate continuing studies and review of intelligence activities, and would require the CIA and similar organizations to keep it currently and adequately apprised of American policy and operations.

The case for such action is unimpeachable. Past events have dramatized the admissibility of oversight. Democratic theory and practice oblige it. The performances of congressional Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services are evidence of legislative responsibility in the national security sphere. A Joint Committee on Intelligence Operations should be established forthwith.

THE UNITED NATIONS: INSTRUMENT OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION FOR PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the U.S. delegation to the Interparliamentary Union Conference now going on

in Ottawa, Canada, it was my good fortune on Friday of last week to hear an address by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO]. This speech very clearly sets forth the position of our country with reference to our desire for peace and disarmament, but also it makes clear our determination to carry out our commitments in Vietnam and at the same time, indicates our readiness to negotiate with responsible parties anytime, any place.

I am inserting the complete speech by Mr. DADDARIO and I recommend its reading to my colleagues:

THE UNITED NATIONS, INSTRUMENT OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION FOR PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

(By Hon. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, U.S. Delegate)

The climate of international relations varies as the weather around us. Two years ago, it was summer, and the conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union was invigorated by the sunshine of the nuclear test-ban treaty. Unfortunately, this year our conference meets in the winter of increasing hostilities in Vietnam and raging battle in Pakistan and India. The cold reality of the existence of warfare in Vietnam dominates the background for our discussions on the agenda topic: "The United Nations, instrument of international cooperation for peace and disarmament."

On this 20th anniversary year of the United Nations, it would be pleasant if we could confine our debate to the many nonpolitical fields in which the achievements of the United Nations form an impressive record. The habit of international cooperation which is gradually being formed in widely scattered fields of interest will clearly contribute to the long-term prospects for peace.

Even when we consider the more controversial area of international political relations, it is still honest to state that the United Nations has been an essential instrument for international peace during its first 20 years and that it has played a leading role in encouraging members to work for disarmament. In Korea, Suez, the Congo, Lebanon, and other crisis situations the United Nations has been the key mechanism for restoring or maintaining peace.

If looked at in the long perspective of history, the successful completion of its first 20 years by the United Nations is a landmark in itself. The machinery furnished by the United Nations places the nations of the world in a situation in which they can discuss and act on international problems with unprecedented speed and efficiency. Only one lifespan ago, at the turn of the century, there was no permanent organization in which nations were regularly meeting to discuss and act upon international problems. Although our own Inter-Parliamentary Union was organized in 1889, discussions of international problems and consideration of measures to promote peace required the convocation of special conferences and congresses such as those at The Hague.

In the future, however, history will judge the United Nations on its success in fulfilling its primary purpose: the maintenance of international peace and security. The League of Nations also provided a regular forum for the discussion of international problems and brought about new heights of international cooperation. Its many accomplishments, however, seemed forgotten when the League could not stem the aggression which led to the Second World War.

In this conference, therefore, let us direct our thought and energy to encouraging a constructive role for the United Nations in the situation which most threatens world peace: Vietnam. Progress in the field of disarmament will undoubtedly be affected until the mounting military requirements and the high level of international tensions wrought by Vietnam are brought back down to normal levels. Progress toward a more secure world peace is dependent on the ability to solve world crises such as this.

The actions we take here can be significant. It was a unanimous vote of the Interparliamentary Union in 1904 that started the wheels turning toward the Second Hague Peace Conference, a milestone in the development of international law and organization. At this meeting, let us do all that we can, all within our power, to start the wheels turning toward negotiations for peace in Vietnam.

The position of my Government on this matter is clear. On July 28, 1965, President Johnson wrote the Secretary General of the United Nations that "the Government of the United States is prepared to enter into negotiations for peaceful settlement without conditions." He reiterated his hopes expressed at the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations Charter "that the members of the United Nations, individually and collectively, will use their influence to bring to the negotiating table all governments involved in an attempt to halt all aggression and evolve a peaceful solution."

On July 30, 1965, in a letter to the President of the Security Council, Ambassador Goldberg pointed out that in the past 4½ years the United States had on at least 15 occassions initiated or supported efforts to bring about negotiations for peaceful settlement of the issues in southeast Asia. Among the efforts of the United States to open a path to peaceful solution in Vietnam which Ambassador Goldberg cited are the following:

"Various approaches to Hanoi, Peiping and Moscow.

"Support of peaceful overtures by the United Kingdom, Canada, and the British Commonwealth of Nations.

"Favorable reactions to proposals made by 17 nonalined nations and later by India.

"Approval of efforts by the Secretary-General to initiate peace discussions.

"Endorsement of a larger role for the United Nations in southeast Asia, including a U.N. mission of observers along the Vietnam and Cambodian frontier, a U.N. mission to investigate alleged suppression of minority rights in Vietnam, and a U.N. invitation to Hanoi to participate in Security Council discussions of the Tonkin Gulf incident.

"Major participation, directly and through the United Nations, in economic and social development projects in southeast Asia."

These efforts to bring peace have been rebuffed by the Hanoi regime, which in addition denies the competence of the United Nations to concern itself with the conflict. Nevertheless, as Ambassador Goldberg has made clear, the United States will continue to explore all possible routes to an honorable and durable peace in southeast Asia, and stands ready to collaborate unconditionally with members of the Security Council in the search for an acceptable formula to restore peace and security in the area.

Negotiations cannot be undertaken unilaterally, however. Both sides in a conflict must be willing to go to the conference table before there can be any prospect for a peaceful solution. As long as Hanoi and Peiping continue to turn down all initiatives in the direction of peace, the United States has no alternative but to continue to assist the Republic of Vietnam in its defensive efforts.

If the aggressors were to succeed in their attempt to gain South Vietnam by force of arms, it would be an invitation to attempt further aggression by the same methods. If the United States and the others providing assistance were to abandon the people of South Vietnam, no small nation threatened with outside aggression or subversion could have confidence that aid which had been pledged would be forthcoming. The Vietnamese people have a stake in our commitment which is literally vital; thousands have died in the faith that this commitment will be honored. If no one were willing to assist the self-defense efforts of the people in Vietnam, those harboring aggressive goals would be emboldened everywhere.

In short, it is precisely because we do believe in the principles of collective security on which the United Nations is based that we are determined to honor our commitment to help the victim of aggression. The United States seeks no territory for itself. It does not seek the destruction of any government. It seeks only that the people of South Vietnam have the right to choose their own form of government rather than have any government forced upon them by outside terror and arms. Our President has stressed, in a public statement of July 28, that "we did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there is no one else."

It seems apparent that Hanoi and Peiping have thus far shown no interest in negotiations for peace, despite the urgings of some 40 nations throughout the world who have assisted the 15 efforts which have been made by the United States to start discussions. We are making every effort to convince our adversaries that we cannot be defeated by force. As President Johnson has said, they are not easily convinced. The tempo of hostilities has increased, but the other side has still not recognized that the conference table is the only location where peace may be won.

If the United Nations is to grow as an instrument for international cooperation for peace, its members must utilize its machinery to help resolve difficult crises such as Vietnam, and now India and Pakistan. They must search for any effective way in which an agent or agency of the United Nations can promote peace in Vietnam. They must make every effort to persuade those who now refuse to negotiate that needless suffering will be the only consequence of continuing their military efforts. The United Nations holds in trust the hopes and fears of all in the world who believe that reasonable men and women can forge a future free of the threat of war. It works in two shadows, the nightmare of a future conflict with horrible destructive possibilities, and the recollection of a past in which honorable men, through an inability to meet the challenges which were thrown at collective security in the League of Nations, could not find a solution in time to avoid a surrender to new aggressions and so inevitably fell victim to World War II.

Those who are responsible for the aggression in Vietnam cannot be unaware that the United States has maintained its position steadfastly through the administrations of three Presidents. President Eisenhower pledged that so long as American strength could be useful, we would continue to aid Vietnam in her difficult yet hopeful struggle. President Kennedy reaffirmed the willingness of the United States to help the Republic of Vietnam to protect its people and to preserve its independence. And President Johnson regards this as one of the most solemn pledges of the America nation.

Nor can the other side be wholly oblivious to world opinion. They hope to distort the facts enough to mask their acts of aggression. They seek to win others to their cause. If world opinion demonstrates that it is not deceived, however, its pressure will be exerted against the aggressor where it belongs. We have noted, and we are grateful, that 30 nations give direct support to South Vietnam. That beleaguered nation has received wide international sympathy and understanding. If those people whom the aggressor seeks to win to its ideology demonstrate their revulsion to the tactics being used

against the Republic of Vietnam, they will add the weight of their votes to peace. The achievement of the test ban treaty is evidence that world opinion can wield an important influence.

The topic on our agenda which we will now discuss, "The United Nations, Instrument of International Cooperation for Peace and Disarmament," offers a unique opportunity for the Inter-Parliamentary Union to make it clear that it favors United Nations efforts to bring about peace in the troubled areas of the world. In the debate which follows, let us not speak with rancor and add to the international tension which already hampers the finding of solutions. But neither let us go to the other extreme and ignore the hostilities which threaten the peace of the world. Instead, let us search together for practical solutions which will help bring peace. Just as the United Nations has been the instrument of peace in the past, let us seek to make it the instrument of peace in the present.

We of the U.S. delegation are ready and eager to explore ways of enlisting the capacities of the United Nations to act for peace—in this as in other situations that threaten peace and security. As Ambassador Goldberg said in the U.N. on August 16, "the world needs—the world desperately needs—a strengthened, not a weakened, United Nations peacekeeping capacity * * *. Those who are prepared to help strengthen it—the overwhelming majority—must be in a position to do so with or without the support of the reluctant few until they learn, as they surely will, that a workable and reliable international peace system is in the national interest of all members of the United Nations." Let us join in that noble and indispensable task.

DISASTER RELIEF LEGISLATION

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the concern and sympathy of the people of my district for those who have been victimized by America's most recent natural disaster: Hurricane Betsy. We in Indiana were exposed to a similar experience just a few short months ago and the horror and the waste of human lives and property is one with which we can truly identify. President Johnson has visited New Orleans and has pledged that "the Federal Government's total resources will be turned to Louisiana to help this State and its citizens find its way back from this tragedy."

Mr. Speaker, we in Indiana found that for the most part the aid of the Federal Government came quickly and effectively. We found that medicines, foodstuffs, and provisions of all kinds came as soon as the President declared our territory a disaster area. But, we also found that, necessary and comforting as these immediate short-term measures were, it soon became clear that Federal machinery required to give meaningful long-term resource therapy to the stricken individual or family either did not exist or fell far short of what was required. Economic aid in the forms of loan adjustment or mortgage postponement came, if at all, too little and too late. The best aid available was just not enough.

Mr. Speaker, on June 22 of this year I stated before the Senate Public Works Committee, then considering a bill to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster:

> We have found, to our dismay, in Indiana, as have other unfortunate communities, which have been victims of major disaster, that, notwithstanding the impressive battery of general Federal disaster relief relating to public property losses, as the people go courageously about the trial of rebuilding their homes, farms, businesses, and lives, little or no direct assistance is available to them. Our experience, and that of other hapless citizens in Alaska, Iowa, California, Minnesota, Oregon, Missouri, Washington, Idaho, Wisconsin, Kansas, and Colorado, has made it clear that new legislation is required aimed at providing proper financial help for people who lose everything except their obligation in tornadoes, floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, and earthquakes. Our present knowledge of meteorology may limit what we can do to influence the weather, but it does not confine our compassion for those who have been damaged nor our responsibility to assist those whose lives have been devastated.
>
> It is imperative that we act with dispatch. For some, such as farmers, help must come now or it will be too late to revive their operations. There are many who desperately watch our actions and await our assistance. While we meditate, disaster, and its resulting toll in suffering, hover in the wings. It would be unconscionable if another tragedy should find us unprepared.
>
> The Nation can wait no longer. We, in Congress, must take the initiative. We must establish continuing authority to enable the executive agencies to deal adequately with the multitude of problems which follow every disaster.
>
> It is within our power to mitigate the economic hardship which has been thrust upon some members of our community by forces beyond their control.

Mr. Speaker, on May 11, 1965, I introduced H.R. 8069, a bill to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster. My distinguished colleague from Indiana, Congressman EDWARD J. ROUSH, introduced companion legislation. On July 22, 1965, the Senate passed the Disaster Relief Act of 1965, which was submitted by the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BIRCH BAYH]. This legislation parallels H.R. 9885 introduced in this House by the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, we have not acted with dispatch. Another disaster has found us unprepared. Let us act now.

WORLD LAW DAY

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Monday, September 13, was an important occasion in our quest for world peace, for people in almost every country on this earth observed the first World Law Day. Monday also marked the opening of the Washington World Conference on World Peace Through Law, at which the highest judicial officials and the leaders of the international legal profession are exploring ways in which law and legal institutions may aid in the resolution of international disputes and the maintenance of world peace.

The international observance of World Law Day, coupled with the meeting of the world's most esteemed jurists and legal scholars, demonstrates the importance of the role of the law to individual freedom and mankind's hope for a peaceful and orderly world.

This year has been proclaimed International Cooperation Year by the General Assembly of the United Nations, and I can think of nothing more indicative of man's fervent desire for peace than these two related events. Citizens the world over are coming to recognize that peace and order can be achieved and maintained in the world community only when law rules and legal institutions are strong enough to prevent war.

The rule of law in world affairs means that nations shall conduct themselves as do responsible individuals in all civilized societies. It means that men and nations shall settle their disputes peacefully, according to agreed rules, principles, and procedures, without force or the threat of force.

This certainly is not a new concept, for it reflects the deepest traditions of nearly every area of the world. If individual nations and societies have realized that the rule of law is something which can exist independent of the will or whim of a particular sovereign, we should be prepared to accept the idea that there is a rule of law which should govern the international conduct of nations and under which their differences should be resolved.

In his address to the Conference on World Peace Through Law yesterday, Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, cited the factors which should enable the nations of the world to move forward in a common drive for a world ruled by law. In addition, our distinguished Chief Justice declared:

> I believe we of our generation can translate the centuries-old dream of a world ruled by law from dream into reality. The imperatives of our day make this a necessity to save mankind from nuclear holocaust.

Law must replace force as the controlling factor in the fate of humanity. I think these two landmark events yesterday constitute a bright beacon of hope that we are moving in the proper direction.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ACADEMY OF ST. ALOYSIUS

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise to pay tribute to one of the

great educational institutions of the State of New Jersey and the Nation.

This year in Jersey City we celebrate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Academy of St. Aloysius. From a humble beginning on York Street, the Sisters of Charity have produced a great school which has been graduating women who have continually raised the stature of the academy. A century later, the academy still maintains its high standards and it has earned an honored place in the educational world.

St. Aloysius graduates have been honored in the arts and sciences and in all the professions and as mothers and wives, they have done their part toward molding a better community.

At a time in the history of this Nation when moral values are often ignored, the time honored precepts taught by the good sisters are of special value. We live in an era when many of our fellow citizens have forgotten the Judaeo-Christian heritage which has brought this Nation to greatness in the world's councils in sharp contrast with the decline in moral values. The Sisters of Charity still practice and teach the centuries old message of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man which is as old as Moses on Sinai or as timely as today's newspaper.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to all the graduates of St. Aloysius, both those who have earned public notice and those whose good deeds are found in the "short and simple annals of the poor."

Mr. Speaker, as a native of Jersey City, as well as a lifelong resident, I am very grateful for all that the Academy of St. Aloysius has done for our city and our State.

Her contribution has been so great and so all pervading that it can never be measured. All of this has been due to the inspired work of the Sisters of Charity of New Jersey of whom it can truly be said that they have, by their devotion to the education of thousands of young women, exemplified the ideal expressed by Chaucer, centuries ago, when he said of the Clerk of Oxenford, "and gladly would he learn and gladly teach."

THE ACADEMY OF ST. ALOYSIUS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in these times it is not strange to read in the papers stories of young people in trouble. It seems that only the bad stories find their way to the front page and these stick in the mind of the public.

But underneath, in the little talked of world of the everyday, there takes place a much more beneficial and worthwhile action. While a very small minority of today's youth is committing crime and disturbance, there stands in quiet splendor the great majority of our young people. Boys and girls—young men and women—are carrying on their lives as responsible and dedicated citizens faithful to the laws of the land.

I submit that the reason such a large majority of our young people turn out to be fine and upstanding adults is the training they receive during their formative years.

A prime example of this excellent and dedicated guidance is the Academy of St. Aloysius in Jersey City, N.J. This year the academy is celebrating its 100th anniversary—a century of devoted endeavor toward the building of young girls into mature responsible women.

Since its beginning under Sister Ann Elizabeth in 1865, the Academy of St. Aloysius has graduated thousands of women who have excelled in the arts, sciences, religion, and most of all as wives and mothers. These alumnae have gone on to influence and inspire others to a code of true moral values, buttressed by a thorough appreciation of and respect for the ideals of our American heritage.

Today St. Aloysius has grown from a small framt building to the modern, well-equipped, and well-staffed facility on John F. Kennedy Boulevard.

My distinguished colleague from Jersey City, Congressman DOMINICK DANIELS, is well acquainted with one outstanding-ing example of the finished and polished products of St. Aloysius Academy. His daughter, Dolores, graduated in 1955 and is now engaged in teaching in Jersey City.

I would like to join with my colleague from New Jersey in saluting the outstanding achievements of the Academy of St. Aloysius and wish them a happy 100th birthday with the hope that the academy will continue to guide and inspire for many years to come.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was an unusual day in the deliberations of this honorable body. There were 7 quorum calls and 15 record votes on which I am not recorded.

I am not remiss in my legislative duties and have maintained a record of over 90 percent on my quorum calls and record votes to date.

However, yesterday it was necessary for me to be in my congressional district because of arrangements which have been made several months ago on the assumption that Congress would have adjourned by this date, and it would have been extremely embarrassing for me not to be present in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent in this honorable body.

Had I been in Washington, I would have answered all the quorum calls and would have voted as follows on the various record votes. On rollcall No. 273, "yea"; rollcall No. 275, "yea"; rollcall No. 279, "yea"; rollcall No. 281, "yea"; rollcall No. 282, "nay"; rollcall No. 283, "yea"; rollcall No. 284, "yea"; rollcall No. 285, "nay"; rollcall No. 286, "yea"; rollcall No. 287, "yea"; rollcall No. 288, "nay"; rollcall No. 290, "yea"; rollcall No. 291, "yea"; rollcall No. 292, "yea"; rollcall No. 293, "yea."

It was my desire to fly in for at least part of the day, but the events within the district precluded this desire and I had to be necessarily absent from the sessions of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I humbly request that these remarks be spread upon the Journal and the RECORD of this date.

GOVERNMENT OF ITALY MAKES GIFT TO THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of considerable gratification to me, as it must be to all Americans of Italian ancestry, that the Government of Italy has made a magnificent gift of marble for construction of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. This gift was originally promised personally by President Segni of Italy on the occasion of President Kennedy's visit to Italy in July 1963. It was to be used for the building then known as the National Cultural Center, which has been renamed as the official national memorial to the late President. President Segni's promise was to provide all exterior and interior marble for the building. This promise was fulfilled on June 30, 1965, in a presentation ceremony at the Italian Embassy, in which Ambassador Sergio Fenoaltea made a formal presentation to Mr. Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the board of trustees of the Kennedy Center.

The monetary value of this generous gift is significant, as it will reduce the cost of constructing the Kennedy Center by about $1,100,000. But by far the greater significance of this gift is its expression of the warm friendship of the Italian people for those of the United States. Truly, a mutual cultural bond, such as is symbolized in this Center for performing arts, is the strongest which two nations can share. These sentiments were aptly expressed by Ambassador Fenoaltea in the presentation, when he remarked that:

> As durable as marble is, something even more durable is the friendship between our two countries.

It is most appropriate that the beautiful white marble of Italy will contrib-

ute to the physical setting in which the masterworks of Italian composers and playwrights, along with those of other nations, will be performed. As Signor Fenoaltea said:

Italy, as one of the mother countries of Western culture, could not fail to give a contribution to the Center.

Italy's contribution will be not only that of the marble, but Italy's great music and drama, and Italy's great performers. In accepting the gift, Mr. Stevens remarked that he hoped that "La Scala will come pay us a visit." This hope I share, and I look forward to attending the performances of La Scala, as well as others, at the Kennedy Center. I am sure that many of my colleagues in this House share my anticipation.

HUMPHREY ON DISSENT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article from the Baltimore Sun of Wednesday morning, August 25, 1965. I feel it shows, once again, the keen understanding that Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, has of our system of representative government:

HUMPHREY ON DISSENT

Vice President HUMPHREY has just read a lesson in elementary civics to a few young Americans who seem to have missed the subject in high school. He was addressing a students' meeting, and among other things, he chided "dissenters" who for several months have been announcing hourly on the hour that they have been silenced. Nonsense, said Mr. HUMPHREY, with an ear cocked to the ringing welkin of opinion in this country, and so, he said, was it nonsense for some Americans to join organizations of the "unrepresented."

Of course, it is true that the duly elected representatives of the people don't reflect in their official action every whim of every voter. In a system working by majority vote it is obvious that those who lose the election will have to accept some policies they voted to prevent. But that that leaves them "unrepresented" by the elective officials is a mere play on words, and a mischievous one, as every Republican knows who has ever asked a Democratic Congressman for a pass to the visitors' gallery—or vice versa. Nothing bigger than a New Hampshire town meeting can decide every question by direct and specific vote, and that is why we have representative government—one in which officials elected by a majority represent all in a broad, though by no means unlimited, exercise of political discretion.

The main reason the today's "unrepresented" style themselves that way is that they don't like Vietnam policy. Can it be assumed in advance that they will pay hospitable attention to the report of several students who have just returned from a 2-months' stay in the battle areas? "They're not just crackpots," said one of these young men of the stateside objectors, "but they just don't understand what's going on out there."

Home objection is legitimate, indeed valuable, and dissent on Vietnam like dissent on other policy is essential to rounded policymaking. But Mr. HUMPHREY rightly chided dissenters who cry that they have been silenced and claim themselves "unrepresented" because a majority dissents from them.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, there is not a single Member of this House who is unaware of the work of the League of Women Voters—in his district, in his State, and nationally. We always respect the work, thoughtfulness, experience, and care which go into arriving at their positions. I agree wholeheartedly with the stand taken by the League of Women Voters of the District, and ask leave to insert in the RECORD the statement prepared by them for the recent hearings on home rule:

STATEMENT OF LEAGUE WOMEN VOTERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AUGUST 1965

(By Mrs. Anthony Schwartz, president)

The League of Women Voters of the District of Columbia appreciates this opportunity to reiterate its support for local self-government for Washington, D.C. League members here and throughout the country have urged home rule in Washington for many years. We are committed to democratic government based on informed and active participation of citizens. We know that Washington residents, like those in State and local jurisdictions throughout the country, must elect their own officials, responsive to their own needs, in order to have effective government. We are convinced, too, that the unquestioned need to protect the Federal interest in this city is amply met by provisions of S. 1118 and H.R. 4644 which retain in the Congress ultimate legislative power over the District and give the President of the United States the right to veto all legislation enacted by a local body.

Washington's electorate, of both parties, unequivocally expressed its desire to govern itself by voting in favor of home rule in the primary elections of 1964. It is fully as capable of self-government as those in other jurisdictions. The average number of school years completed by District residents aged 25 years and over is 11.7. Only nine States surpass this level of educational attainment.

The league's day to day, month to month, year by year activity in following legislation for the District of Columbia has taught us that Members of Congress, despite the best will possible and knowledge available, are too absorbed by matters of national scope and of their own constituencies to give the necessary attention to the complexities of District government. Washington is beset by problems similar to those which plague other urban areas, problems resulting from rapid metropolitan growth and a population distribution which concentrates low-income residents in the central city. These are problems which tax the brains, imagination, and organizing ability of the most dedicated full-time legislators and executives. They must be met by officials whose first responsibility and deepest concern are the welfare of the people who elect them, by a form of government which permits action in a far simpler and more sensible line of authority than the complicated Federal structure which now disperses decisionmaking on District affairs to the vanishing point.

League members can cite from their intimate experience all too many instances of essential local governmental programs which have been adopted too late or too little or not at all. Most are in the fields of health, education, welfare, housing, and employment—programs to meet human needs and inhibit the growth of destructive circumstances which result in crime, delinquency, illness, and incompetence. If the city had begun to adopt them 10 years ago, when their importance became apparent to us, we would not now need to combat the most rapidly rising crime rate in the country.

We are not saying that local self-government will automatically solve the District's problems. We are saying that it will give us the opportunity to confront these problems squarely and the tools to act on them rationally with sufficient speed.

We recommend to this committee, and to the House of Representatives, S. 1118 as recently passed by the Senate. It satisfies in nearly all particulars the carefully considered judgment of members of the League of Women Voters, judgment based on intensive study of the issues. We favor especially the bill's provisions for an elected mayor as well as city council, for some councilmen elected by wards and some at large, for a nonvoting delegate to the House, for an automatic Federal payment formula, and for borrowing power commensurate with ability to repay. The last two measures will give the District a firm and predictable revenue base on which to plan and carry out its governmental programs.

The Senate has passed a home rule bill for the sixth time, by more than two-thirds vote, without the full House of Representatives ever having been allowed to vote on one. The most elementary rules of fair play and of democratic government require that the House exercise its prerogative to express its will on such legislation. We therefore urge this committee to report out a bill without further delay.

HURRICANE BETSY

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, President Johnson flew to Louisiana last Friday to survey the staggering damage suffered by my State as a result of Hurricane Betsy. He was kind enough to invite me, other Members of the House delegation and the two Senators from Louisiana, to accompany him.

We made this trip at a time when the hurricane was still alive in the State. This display of concern, even at a time of some threat to his own personal safety, must not go unrecognized. For that reason, I would like to insert here in the RECORD a copy of the letter I wrote the President on the morning following our return to Washington.

We of Louisiana appreciate all he has done and continues to do in the wake of the disaster which has befallen our State.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 11, 1965.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have just returned to my desk after our trip to Louisiana to survey the damage caused by Hurricane Betsy. Uppermost in my mind is to thank you, personally and on behalf of the people of Louisiana, for your deep concern over the grave disaster which has befallen us.

Your tour of the State has heartened the people. By making available to the victims of the hurricane the assistance of the Federal Government in the generous manner you have, you have lessened a great deal of the sorrow and hastened our recovery.

For these acts of humanity and for your unselfish concern, we are appreciative. I wanted you to know of our gratitude.

Sincerely yours,

JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

"HOME RULE" A SLOGAN

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing and reading a great deal about the bill, H.R. 4644, which was successfully discharged by petition signed by 218 Members of the House, to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

This bill, and the discharge petition was promoted under the catch-phrase, "home rule," which is simply a Madison Avenue type political slogan. I hope and pray that our Nation has not reached the point that the Congress legislates only by slogan, and under the influence of threat and duress; I trust that the Members, and especially those who signed the discharge petition, will take time to read H.R. 4644 ere it comes on for debate and vote. Surely, no conscientious Member will want to cast a vote merely for the slogan, without first being sure what is concealed beneath it. Logically, we would not expect the local reporters and editorialists to read the bill, as their omnipotence and all-inclusive knowledge makes it unnecessary, but we legislators, as mere mortals, should inform ourselves before acting. I imagine that very few, if any, of the signers of the discharge petition are aware, for instance, that the bill, H.R. 4644, gives the proposed council authority to levy ad valorem taxes without limitation as to the rate or amount.

Is this revelation, alone, not enough to cause my colleagues to read this bill before it comes on for debate?

Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star, of September 10, carried a column written by James J. Kilpatrick on this "home rule" subject. I respectfully incorporate it as a part of my remarks:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, (D.C.), Sept. 10, 1965]

HOUSE DISTRCT OF COLUMBIA UNIT DESERVES A HEARING

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The House Committee on the District of Columbia is so recklessly maligned these days in the liberal press that it is widely supposed, abroad in the land, that nothing good can come from it. The myth cries out for dispelling.

In the current rage for "home rule," the committee has opposed a bill that is bad in law and bad in principle, and it has offered an alternative that makes a certain rough sense. Before the committee is beaten down, horse, foot, and dragoons, as John Randolph used to say, its position ought to be heard.

The home rule bill approved by the Senate on July 22 would turn over the government of the entire District of Columbia, in effect, to a mayor, city council, and school board who would be elected by those persons, over the age of 18, residing in the District. To be sure, the bill does retain for Congress a right to repeal or modify any action of the local council, but no political realist imagines this power would ever be used. For all practical purposes, the Congress would abandon its constitutional power to exercise "exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over the seat of the Nation's Government.

The heart of the Senate bill lies in section 741, which lays down a formula for computing a permanent, indefinite Federal payment to the District of Columbia. Under this provision, the new mayor of Washington would transmit to the U.S. Treasury, every January, a "request" for a Federal payment in lieu of taxes. The Treasury would forward this request to the Administrator of General Services. It is important to see what happens next, for here we enter the foggy fields of poor draftsmanship. Notice what the bill says:

"After review by the Administrator of the request for Federal payment and certification by him * * * that such request is based upon a reasonable and fair assessment of real and personal property of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, not later than September 1, cause such payment to be made to the District out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

Notice that this is not a mere authorization. Once the request is reviewed and certified, the Secretary "shall cause such payment to be made." Notice that no provision is made for an administrator's refusal to certify. What then? The Administrator is directed to enter into "cooperative arrangements with the mayor whereby disputes, differences or disagreements involving the Federal payment may be resolved." What legal meaning attaches to such fuzzy phrases? The fact is that the annual payment of unknown millions of dollars in Federal tax funds is to depend upon a request, a review, and a certification by persons who are politically beyond the effective reach of Congress. And this is sound legislation?

The House committee wisely refused to report a bill so badly drawn, but last week, when President Johnson's bucket-shop pressures produced 218 signatures on a discharge petition, the committee offered an alternative. This alternative has been widely ridiculed. It merits serious thought.

The emotional steam behind the Senate bill has been fired up by piteous cries that residents of the District are now denied the right of self-government. Under the committee's alternative proposal, most of the District residents could get self-government, all right, for the bill would provide for a referendum on the retrocession to Maryland of everything except the original "Federal City of Washington." This would make the residents of Georgetown, for example, voters and citizens of Maryland; and it would retain for congressional jurisdiction a compact District of Columbia about the size of Fort Belvoir.

The proposed new District would contain all the shrines, monuments, major buildings and parks that have historic importance. These would continue to belong to all the people of the United States, and to be administered by their Congress. Meanwhile, residents of the retroceded area would have all the rights that appertain to such free, self-governing Marylanders as the residents of suburban Hyattsville, Takoma Park, and Silver Spring; and the House would be enlarged temporarily by one more seat from Maryland, in order to give these liberated captives a voting Representative in the Congress.

What is wrong with this idea? The only objection rests in the humane consideration that its approval probably would cause such frenzy in liberal quarters that half a dozen editors, and five Senators would die of apoplectic seizures at their desks. It is a lamentable prospect, but not, perhaps, too high a price to pay.

THE PEANUT INDUSTRY

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the peanut industry is one of the most important segments of industry in my area of Virginia. It means much to our economy—more perhaps than many people realize. The farmers who produce the peanuts, the shellers who buy the crop, and the farmer suppliers all contribute immensely to our economy. It is true, we have had a long haul and at times rough going in trying to stabilize our economy. As producers, we have had our ups and downs but by working together much progress has been made.

Some years ago, the Association of Virginia Peanut and Hog Growers, Inc., was organized to help our farmers help themselves. This has been a most progressive and outstanding farm organization. It has kept our peanut producers informed of vital and needed information. It has done an outstanding job in keeping farm prices steady and in presenting to governmental agencies and legislative committees needed legislation. Its officers and directors have rendered outstanding service to its membership. It has been my pleasure to cooperate with this organization ever since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives. We work together closely and harmoniously. I commend the organization for the outstanding work it has done in trying to protect the producers as well as keep them informed of the many problems they face.

On Friday, September 10, 1965, the Association of Virginia Peanut and Hog Growers, Inc., held their annual meeting at Courtland, Va. At the meeting, Mr. George B. Ligon, president of the association, presented a most enlightening statement outlining the activities of the

association since its origin. It was so interesting and informative that along with my remarks, I include the president's report which is as follows:

HIGHLIGHTS SINCE ORGANIZATION OF ASSOCIATION OF VIRGINIA PEANUT AND HOG GROWERS, INC.

The executive secretary and general counsel has distributed to the members present a rather detailed report covering the activities of our Association of Virginia Peanut and Hog Growers since our last annual meeting.

It has been suggested by the executive committee that I take a few minutes to review the highlights of the accomplishments of our commodity organization since the first bylaws were adopted on June 8, 1946.

Initially, there was very little financing available for the association to use for operations. Local boards of supervisors and other groups made modest contributions and this, added to a $2,000 a year annual appropriation by the General Assembly of Virginia provided the financing with which the association began activities.

The Association of Virginia Peanut and Hog Growers in 1948 sponsored legislation in the General Assembly of Virginia which brought into being the Virginia Peanut Commission. Under this legislation, the Virginia Peanut Commission, consisting of nine members appointed by the commissioner of agriculture, was charged with the responsibility of administering a fund which was known as the peanut fund. This fund was derived from a 1-cent per hundred pound deduction on all farmers stock peanuts produced and sold in Virginia. The fund, until the 1964 crop, averaged $18,000 per year, depending upon the size of the peanut crop. The Virginia Peanut Commission has, and continues to work closely with the Association of Virginia Peanut and Hog Growers and under annual contractual arrangements with the association makes a substantial portion of the peanut fund available to the association to conduct promotion, research, and educational work in the best interest of Virginia peanut producers.

I think it should be understood that this move in 1948—that is to say—the creation of a self-help program for Virginia peanut producers, was the first such effort on the part of peanut producers in any State. Since that time, North Carolina, Alabama, Georgia, and Oklahoma have followed with the creation of similar funds, all of which bring in substantially more revenue than the original Virginia fund or the recently stepped up Virginia fund.

So that each of you will know the finances available to the growers of the before mentioned States, I would point out to you that the States of Georgia, Alabama, and Oklahoma all make a deduction of $1 per ton on peanuts produced in their respective States: North Carolina makes a deduction of 40 cents per ton and this is the same as the Virginia deduction was increased to, effective with the 1964 peanut crop. However, there is considerably more tonnage involved in North Carolina than in Virginia and consequently the fund amounts to considerably more.

Based upon current yields, it is estimated that the respective State grower funds return the following amounts—Georgia, $315,000; Alabama, $105,000; North Carolina, $70,000; Oklahoma, $75,000. These State funds add up to a total of $603,000 and of that total Virginia's available funds are only $38,000 and until the 1964 crop, they were only $18,000.

It is my thought that it is important to understand that with relatively limited funds the grower association in Virginia is continuing to be a leader among the various peanut grower groups and continues to make significant contributions to the total peanut industry as well as the economy of the peanut producing area of Virginia.

Since the creation of the self-help program in Virginia, $40,190 has been made available for additional peanut research at the Virginia and North Carolina Experiment Stations. In practically every case, the money was spent to get a research project started and soon thereafter, the State, from State funds, took over the continuation of the needed research project. Therefore, the $40,000 has multiplied many times and has been of much benefit to all peanut growers.

Other major expenditures of the peanut fund have been for direct peanut promotion through the National Peanut Council in an amount of $8,000—$4,100 as our part of underwriting the film, "The Peanut Story" with the North Carolina Peanut Growers Association—$4,000 on the mold or aflatoxin problem and several thousand dollars for miscellaneous projects such as the peanut production contest sponsored by this association, research on damage done to crops by blackbirds and related matters.

In 1951, the association was in the forefront in having the Abbitt bill passed which permitted the Secretary of Agriculture to increase allotments by types. At that time, there was a distinct shortage of Virginia-type peanuts and we were in a most serious situation in the Virginia-Carolina area.

In 1951, 1952, 1955, and 1956 there were increases in peanut acreage allotments which were directly the result of this legislation. In the State of Virginia only, these increases amounted to 68,000 acres. I think it is conservative to figure that over such a period of time, the gross value of these additional acres—at $300 per acre—added approximately $20,400,000 to the economy of the eight major peanut producing counties in Virginia. This is a material and measurable result of the activities of this association and if the association had accomplished nothing before or since, the additional income generated from these increased acreage allotments would justify the modest deduction from producers for generations to come.

In 1951 and 1952 the Association of Virginia Peanut and Hog Growers took on the task of organizing the Peanut Growers Cooperative Marketing Association to service the price support program in Virginia, North Carolina and parts of South Carolina and Tennessee. There was no similar grower organization in North Carolina at the time this project was initiated and it was a major undertaking for a small commodity association with one full time employed person—the executive secretary. With cooperation of many groups and individuals, Peanut Growers Cooperative Marketing Association was organized, preferred stock was sold in sufficient quantity to initiate operations and the cooperative has continued, since that date, to render a real service to the peanut growers of our entire area. During the first year of operation, the executive secretary and general counsel of the Association of Virginia Peanut and Hog Growers served in the dual capacity of executive secretary and general counsel of the association, as well as, manager of the cooperative, and, until the present permanent manager was employed.

There were 2 years in the early fifties when there was a less abundant supply of peanuts and some manufacturers went to the tariff commission with a request that would have opened the floodgates to the importation of foreign peanuts into this country. Again, in the forefront at the hearings before the tariff commission, and, with days and weeks of effort to keep the imports to the absolute minimum necessary to supply the demands of the trade, was the Association of Virginia Peanut and Hog Growers. Our own executive secretary and general counsel, together with specialized counsel employed by our association and others, was able to limit the imports to a quantity that was not damaging to producers and to the peanut support program.

In 1955, our association and the North Carolina Peanut Growers Association, began publication of the Virginia-Carolina Peanut News. This publication has been published each quarter since April 1955 and has carried numerous articles by extension and research personnel of interest to Virginia peanut and hog growers. Further, there have been regular columns by extension personnel, by the manager of Peanut Growers Cooperative Marketing Association and ASCS personnel.

The two grower associations put up $2,000 to start this worthwhile project and since then, with the cooperation of our advertisers, this amount has been returned more than 10 for 1. In addition to the publication being more than self-sustaining, it has filled a great need in getting important information to our growers. It is difficult and even impossible to put an approximate dollar value upon the good that this publication has done since 1955 and will continue to do in the years ahead. Also in 1955—to be exact on May 4 and 5, peanut growers went through a most trying 48-hour period. By a teller vote of 186 to 150, the House of Representatives adopted an amendment to H.R. 12, offered by Congressman GREEN, of Pennsylvania, to eliminate the peanut price support program. The night of May 4, our executive secretary and general counsel, together with Mr. Wingate, president of the Georgia Farm Bureau, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture John Baker, then with the National Farmers Union, Joe Parker of the National Grange, and Congressman "WATT" ABBITT, stayed up all night in Washington seeking to bring about a reversal of the vote when the House convened on May 5. On a rollcall vote, on May 5, the adverse vote of the previous day was reversed by a vote of 215 to 193 and the peanut price support program was saved.

It is hard to figure what would have happened had the all night work and contacting by our association's executive secretary had not been done. I do know that he immediately went to Washington, that on behalf of our association, he put his shoulder to the wheel and the record is clear that the vote was reversed the next day. Again, it is impossible to put a dollar value on this activity of our association.

In 1960, our association worked closely with friends in the general assembly to have added to the appropriations bill, the sum of $15,000, to provide for a badly needed greenhouse at the Holland Experiment Station and items totaling $45,000 added to the bill for essential swine facilities at the same Holland Experiment Station. These items had not even been included in the budget submitted by VPI. It was not an easy task to have these items added to the appropriations bill. It was because of the initiative and forcefulness of our association, together with the cooperation of our members of the general assembly, especially delegate Shirley T. Holland, who was a ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee, that these facilities were provided.

In 1960 our association went to the House Agriculture Committee with a protest over the practice of the USDA of placing oil stock or No. 2's, in cold storage in order to pad the supply to force a lower support price for growers. This matter was given a thorough hearing by a committee in the House as well as a committee in the Senate and the net result was that the support price in 1960 was increased $7.74 over the support price in 1959. This was a significant contribution to producer income as well as to the general economy of the entire producing area.

In 1962, the association was in the forefront of bringing into being the Virginia-Carolina Peanut Advisory Committee. This

committee is made up of representatives of growers, shellers, research, and extension workers. The purpose of this committee is to coordinate the research and extension efforts between the two States for the mutual good of the Virginia-Carolina peanut producing area. The first chairman of this committee was the executive secretary and general counsel of our association. This committee is continuing to be a very useful tool in making our research and extension dollars accomplish more for area growers as well as other segments of the peanut industry.

In 1963, the association was in the forefront of bringing into being a nine member committee to fully explore the potential of foreign markets for American produced peanuts and peanut products. Serving as chairman of this nine-man industrywide committee was our executive secretary. This effort resulted in a peanut exhibit at the Amsterdam food fair and two trips to Europe by a survey team made up of industry representatives and foreign agricultural personnel of the USDA.

Essential data was gathered, important contacts made and the groundwork laid for what now promises to be a growing and profitable export market which could be of material importance to the entire peanut industry. In 1964, our association forcefully brought to the attention of the Department, the fact that the use of the pneumatic sampler stood to unduly penalize growers in the form of additional loose shelled kernels and additional foreign material. Although the Department—and in my opinion very wrongfully—refused to make any correction for the 1964 crop, the results of our protest brought about arrangements to collect additional grade data during the movement of the 1964 crop.

On the basis of this grade data, the 1965 support price is $2.30 more per ton than would have otherwise been the case. The executive secretary and general counsel has previously reported on the approximate dollar value to our growers as a result of this action; namely, approximately $700,000 extra per year net income, for area peanut growers.

In closing, I would say that it has been my observation that we have an extremely effective commodity organization here in our peanut area—an organization that has over the years done a job for producers that is perhaps now too often taken for granted. I know of no investment such as the small deduction made from Virginia growers that has resulted in such returns to producers.

We were the first producers to go this route and since then we have assisted and advised with producers in North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Oklahoma as to what our experiences have been and the result has been that now the producers in each major peanut-producing State, other than Texas, have adopted the example set by Virginia producers in 1948.

During the same period of time, our present executive secretary and general counsel has become the senior representative of any producer or sheller group in the country.

The late President Kennedy twice appointed him to be a member of the President's National Agricultural Advisory Commission—a 25-member commission of farm representatives, consumers, and other interests. This speaks for the national regard in which our relatively small commodity association is held and certainly recognizes Bill Rawlings in a most high and appropriate manner.

Our effectiveness has increased with maturity and I hope that this brief summary of some of the highlights since the organization of our association will serve to be a constructive review as to what our association has done in the past and what its capabilities are for the future.

STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR BANK MERGERS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have been joined by 19 of my colleagues on the House Committee on Banking and Currency in the introduction of a bill to amend the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

The purpose of this bill is to provide a clear, rational, and orderly body of standards and procedures for the governmental review and approval or disapproval of proposed mergers in the commercial banking field. This was the objective of the Congress in 1960 when the Bank Merger Act was enacted. However, decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Philadelphia National Bank case on June 17, 1963, and the First National Bank & Trust Co. of Lexington, Ky., case on April 6, 1964, have left the law applicable to bank mergers in a confused and uncertain state. This confusion and uncertainty must be removed, and only the Congress has the power to provide a practical and adequate remedy.

A review of the relevant events that preceded the two aforementioned Supreme Court decisions is essential to a complete understanding of the problem which our legislation seeks to solve. The Clayton Act—and more specifically section 7 of that act—has over the years proved to be the Federal Government's most effective legal tool for dealing with the anticompetitive effects of corporate acquisitions and mergers. In its original form section 7 was only applicable to mergers achieved through stock acquisition. Because a vast majority of modern corporate mergers occur through asset rather than stock acquisition, it became necessary to extend the law's reach to cover and prohibit anticompetitive asset acquisitions. This was done in 1950 with the enactment of the so-called Celler-Kefauver Act. However, the Celler-Kefauver amendment to the Clayton Act was specifically phrased so as to limit its applicability to acquisitions made by corporations which were subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. Commercial banks have never been subject to the jurisdiction of the FTC.

During the 1950's, as our economy completed its conversion from wartime to peacetime emphasis, a marked increase in the number of bank mergers developed. These mergers occurred through asset acquisitions. As this development continued, it became apparent to many in the Congress and the executive branch that the Federal Government lacked effective legal tools for dealing with bank mergers, especially those in which anticompetitive factors might be present. Accordingly, beginning in 1955, several attempts were made to broaden section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act, to cover bank mergers. These efforts failed, largely because of a prevailing view in the Congress that bank mergers should not be judged solely on the basis of competitive effect. Then in 1960 the Congress enacted the Bank Merger Act, establishing special procedures and standards for the review of proposed bank mergers.

The 1960 act placed the primary responsibility for the review of proposed bank mergers in the three Federal bank supervisory agencies. It provided that bank mergers should be analyzed on the basis of seven statutory factors, one of which was the merger's effect on competition, and that no merger should be approved unless, after consideration of all seven factors, the banking agency found the merger to be in the public interest. The 1960 act provided that the bank supervisory agency having primary responsibility for review should obtain from the other two banking agencies and the Department of Justice advisory reports with respect to the single factor of the merger's effect on competition. While the competitive aspect of a merger was certainly expected to receive significant attention under the 1960 act, nevertheless, an objective reading of the legislative history established in both the House and Senate makes unquestionably clear the fact that Congress intended that bank mergers should be reviewed not just on the competitive factor but on the banking factors as well and that after such a balanced review a merger should be approved only if the banking agency determined it to be in the public interest. Thus, immediately after passage of the Bank Merger Act in 1960, the legal standards applicable to bank mergers would seem to have been these:

First. Section 7 of the Clayton Act had no practical application, because bank mergers were achieved through asset acquisitions and banks were not subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission.

Second. The Bank Merger Act was the paramount statute law governing bank mergers. Its provisions placed primary regulatory jurisdiction in the Federal bank supervisory agencies, and provided that bank mergers should only be approved when found to be "in the public interest" after careful review of the competitive factor and six specific banking factors.

Third. Section 1 of the Sherman Act, if deemed applicable to bank mergers, would only be applied under the "rule of reason" established in the Standard Oil case, thereby permitting the courts to take into account the specialized and unique nature of the banking industry in determining whether or not a particular merger would "unduly diminish competition."

This legal climate was drastically modified by the decisions of the Supreme Court in the so-called Philadephia and Lexington cases. A review of those two cases is necessary to a clear understanding of just what the status of the bank merger law is today. First the Philadelphia case:

On February 25, 1961, the Department of Justice filed suit to block the proposed

merger of the second largest bank in Philadelphia, the Philadelphia National Bank, and the third largest bank in Philadelphia, the Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank. Although this merger had been approved by the Comptroller of the Curency under the Bank Merger Act of 1960, the Justice Department alleged that the merger violated section 1 of the Sherman Act and section 7 of the Clayton Act. The banks agreed to postpone the consummation of the merger pending the outcome of the litigation.

After trial the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania held that section 7 of the Clayton Act did not apply to the bank mergers, but that, if it did, the merger did not violate section 7. Assuming that the substantive test of section 7 was more stringent than that of section 1 of the Sherman Act, the court also held that section 1 was not violated by the merger (201 F. Supp. 348 (1962)).

On June 17, 1963, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the district court, holding that the merger violated section 7 of the Clayton Act. The majority opinion was written by Justice Brennan who was joined by four other justices. Justice Harlan, joined by Justice Stewart, dissented on the ground that section 7 did not apply. Justice Goldberg, agreeing with Justice Harlan that section 7 did not apply, withheld judgment on the Sherman Act aspect of the case. Justice White did not participate.

The majority opinion in the Philadelphia National Bank case noted that, prior to 1950, section 7 of the Clayton Act applied only to stock acquisitions and that the Supreme Court had held that a merger was not a stock acquisition. *Arrow-Hart & Hegeman Elec. Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission*, 291 U.S. 587. The 1950 amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act applied the act to asset acquisitions of corporations—but only those subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. The majority opinion recognized that banks were not subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. However, the opinion argued that a merger did not fit neatly into either the stock or asset acquisition categories, and concluded:

> Thus, the stock-acquisition and asset-acquisition provisions, read together, reach mergers, which fit neither category perfectly but lie somewhere between the two ends of the spectrum. * * * So construed, the specific exception for acquiring corporations not subject to the FTC's jurisdiction excludes from the coverage of section 7 only asset acquisitions by such corporations when not accomplished by merger (374 U.S. at 342).

The majority also held that the Bank Merger Act of 1960 had no effect on the application of the antitrust laws—as construed by the majority—to bank mergers.

Justice Harlan, in his dissenting opinion, noted that the Justice Department, after passage of the 1950 amendment to section 7, repeatedly took the position that the amended section 7 did not apply to bank mergers. Justice Harlan pointed out:

> The inapplicability of section 7 to bank mergers was also an explicit basis on which Congress acted in passing on the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

Hence the passage of the Bank Merger Act clearly evidenced a congressional intent not to subject bank mergers to section 7, but rather to provide an administrative procedure for the approval of bank mergers. Congress had on several occasions refused to apply section 7 to bank mergers. Criticizing the majority opinion, Justice Harlan said:

> The result is, of course, that the Bank Merger Act is almost completely nullified; its enactment turns out to have been an exorbitant waste of congressional time and energy (374 U.S. at 384).

The landmark 1963 decision of the Court in the Philadelphia case, holding section 7 of the Clayton Act to be applicable to bank mergers, was followed in less than a year by the precedent-shattering decision with respect to the Sherman Act in the Lexington case.

Following approval by the Comptroller of the Currency, a consolidation of the First National Bank & Trust Co. of Lexington—First National—and the Security Trust Co. of Lexington—Security Trust—was effected on March 1, 1961. The consolidation brought together the largest and the fourth largest bank in Fayette County, Ky., to form the First Security National Bank & Trust Co. which controlled over 50 percent of the assets, deposits, and loans held by commercial banks in the county. A civil suit, alleging violations of sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act, was filed the same day.

The District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, while expressly recognizing the applicability of the Sherman Act, found that the consolidation did not constitute an unreasonable restraint of trade in the field of commercial banking or constitute an unlawful combination or attempt to monopolize commercial banking. It therefore dismissed the complaint. *U.S.* v. *First National Bank and Trust Company of Lexington*, 208 F. Supp. 457 (1962).

The Supreme Court reversed and found an unreasonable restraint of trade in violation of section 1 (376 U.S. 665 (1964)). The majority opinion, written by Justice Douglas and joined in by four other Justices, stated that the case was governed by a standard which the Court derived from four so-called railroad cases decided between 1904 and 1922. This stringent standard held:

> That where merging companies are major competitive factors in a relevant market, the elimination of significant competition between themselves, by merger or consolidation, itself constitutes a violation of section 1 of the Sherman Act (376 U.S. at 671–672).

The dissenting opinion, written by Justice Harlan and joined by Justice Stewart, pointed out that the test laid down in the railroad cases had been all but expressly overruled by the Court in *U.S.* v. *Columbia Steel Co.*, 334 U.S. 495 (1947).

The Columbia Steel case, which dealt with the acquisition of a competitor by the United States Steel Corp., held that the Sherman Act prohibited any acquisition which "results in or is aimed at unreasonable restraint."

> In determining what constitutes unreasonable restraint, we do not think the dollar volume is in itself of compelling significance; we look rather to the percentage of business controlled, the strength of the remaining competition, whether the action springs from business requirements or purpose to monopolize, the probable development of the industry, consumer demands, and other characteristics of the market. We do not undertake to prescribe any set of percentage figures by which to measure the reasonableness of a corporation's enlargement of its activities by the purchase of the assets of a competitor. The relative effect of percentage command of a market varies with the setting in which that factor is placed (334 U.S. at 527–528).

Although the Justice Department in Columbia Steel urged that the Supreme Court follow the railroad cases the Supreme Court said:

> We do not stop to examine those cases to determine whether we would now approve either their language or their holdings. The factual situation in all those cases is so dissimilar from that presented here that they furnish little guidance in determining whether the competition which will be eliminated through the purchase of Consolidated is sufficient to warrant injunctive relief requested by the Government (334 U.S. at 531).

The dissenting opinion in the Lexington case characterized the majority opinion as "the revitalization of a properly moribund rule of antitrust law" (376 U. S. at 679). While agreeing with the majority that the Lexington bank merger was unlawful on the facts there presented, a concurring opinion by Justices Brennan and White also would have rejected the test laid down in the railroad cases in favor of the more sophisticated test of Columbia Steel.

As a result of the Philadelphia and Lexington decisions, we now find the law relating to bank mergers dramatically different from what it was generally assumed to be in 1960. Today—only 5 years after its enactment—the procedures and substantive tests on the Bank Merger Act have been relegated at best to a secondary position—if, indeed, they have any practical importance at all. The Clayton Act—section 7—and the Sherman Act—section 1—now are the crucial and controlling standards against which any bank merger must ultimately be tested.

It was against this background that the Senate earlier in this session passed S. 1698, the so-called Robertson-Proxmire bill. The original version of this bill by Senator ROBERTSON would have exempted bank mergers past, present and future, approved under the Bank Merger Act. In other words, it would have restored the situation to what it was considered to be for all practical purposes at the time of the enactment of the Bank Merger Act and before the Supreme Court's decisions in the Philadelphia and Lexington cases. The bill was amended in the Senate committee to prevent banks from merging if the Justice Department, within 30 days after approval of a bank merger by the appropriate agency, instituted an antitrust suit. If the Justice Department did not sue within this 30-day period, or if the

Court held that the merger did not violate the Antitrust Acts, it could be consummated, and it would no longer be subject to antitrust action. In the case of mergers already consummated, at the date of enactment of the bill, exemption from all proceedings under the antitrust laws would be provided.

As to the future, the Robertson-Proxmire bill provides that the Justice Department would be as free as it now is to institute suits during the 30-day period and those mergers affected would be judged under the strict criteria of the Clayton and Sherman Acts without regard to the banking factors.

While this bill would eliminate the problems inherent in unscrambling banks and make mergers certain and final after the passage of the 30-day waiting period, it does violence to the concept of the original Bank Merger Act. It abandons the precepts of the act that banking is an industry which could and should be distinguished from antitrust rulings applicable to industry generally which the Supreme Court has applied to banking in the Philadelphia and Lexington Court cases.

While competition is important in the banking industry, the history of the United States is replete with disastrous events which in the past have arisen from uninhibited competition in banking. The laws of both Federal and State governments recognize that banking is unique. It is inconceivable that the laws and regulation applicable to banking would be applied to business generally. In banking, entry and branching are strictly controlled. Capital structure is controlled. Borrowing is controlled. Limits are placed upon loans to any one borrower, and upon types of loans. Debt is limited in form and amount. Reserves are regulated in amount and form.

Indeed the nature and extent of regulation is so detailed and complex as to be almost impossible to describe.

The reasons are apparent. In addition to the fearful consequences of bank failures, not to be compared with failures of other businesses, the banking industry is at the heart of the Nation's monetary and economic health. The Federal Reserve System exists for the primary purpose of regulating the supply and distribution of credit through the banking system.

As banking is unique, so the criteria for measuring the public interest involved in bank mergers should be tailored to the public interest involved in banking and should be different from those applicable to business generally, just as other regulated industries are excepted from section 7 of the Clayton Act: those regulated by the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

It was for these reasons that Congress in 1960 designed a method of regulating bank mergers specifically adapted to the public interest in banking. And it is for these reasons that a substitute bank merger bill has been introduced in the House which would restore the original intent of the Bank Merger Act but at the same time strengthen its standards and procedures.

The bill may be summarized as follows:

First. The competitive considerations in passing upon bank mergers are strengthened by making predominant the attorney general's judgment as to the effect upon competition rather than the judgment of the banking agency. The banking agency, however, would retain the power to approve the merger if "after considering all of such factors"—the competitive factor and the so-called banking factors—"it finds the transaction to be in the public interest."

Second. It is specifically provided that the banking agencies should consult and advise with the other two agencies and with the Attorney General. This is an effort to achieve coordination of policy on bank mergers. The mechanics are not defined but this language does constitute a mandate to consult and advise, rather than merely to receive reports.

Third. Judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals is provided by the insertion of language from the Bank Holding Company Act. This language is supplemented by a specific provision that the Attorney General, as well as any aggrieved party, may obtain judicial review. The Court, however, is specifically required to consider all of the factors set forth in the Bank Merger Act, that is, the banking factors as well as the competitive factors.

Fourth. It is provided that mergers consummated prior to June 17, 1963, the date of the landmark Supreme Court decision in the Philadelphia case, would be exempt from the antitrust laws. This case held for the first time that the Clayton Act applied to bank mergers. The three cases subsequent to this decision would be adjudicated under the substantive criteria referred to in paragraph 3 above.

Fifth. The Justice Department would have continuing power to invoke the antitrust laws with respect to any activities of the resulting bank after the merger.

Let me compare for a moment the provisions of the new House bill with S. 1698.

As to the some 2,200 mergers already consummated and not under challenge by the Justice Department, the Robertson-Proxmire bill provides that the merger transactions shall be immunized from antitrust attack. Our bill provides identical relief. It has been stated by the authors of S. 1698 that the immunity granted is meant to be limited strictly to the transaction of merger, and is in no sense intended to protect the merged institutions from suit for antitrust violations which may occur after the merger is consummated. While this is the intent, I find the actual language of S. 1698 somewhat ambiguous on this point. Our bill contains specific language in section 2(d) clearly spelling out the limitation of immunity.

With respect to the procedures and substantive law applicable to future mergers, our bill differs rather significantly from S. 1698, as approved by the Senate. S. 1698 leaves unchanged the provisions of the Bank Merger Act of 1960 up to the point of administrative approval of a merger by one of the three Federal bank supervisory agencies. It is after the approval process that S. 1698 modifies existing law. S. 1698 provides that, once a merger has been approved by the appropriate banking agency, a 30-day waiting period would intervene before the merger could be formally consummated. During this 30-day period the Department of Justice could file suit to challenge the merger on antitrust grounds, and should suit be so filed, then the merger could not be consummated until after the suit had been finally adjudicated and then only to the extent consistent with the judgment. Such suit would be judged strictly on the basis of antitrust standards and thus no consideration would be given to the six banking factors which the banking agency reviews in its balanced study of a proposed merger. A merger transaction not challenged within the 30-day waiting period would, under the provisions of S. 1698, be immunized from later antitrust attack.

By contrast, our bill makes a fundamental change in the banking agency review provisions of the Bank Merger Act. It changes the role of the Attorney General on the factor of competition from advisory to determinative; for if, under the House bill, the Attorney General finds that a proposed merger will have an adverse effect on competition, the banking agency may not approve the merger, unless after considering this competitive factor along with the six banking factors it finds the merger to be in the public interest. Thus, the banking agency is compelled to assemble a substantial body of probative evidence to support its finding.

While this proposal substantially strengthens the role played by the Attorney General during the agency review of a proposed bank merger, it does counterbalance his expanded powers with provision for a more balanced judicial review of an approved merger which may be challenged by the Attorney General. At present, if a merger approved in full conformity with the procedures of the Bank Merger Act is challenged by the Attorney General under the authority of the Clayton Act or the Sherman Act, a Federal court is obliged to consider only the competitive consequences of that merger. It cannot consider such important banking factors as the adequacy of capital structure, the general character of management, and the needs and convenience of the community to be served by the merged bank. These banking factors are extremely important in reaching a reasoned judgment as to whether or not a particular merger will be in the public interest. The Robertson-Proxmire bill does nothing to change the scope of judicial review. Our bill directs that a U.S. Court of Appeals, in reviewing a merged approved by the banking agencies, shall consider the banking factors as well as the antitrust factors in determining whether the agencies act in the public interest. I sincerely believe that this expanded scope of judicial review is essential to assuring that our Nation will be served in the future by a banking system with the ca-

pacity to respond effectively to the needs of an urban economy.

So that there shall be no misunderstanding, I wish to make abundantly clear that the fact that I join with Senator PROXMIRE and many others in the Congress in the desire that the Department of Justice should play a more determinative role in the regulation of bank mergers than was permitted to it under the terms of the original Bank Merger Act. On this point, we have a common objective. The House bill merely suggests a somewhat different method for achieving that common objective.

Our bill differs from S. 1698 on one other point. This is the matter of the treatment to be accorded the six bank mergers, which are the subject of antitrust suit by the Department of Justice and which are still in the process of adjudication. S. 1698, in laying down its new rules for bank merger regulation, would wipe the slate clean, thereby granting all six of these merger transactions relief from the antitrust laws. Our proposal does not go quite that far. It would grant relief to the three transactions which were consummated prior to the Supreme Court's decision in the Philadelphia case on June 17, 1963. For the three transactions occurring after that date, the bill provides that the Federal courts shall adjudicate these cases under the broadened standards of review which our bill establishes for the future. Accordingly, in passing on the three post-Philadelphia mergers, the courts would be obliged to look not only at the antitrust factor but the six important banking factors as well.

I feel strongly that the focus of our attention should be on the establishment of a clear, orderly, and rational public policy for the future governmental regulation of mergers in the banking field. There is no clear public policy at the present time. Banking plays so fundamental a role in our total national economy that we endanger our economy by permitting this chaotic state of the law on banking concentration to continue. Only the Congress has any effective power to bring order to this situation. I suggest that we exercise that power, that we exercise it with dispatch in this session, and the House bill is offered in the hope that it will aid in the achievement of this goal.

HURRICANE BETSY POINTS UP NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, it was a great disappointment to me that the ruckus of last evening prevented us from considering H.R. 7397, the House version of S. 408 which would authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future natural disasters.

The recent tragedies along our gulf coast wrought by disastrous Hurricane Betsy should certainly be reason enough to bring this bill to the floor for consideration.

I sincerely trust that we will not further forsake our obligation to the unfortunate victims of natural disasters by failing to reschedule this important piece of legislation.

It was my privilege to have introduced one of the original bills dealing with this very subject early in the session. My reasons for declaring that this legislation is vitally necessary are indeed reinforced by the example of the mass of destruction maifested by Hurricane Betsy.

But not only gulf States residents are victims of the mighty storms which originate in the tropics.

I know personally the losses that were experienced by many residents of my district as a result of hurricanes and accompanying tidal waves that have hit southeastern Massachusetts. In my memory major tropical storms struck this area in 1938, 1944, 1954, and 1955. In each of these years, there were extensive losses of life and property. Insurance can be bought for hurricanes and windstorms but insurance against abnormal high tides is almost impossible to find, and the cost is almost prohibitive.

In 1956, the staff of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee prepared a study on natural disasters in the United States. I have selected certain years from a table included in that study to give my colleagues an indication of the extent to which abnormally high tides—caused usually by hurricanes—wreak havoc on human lives and property:

	Estimated damage
1938 (600 lives lost)	$300, 245, 000
1944 (64 lives lost)	165, 010, 000
1954 (193 lives lost)	755, 472, 500
1955 (231 lives lost)	1, 776, 120, 000

I would remind my colleagues that these figures relate only to losses from tropical storms on the Atlantic and gulf coasts. Losses from other disasters such as tornadoes and earthquakes would multiply these figures many times.

In the 84th Congress, a great deal of consideration was given to the problem of natural disaster insurance. The 85th Congress passed the Federal Flood Insurance Act (42 U.S.C. 2401), but there have never been any appropriations made to fund the program.

We are now in the 89th Congress and we still do not have an effective coordinated approach dealing with the problem. The Federal Government has been proceeding on an ad hoc basis, providing assistance when needed—frequently after the Congress, on an emergency basis, has enacted legislation to deal with the immediate disaster.

In my opinion, this problem has been left in limbo long enough. The Government, in cooperation with the private insurance industry, can surely find a way to protect these citizens. These two forces, working together, can, I am sure, come up with a solution that will strengthen our free enterprise society and protect the Nation against the unforeseen ravaging of its resources by natural disasters.

MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, every Member takes pride in the educational institutions—and their achievements—in his district. I am no exception.

One of the outstanding colleges in the Nation is located at Clinton, Miss. I speak of Mississippi College, a private institution maintained by the Mississippi Baptist Convention. It is the oldest senior college in our State, having been founded in 1826.

Graduates of Mississippi College can be found around the world, participating in a myriad of endeavors. The many contributions to society of those who attended Mississippi College can never be cataloged. Such a task would be impossible; but each, in his own way has and will carry forward the Christian principles taught at Mississippi College. The 1965 class will continue this tradition.

In tribute to this educational giant, I ask permission to place in the RECORD selected portions of the 139th commencement program held on May 30, 1965, at which time 322 degrees were awarded.

It will be of more than passing interest to the House to note that one graduate on that date was Sarah Patsy Miller, daughter of our delightful and resourceful Doorkeeper Hon. William M. Miller.

The baccalaureate address was given by Dr. John D. W. Watts, president of the Baptist Theological Seminary in Ruschlikon—Zurich, Switzerland, a 1941 graduate. It follows:

CHRISTIAN REALISM

(Baccalaureate address by Dr. John D. W. Watts at Mississippi College, May 30, 1965)

Dr. McLemore, respected members of the faculty, honored graduates of the class of 1965, dear students and friends, the entire process of higher education has changed drastically since I sat where you sit 24 years ago. There is hardly a subject which is taught today on the same basis or in the same way, or even with the same content with which it was taught 24 years ago.

Still the basic question of all education remains that which the psalmist spoke in Psalm 8, "What is man?" The aim of a liberal arts education has not changed in this time: to help us see ourselves and our world with analytic insight and synthetic appreciation; to help us to look at ourselves and our world without pretense or prejudice.

Unfortunately religion is highly prone to both pretense and prejudice. Mind you, I said "religion." Faith, true faith, Biblical faith—from Moses through the prophets to John the Baptist, Jesus, and Paul—is scornful of all such. They sought in faith a realistic understanding of themselves and their world beyond pretense and prejudice and found it. We can find it, too, if we read our Bibles with open eyes, minds, and hearts. Appearances are deceiving, but genuine reality can be visible to all who have eyes and use them.

Yes, appearances are deceiving. The appearances of culture, progress, affluence, joy which may be seen in the world capitals of London, Berlin, Vienna, Beirut, Léopoldville, or Saigon, those appearances of civilization or culture which cloak the world of New York, Washington, or for that matter of Meridian, Philadelphia, Jackson, or Clinton.

In any of these, a deceptive calm and apparent order even gaity covers the inescapable reality of human sin and depravity which lurks behind the facade. We are all too likely to be led to pretend that the great evils of the world could not happen to us and could not happen here.

In 1949, soon after we had taken up residence in Switzerland, I was invited to attend the dedication of a new church in the Ruhr area of Germany. It was in a city which had been completely destroyed by bombs. Amid the ruins a little chapel had been built. I was asked to dinner in the home of a decon whose home had been mercifully spared and in which we sat, a single part of an apartment building with ruins all around us. As we sat at dinner, the motherly woman who presided at the table came to speak about the war. Some mention was made by someone of the feelings of neighboring peoples who had suffered atrocities under German aggression. With a little exclamation she said, "But that could not have been true, our fine German boys would never do anything like that." Her son who sat at my elbow had been an officer in the Luftwaffe in Holland and he protested mildly saying, "Mother, I was there, it was true." It is hard for any American mother to conceive of her son or boys like her son doing anything violent or atrocious. And we all sit ever and again in the spot where that German mother sat, deceived into the thought that these things could not be for the young men that she knew.

But anyone who has eyes to see in our world can see that this appearance of civilized culture is deceiving. Modern writers, from Camus and Sartre to William Faulkner and Tennessee Williams have pictured this human existence of ours in no uncertain terms. Yet, we have often turned away from them, saying that this must be someone else. It is not me, it is not our kind. The Bible implies that this picture of utter depravity is our picture. The pretense that it does not exist does not rid us of its reality. This picture of depraved, rotten humanity is man. Appearances to the contrary, man is a sinner, evil from his heart, capable of rivaling the Devil himself in iniquity.

Christian life and faith in such a society of sinful man is and must be a struggle to build up and to tear down. T. S. Eliot has caught this in his poem. "Why Should Men Love the Church?"

"It is hard for those who have never known persecution,
And who have never known a Christian,
To believe these tales of Christian persecution.
Do you think that the Faith has conquered the World
And that lions no longer need keepers?

Do you need to be told that whatever has been, can still be?
Do you need to be told that even such modest attainments
As you boast of in the way of polite society
Will hardly survive the Faith to which they owe their significance?
Why should men love the Church? Why should they love her laws?

She tells them of Life and Death, and of all that they would forget.
She is tender where they would be hard, and hard where they would like to be soft.
She tells them of Evil and Sin, and other unpleasant facts.
They constantly try to escape
From the darkness outside and within
By dreaming of systems so perfect that no one will need to be good.

But the man that is will shadow
The man that pretends to be.
And the Son of Man is crucified always
And there shall be Martyrs and Saints."

But if appearance of affluence and culture can deceive, so can appearance of evil in man which makes one despair and give up. If one tours the trouble spots of the world, the slums of the great cities, the borderlands of Congo, the villages of Vietnam, the pattern would be pretty much the same, and one would very quickly despair. What is man that God should care? "Nothing," cry the philosophers and the writers today, "Nothing worth having."

But appearances are deceiving. There are human values which remain valid, true, indestructible within this chaos, living amid death, showing themselves in the most surprising way. Browning knew this when he had Pippa cry "God's in his heaven. All's right with the world." Pippa did not know the evil being perpetrated behind the walls of the house she passed, but Browning did and had her say it anyway.

William Rose Benét has caught the sense of this enduring value in man in his poem "Song Under Shadow." He writes:

"Fear not the despots raging,
The loud and brazen lie,
The blood that unassuaging
Pours down the noonday sky,
What man thou wert than man thou art
For all that they can do.
A door stands open in the heart
And all good things are true.
Then rise with every morning
Thy risen Lord to find
With fear and hate and scorning
The blind lead on the blind,
But love who has a world apart
Knows all they never knew.
A door stands open in the heart
And all good things are true."

Ah, that's it. "A door stands open in the heart." That is the hope of man. When man is open to God and his fellows—there is hope. There, indestructible faith rises and reliable character is born.

While I was a student in Mississippi College a group of us from the BSU traveled with Chester Swor to a southwide BSU convention in Memphis. In those troubled days before World War II we thrilled at the pictures of faith around the world given us by many speakers. Charles Wells, the well-known Quaker journalist told us the story of Martin Niemüller's imprisonment. This decorated U-boat captain of World War I had strongly resisted Hitler's attempt to take over the Christian churches. He was thrown in prison and cast into a very tiny cell with an electric light globe that shone down on him day and night. There, for weeks he was left incommunicado, in the hope that it would break his spirit. But the Nazis had misjudged their man. Martin Niemüller reached up to the bars in the tiny window high above his head and chinned himself repeatedly every day, keeping his muscles toned and hard. Niemüller could speak to no one in prison but to his God. But his heart was tuned to a wavelength that his prison guards would never understand, and he communed with his God. When the judges expected to find before them a broken man, they found a poised tiger who, instead of a defense, brought an attack upon the competency of the court to deal with the matters that belong to the King of kings and Lord of lords. Three Nazi judges instructed to convict, apparently would rather face Hitler's wrath than Martin Niemüller's attack. They declared him innocent, but before he could leave the room he was taken by his SS guards back to a cell which he would not leave till the end of the war. When God can enter through the open door of the heart, an indestructible faith arises and a reliable character. These are the values of humankind that cannot be denied.

Isn't it inconsistent, however, to hold that man is unimaginably evil, yet of inestimable value? For the wisdom of man yes, but it is God's logic with which we deal. It is no accident that both Eliot and Benét routed their ideas in the Gospel.

Listen to Peter's words at Pentecost (Acts 2: 22–23, 32–33 plus verse 36):

"Men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man attested to you by God with mighty works and wonders and signs which God did through him in your midst, as you yourselves know—this Jesus, delivered up according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God, you crucified and killed by the hands of lawless men.

"This Jesus God raised up, and of that we all are witnesses. Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured out this which you see and hear. Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified."

Jesus, whom God attested, whom God delivered up, whom God raised up, whom God exalted and made both Lord and Christ. This Jesus, man crucified.

There you have it! That is what man is! Capable of crucifying God's own son! And if that, capable of every other crime to which he might be called to account in human history. What should be done to those guilty of such a crime? Germany's courts still drag out the attempt to purge her of the executioners of the third Reich.

Those whom Peter had indicted for the crucifixion of Christ, cried out, "What shall we do?" What retribution or penalty would suffice for such crime?

Peter, amazingly answers those who crucified the Saviour: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Christ Jesus for the forgiveness of your sins; and you shall receive the Holy Spirit." If there is hope for man—any man for you or me or those with blood on their hands and hearts in any part of the world—this is it. That God continues to address the invitation of the Gospel to him, that forgiveness is available from the cross of Christ, that the Holy Spirit may enter the "open door," Benét speaks of, to purge, renew, and use, that Christ, the Saviour is indeed Lord and Messiah over time and the end.

That is Christian realism which recognizes the almost unlimited evil which man, any man, is capable of, but which lives and works and fights the fight of faith in the knowledge that God knows this evil and has conquered it. What we now experience are the mopping up operations in God's history, the battle is won and the victory assured. The sign of that victory is that God can address man unhindered and man can hear because Christ died and is raised.

But this affirmation also means that in the framework of this faith and hope everyone who lives by this hope must be a tool of the Spirit of God to purge, renew, and rebuild broken man and society which Christian realism has recognized. This faith is no reason for Christians or Christian churches to be still in society. Rather it challenges the pretense of normality, the prejudice of established culture with the affirmation that this world belongs to God, and that every part of it stands both under His leadership and His judgment. This is what Eliot understood as he spoke both of the quiet building operation of the church and of the place for martyrs in an unredeemed society.

Conclusion. Now in closing let me ask the pragmatic question. How does this realistic faith work out?

Surely a 25-year sentence to a Siberian work camp must be one of the hardest tests of life or faith possible. The world has recently been given a remarkably realistic and convincing glimpse of that hard and raw life in the book "A Day in the Life of Ivan Den-

isovich." The book among other characters tells of a mild but strong man called Alyosha the Baptist who occupied a bunk across from Denisovich in the barracks. While others smuggle bread to eat or metal for knives, Alyosha smuggles the handwritten copy of the Scriptures which he treasures and reads in every spare moment. While others distract themselves with dirty stories Alyosha prays or talks to another prisoner about God. He pulls his weight in camp, helps others as opportunity arises, something no other Zech would dream of doing. His simple faith lights several of the pages of that book chronicling the day in the life of Ivan Denisovich. If the Baptist in the Siberian camp made such an impression on the author of that book, it is no wonder that Baptists in Russia have grown, despite all of their difficulties, to have the largest number of Baptists in any one country outside the United States.

Ah, but you say that was a concentration camp. No wonder he stood out. But young men and women, faith that succeeds in a work camp will bear watching anywhere. I venture such faith would stand out on Main Street just as well. May God help you to prove it.

Mr. Speaker, the invocation at the graduating exercises was delivered by Rev. Carey E. Cox, pastor of the First Baptist Church at Brandon, Miss., as follows:

INVOCATION

We would, dear God, Thy power to know,
Before we forth to service go,
Or else we serve in vain.
We care not for human will or might,
Our souls are helpless in the fight,
Until Thy power we gain.

Holy Father, we thank Thee for Thy Son Jesus Christ, our wonderful saviour. We pray that Thy great power may be made the servant of Thy wonderful love in bringing abundant blessings out of the storehouse of Thy mercies to each of these graduates.

Shower abundant grace upon Mississippi Baptists for following the leadership of Thy Holy Spirit in establishing and maintaining this great educational institution. We thank Thee for education at its best, education with a Christian environment for the student, for teachers and an administration which seeks to emulate Thy teachings.

We rejoice as parents and friends in the privilege to be present as witnesses to the triumph of our young people, and at the same time, place the welfare of these graduates in Thy loving care. We come to Thee who alone knowest the future of Thy children. As these young people set out upon the uncharted seas, may they as mariners check with regularity the compass of their souls and keep their souls sensitive to the mysterious movements of Thy spirit.

We pray for these, Thy disciples of the coming generation. Wilt Thou open opportunities which will enable them to show their debt to Thee, their parents, teachers, and fellow Americans? May each make the noblest use of mind and body in the advancing years. Grant that the ties of friendship established here will be strengthened with the passing years and that new and wonderful friendships may be begun. Forgive, we pray Thee, if any have thought success better than righteousness, and ease more desirable than service. May each seek to be like our Saviour who went about doing good.

Wilt Thou be with each of these throughout this day and all of God's eternal tomorrow. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

The graduation speaker was Dr. G. Baley Price, chairman of the department of mathematics at the University of Kansas. A former president of the Mathematical Association of America, Dr. Price on that occasion celebrated his 40th anniversary as a graduate of Mississippi College. At this point I include Dr. Price's address.

TO THE GRADUATING CLASS OF 1965, MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE, MAY 30, 1965

President McLemore, members of the board of trustees, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class of 1965, parents, friends, ladies and gentlemen: I address my remarks on this occasion to the members of the graduating class of 1965.

Today your preparation ends. The Nation and the world summon you to positions of responsibility and service. These commencement exercises signal your entrance onto the stage of the world. Tomorrow you must begin.

You graduate in one of the great periods of the world's history. Other great periods have preceded our own. Greece and Rome, the advent of Christianity in the first century, the Renaissance in the 15th century, the Elizabethan era in the 16th and 17th centuries, and the industrial revolution in the 18th and 19th centuries—these ages of the past have shaped the course of history. You graduate in the 20th century: the age of science, the nuclear age, the jet age, the space age. You graduate in one of the great and awful periods of the world's history.

The age of science, through research, has discovered and invented plastics, synthetic fibers, antibiotics, polio vaccine, hybrid corn, the vacuum tube and the transistor, radio, television, long distance dialing, satellite communication, nuclear power, the jet airplane, and the automatic electronic digital computing machine. These and other inventions and discoveries have bestowed untold blessings on the peoples of the world. But the 20th century has also brought the most devastating wars of all times, madmen such as Hitler, the hydrogen bomb, and the threat of the destruction of civilization itself.

The age of science is characterized by change. As a result, your professors have not been able to teach you all that you will need to know for the remainder of your lives. No one can foresee the future, but swift, sudden, and accelerating change is certain. New knowledge, new discoveries, and new inventions will force you to continue your education throughout your lives. Your education thus far will enable you to continue successfully—many with the help of some years of graduate and professional school, but all with the help of constant study, occasional workshops, refresher courses, or sabbatical leaves.

I have said that the age of science is characterized by change. Four changes have occurred which will strongly influence the courses of your lives.

First, as a result of the development of the jet airplane and modern electronic communications systems, the world has become small. When I was in graduate school, the trip from Jackson to Boston—by train, of course—took almost 48 hours, and about 4 days were required to cross the United States. Now Trans-World Airlines flight 800 leaves Kansas City at noon and, after stops in New York, Paris, and Cairo, terminates in Bombay, India, early in the morning 2 days later. The total elapsed time for the trip is less than 30 hours. Canadian Pacific Air Lines has a flight which starts in Hong Kong, makes stops in Tokyo, Vancouver, Mexico City, Lima (Peru), Santiago (Chile), and terminates in Buenos Aires. Airmail letters are now delivered to any part of the world within 3 or 4 days. Telephone calls can be made to nearly all parts of the world, and international direct dialing telephone service will soon be in operation. The international character of the student bodies of most of our colleges and universities is convincing evidence that the world has become small. Students from India, Pakistan, China, Japan, other countries in the Far East and in the Near East, Africa, Latin America, and Western Europe are found in large numbers on campuses throughout the United States.

At the beginning of the 20th century the United States was separated by wide oceans from most of the rest of the world. Although aware of its historical connections with Western Europe, the United States lived in relative isolation from other nations. Until very recent times, our colleges and universities taught the history, languages, and culture of the Western World—that is, Western Europe and the United States—with only occasional references to Russia, India, China, Africa, and Latin America. Because these countries were far away and outside the world in which the United States lived, we found it possible and convenient to ignore them. But Russia, India, China, Africa, and Latin America are no longer far away. The world is now small, and the welfare of the United States is closely linked with the welfare of nations everywhere.

The new, small world in which we live has brought new responsibilities and obligations. We must develop sympathies for all nations, an understanding of the histories and cultures of all nations, and an interest in the welfare of all nations so that we can work effectively with them toward the creation of a better world. The colleges and universities of the United States have responded to these demands by developing many new programs to teach the languages, histories, and cultures of Russia, Latin America, Africa, India, and the Far East. Many students have entered these new programs, and their eagerness to learn about the nations of the entire world assures the United States an informed public and highly qualified leaders.

A second change concerns the population of the world. The world itself has become small, but the populations of countries everywhere are increasing rapidly. Furthermore, the jet airplane has made all nations our neighbors. Thus, both the increase in population itself and the decrease in the size of the world have contributed to the increase in the number of people with whom me must deal.

The rapid increase in the population—usually described as the "population explosion"—has brought a first set of problems. The problem created by the population explosion in the world as a whole is this: Today's parents have more children than they can feed, clothe, and educate. In many parts of the world the standard of living has fallen because nations have been unable to expand agricultural production fast enough to provide the food required for their rapidly increasing populations. Even in the United States this generation is unable to provide the education needed by its sons and daughters. There are severe shortages of qualified teachers at the college and university level. Funds are not available to build the schoolhouses and the college and university buildings needed for our children.

A second set of problems arises from bigness itself. Bigness creates problems of planning, organization, and administration. The New England town meeting is an institution of great simplicity for administering the affairs of a village. Today, however, there exists the need for a world government to supervise the affairs of all nations. The new, heavily populated, world of today requires planning, organization, and administration of great complexity and on a grand scale. Bigness requires educated leaders, skillful administrators, and planners with vision and imagination who can devise new patterns of organization to administer the affairs of ever larger and more diverse groups of nations and peoples.

One aspect of the bigness of the modern world concerns scientific computing and data processing. The modern world requires

that great masses of data be analyzed, that huge quantities of records be kept, and that a tremendous volume of reports be rendered. The requirements can be met only by the most skillful employment of modern data processing equipment. Financial records of banks and other business organizations were formerly kept by bookkeepers who sat on high stools and wrote numbers on sheets of paper with steel pens. The corresponding records are now produced by the modern electronic digital computing machine. The records of both the registrars' offices and the business offices of most of our colleges and universities are also processed by computing machines. Members of the graduating class of 1965, you must understand the revolution produced by the automation of data processing; to be effective in the world you are about to enter, you must understand the capabilities and the employment of modern data processing equipment.

A third change in the world is the growing gap between the developed and the developing nations of the world. The decreases in the size of the world has made the developing nations aware of the riches of the developed nations and has produced "the revolution of rising expectations." The age of science has witnessed—and, indeed, has helped to produce—the widening gap between the rich nations and the poor nations of the world. In some cases rapid population growth has followed advances in medicine and public health and forced a decline in the standard of living. America is rich and is burdened with farm surpluses; many parts of the world are hungry. The standard of living in the United States is high; in many parts of the world it is low. The gap between the developed and the developing nations constitutes perhaps the most serious of all threats to the welfare of the world today. Our efforts to help the rest of the world are efforts to secure our own safety and well-being. The world's best efforts thus far have not succeeded in reducing the gap between the developed and the developing nations. The problem remains—the problem grows.

I have named three important changes in the world in the age of science: the world has become small, the populations of the world are increasing rapidly, and the gap between the developed and the developing nations of the world has widened. A fourth change has thrust the United States into a position of world leadership. The Communist nations of the world have become strong and aggressive. The relative strength of Western Europe has declined. The United States has advanced rapidly in scientific, technological, industrial, economic, financial, and military strength. The United States, as the strongest power in the free world, has heavy responsibilities for world leadership.

The leader of the free world faces many difficult problems. In earlier times it was possible for a nation to dominate by force of arms and thus to exercise world leadership, but such is no longer the case. The age of science has produced the hydrogen bomb and military stalemate. Military might is still necessary, but it is no longer overpowering and decisive. It is not easy for a leader to rally support for the common cause. Nations are separated by the gap, and nationalism is rampant among the newer nations of the world. The time has passed when the United States could live peacefully behind its broad oceans. Today, as the only means of protecting itself, the United States seeks to build a better world for all.

A leader must excel. As a result, the United States feels great pressure to excel in every type of activity in which nations compete: in sports, in music and the arts, in literature, and especially in scientific research and technological development. The United States suffered a defeat when Russia launched Sputnik I; this fact explains the great efforts made by the United States since that time in the exploration of space. Our spectacular accomplishments and solid achievements in the exploration of space have not yet gained for the United States the position of leadership in space travel and research. In today's world, the responsibilities of leadership cannot be taken lightly. The pressure of these responsibilities is felt in many ways by the Nation's colleges and universities.

If change is the characteristic feature of the age of science, certainly the struggle with communism is the dominant feature of the political life of the 20th century. In a very real sense, there is no peace—the world is at war. The United States, as a leader of the free world, has a heavy responsibility to preserve the values, traditions, and institutions of the Western World, and to help build a new world in which there will be real peace.

Members of the graduating class of 1965, I am happy to report that there is a demand for your services. There are problems to be solved that are worthy of your best efforts. I would like to describe two of them for you.

The first problem is to reduce the gap between the developed and the developing nations of the world. The missionary programs of our churches, the Peace Corps, the international educational activities of our schools, colleges, and universities, and Government service all provide channels through which you can work. The ends to be achieved are the educational, scientific, medical, social, political, economic, industrial, and agricultural development of the countries of the world. Those in the Western World are a minority of the peoples of the world. If we reduce the gap sufficiently, we shall gain friends and allies, and the opportunity to work with them in building a better world in the future.

It would be possible to give many examples of the efforts being made by the United States to reduce the gap between this country and other nations, but two must suffice. The first example is an effort by the U.S. Government to strengthen the educational system of India. In 1953 the National Science Foundation began the development of its program of summer institutes for high school and college teachers of science and mathematics. These summer institutes were designed to modernize and strengthen the teachers' knowledge of the subjects they teach. The summer institutes proved to be remarkably effective. After the launching of Sputnik I, Congress provided funds for a massive expansion of the program of summer institutes. The funds appropriated by Congress paid all operating costs of the institutes and provided stipends for teachers to enable them to attend. These institutes have been one of the important factors contributing to the great improvement in the teaching of science and mathematics in our schools in the past 6 or 8 years. In the summer of 1964 the United States helped India with the organization and operation of a program of summer institutes for the teachers of India, and a similar program has been planned for the summer of 1965. Many professors have been sent from the United States to teach in these institutes. Since the United States does not have qualified professors to spare, the extent of the gift to India is clear. Those who have participated in the educational programs abroad have found their efforts interesting and rewarding. Both they and the United States have learned much from those they have attempted to help.

The second example concerns the efforts of the Ford Foundation to assist in the educational development of Latin America. In 1963 I was a member of a team of three who visited the National Engineering University in Lima, Peru, for the Ford Foundation. The trip resulted in a cooperative program between the National Engineering University and Iowa State University for the development of the former; the program is supported by grants from the Ford Foundation. This spring I was one of four department chairmen from the University of Kansas who visited the new University of Oriente in Cumaná, Venezuela, to plan a program in which my university will assist the university in Venezuela in the development of its departments of biology, physics, chemistry, and mathematics. Students and staff members will come to the University of Kansas from the University of Oriente to receive further education. Staff members from the University of Kansas will go to Venezuela to teach and to assist in the development of the four departments there. Members of the graduating class of 1965, you also will be asked to participate in the programs designed to improve the educational systems of the nations of the world—to assist in narrowing the gap between the developed and the developing nations of the world.

A second problem demands your attention: you must establish the rule of law—a world government of some kind—over the entire world. Regulation of the affairs of nations by law has become a necessity in the age of the hydrogen bomb. War must be banished. Some who have worked on the problem believe that the rule of law over the world can be established by the year 2000, that is, in your lifetime. The age of science, by producing the hydrogen bomb, has made the establishment of law a necessity. Furthermore, science has provided the communication facilities—radio, television, and the jet airplane—without which the administration of world law would be impossible. The establishment of a world government will certainly be difficult, but it cannot be considered impossible. The Common Market has made progress toward uniting the nations of Western Europe. France and Germany—mortal enemies for centuries—have played a dominant role in the establishment of the Common Market. Their example shows what can be done.

I have described two problems. The world calls for your help in solving these problems and others, now and throughout your lifetime. The world needs the energy, the enthusiasm, the imagination, and the vision of youth to help it in solving its problems. You will be called to serve in high and in low positions. Whatever your position, strive for greatness: create some new thing of beauty, formulate some new truth, contribute some new institution or pattern of organization to help the world, or solve some significant problem of science or medicine. In the words of James Russell Lowell.

"Greatly begin! though thou have time
But for a line, be that sublime—
Not failure, but low aim, is crime."

I repeat: you graduate in one of the great and awful periods of the world's history. Success in solving the problems that confront us will bestow matchless blessings on the peoples of the world, failure may be fatal for our civilization. Your problems, though great, are not insuperable. You must not be overconfident; you must not underestimate the abilities of those who have preceded you—many were giants. You cannot expect to win: continuing struggle, military stalemate, ever rising levels of performance are more characteristic of our age than success, victory, and established record. You will surpass the records of those who have preceded you, but those who follow you will in turn surpass your performance. You must have courage and determination and persistence. You must not give up. Edgar Allan Poe's poem entitled "Eldorado" describes the qualities demanded of those who search for a better world.

"Gaily bedight,
A gallant knight,
In sunshine and in shadow,
Had journeyed long,
Singing a song,
In search of Eldorado.

"But he grew old—
This knight so bold—
And o'er his heart a shadow
Fell as he found
No spot of ground
That looked like Eldorado.

"And, as his strength
Failed him at length,
He met a pilgrim shadow—
'Shadow,' said he,
'Where can it be—
This land of Eldorado?'

" 'Over the Mountains
Of the Moon,
Down the Valley of the Shadow,
Ride, boldly ride,'
The shade replied—
'If you seek for Eldorado.' "

You must have faith in God and in your fellow man. You must have faith that a better world is possible. You must believe that the quest for a better world is worth your best efforts. I cannot promise you fame or riches, but the knowledge that you have made a noble effort in the search for a better world will be a reward that will endure forever.

At this significant exercise, the benediction was pronounced by Rev. Joseph B. Flowers, pastor of the West Hampton Baptist Church, Hampton, Va., as follows:

BENEDICTION

(Delivered by Joseph B. Flowers, pastor of West Hampton Baptist Church, Hampton, Va., at graduating exercises, Mississippi College, May 30, 1965)

We come in the name of Jesus, Our Father, Thou God of the unending years, to pray that as these members of this graduating class, stand on the threshold of tomorrow dawning, God the Spirit will brood over, guide and protect.

When they come to the Red Sea crossings, and the barriers that stand between them and life's purposes and the achievement of much to be desired spiritual goals, loom awesome and tremendous, let the power of the Almighty roll back the waters so they might know in their own generation, the mighty works of God.

When on the weary, dusty road of life's pilgrimage they drink the bitter waters of disappointment, let the waters be sweetened with hope.

When the world builds her golden calves and calls them to dance around the man made, synthetic gods of our Western culture, and tempts them to conform to the moral code of an unregenerate age, call them back to the old time faith and to the unchanging truths of an immutable God.

When the lethargy of indifference to human need and the forgetfulness of their relation to eternity would make laggards of them all, let the silver trumpet of God, that called Israel to move on, sound in their hearts and call them also to advance.

So that—

"When the spirit clothed immortal
Wings its flight to endless day.

And they stand on that bright golden shore—

"This their song through endless ages
Jesus led me all the way."

And then, even as now, "Unto the King, eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory, forever and ever. Amen."

Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege to read the following newspaper item into the RECORD:

[From the Clarion-Ledger Jackson Daily News, May 30, 1965]

MC DEGREES GO TO 322 TODAY—BACCALAUREATE AT 11 A.M., COMMENCEMENT AT 5:30 P.M.

CLINTON.—Mississippi College will award degrees to 322 students Sunday afternoon as the college conducts its 139th commencement program.

Commencement activities got underway on Saturday with the annual senior breakfast sponsored by the alumni association. Following throughout the day were rehearsals, picture taking, reunion meetings for the classes of 1925 and 1955, and other related activities.

Today's activities will begin with a breakfast at 8:30 a.m. for the class of 1915 in the B. C. Rogers Student Center. Each returning member will be presented with a special "Golden anniversary" diplomat.

Later in the morning the graduates-to-be, their parents and friends, will attend the annual baccalaureate service in Nelson Auditorium starting at 11 a.m.

Dr. John D. W. Watts, president of the Baptist Theological Seminary in Ruschlikon, Switzerland, will deliver the sermon. Dr. Watts is a 1941 graduate of Mississippi College.

The invocation for the morning service will be given by Dr. Russell McIntire, pastor of the Clinton Baptist Church, while Rev. Alexander J. Bibighaus, pastor of the Park Avenue Alliance Church, Greenville, S.C., will pronounce the benediction. Rev. Bibighaus has a son among the graduates.

From 3 to 4:30 p.m. Dr. and Mrs. R. A. McLemore, president and first lady of the college, will hold their yearly President's Reception for members of the graduating class and their families. The reception will be in the Reserve Lounge of the student center building.

Commencement activities will climax with the conferring of degrees and the charge by the graduation speaker. The exercises will get underway at 5:30 on Robinson Field.

Dr. G. Baley Price, chairman of the department of mathematics at the University of Kansas and former president of the Mathematical Association of America, will be the graduation speaker. Dr. Price will be celebrating his 40th anniversary as a graduate of Mississippi College.

The commencement invocation will be given by Rev. Carey Cox, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Brandon. Pronouncing the benediction will be Rev. Joseph B. Flowers, pastor of the West Hampton Baptist Church, Hampton, Va. Reverend Cox has a daughter graduating, while Reverend Flowers has a son among the graduates.

Degrees and awards will be presented by Dr. McLemore, assisted by Dr. Howard F. Spell, academic dean of the college, and Dr. J. W. Lee, dean of the graduate school.

Honorary degrees will be conferred on two distinguished Mississippians: Rev. L. Gordon Sansing, secretary of evangelism for the Mississippi Baptist Convention, will receive the doctor of divinity degree, while Howard Cleland, president of Belhaven College in Jackson, will be presented the doctor of law degree.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD the program for the entire affair, the 139th annual commencement, which is as follows:

139TH ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT, MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE, MAY 29–30, 1965

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS FOR COMMENCEMENT

Friday, May 28, 1965:

At 12 noon, luncheon meeting, board of directors, Alumni Association.

Saturday, May 29, 1965:

At 8:30 a.m., annual alumni breakfast honoring 1965 senior class, B. C. Rogers Student Center.

At 10 a.m., senior rehearsal for graduating exercises, Nelson Hall Auditorium.

At 12 noon, reunion luncheons for classes of 1925 and 1955, B. C. Rogers Student Center.

Reception at the home of Dr. and Mrs. William H. Sumrall honoring class of 1925.

Sunday, May 30, 1965:

At 8:30 a.m., breakfast for class of 1915, President's Dining Room, B. C. Rogers Student Center.

At 11 a.m., baccalaureate service, Nelson Hall, Dr. John D. W. Watts, Ruschlikon—Zurich, Switzerland.

At 3–4:30 p.m., president's reception honoring seniors, guests, and alumni, Reserve lounge, B. C. Rogers Student Center.

At 5:30 p.m., commencement exercises, Robinson Stadium, Dr. G. Baley Price, Lawrence, Kans.

BACCALAUREATE

(Nelson Hall, Sunday morning, May 30, 1965, 11 o'clock, President McLemore, presiding)

Prelude: "A Festal Prelude," arrangement by Walther.

Processional: "Praise to God," Bach.

Invocation, Dr. Russell M. McIntire.

Solo: "Andante from Sonata III," Bach, Dr. Charles Knox, trombonist, arrangement by Knox.

Announcements.

Hymn: "Fairest Lord Jesus," Volkslieder.

"Fairest Lord Jesus, Ruler of all nature,
O thou of God and Man the Son, Thee will I cherish.
Thee will I honor, Thou my soul's glory, joy, and crown.

Fair are the meadows, Fairer still the woodlands,
Robed in the blooming garb of spring; Jesus is fairer,
Jesus is purer, Who makes the woeful heart to sing.

Fair is the sunshine, Fairer still the moonlight,
And all the twinkling, starry host; Jesus shines brighter,
Jesus shines purer, Than all the angels heaven can boast."

Sermon: Dr. John D. W. Watts, B.A., Mississippi College, 1941; Th. M., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1944; Th. D., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1948; president, Baptist Theological Seminary, Ruschlikon—Zurich, Switzerland.

Solo: "I know That My Redeemer Liveth (Messiah)" Handel, Henrietta Lee, soprano.

Benediction, Rev. Alexander J. Bibighaus.

Prayer hymn.

Recessional: March, Grieg, Miss Mary Berner, organist.

GRADUATING EXERCISES

(Robinson Stadium, Sunday Evening, May 30, 1965, 5:30 o'clock, President McLemore, Presiding)

Processional: "Trumpet Voluntary," Purcell.

Invocation: Rev. Carey E. Cox.

Address: Dr. G. Baley Price, B.A., Mississippi College, 1925; M. A. Harvard University, 1928; Ph. D., Harvard University, 1932.

Hymn: "O For a Thousand Tongues," article by Mason.

"O for a thousand tongues to sing
My great Redeemer's praise
The glories of my God and King,
The triumphs of His grace.
My gracious Master and my God,
Assist me to proclaim.
To spread through all the earth abroad
The honors of Thy name.
Jesus! the name that charms our fears,
That bids our sorrows cease;
'Tis music in the sinner's ears,
'Tis life, and health, and peace.

He breaks the power of canceled sin,
He sets the prisoner free:
His blood can make the foulest clean:
His blood availed for me."

Conferring of degrees and delivery of diplomas.

Conferring of honorary degrees.

Presentation of awards.

Recognition of classes 1905, 1915, 1925, 1935, 1945, 1955.

Alma Mater:

"Fairest of all is our dear Mississippi,
Rising in state as the crest of a hill,
Staunch as a rock is our dear Alma Mater,
Round her so noble our hopes ever live,
When in the future our hearts may be yearning,
For the bright scenes of our dear college youth,
Back to thy portals our memories turning,
Clear beams thy beacon of virtue and truth,
M. C., we hail thee, our dear Mississippi,
Queen of our hearts no foe shall alarm,
Faithful and loyal thy children will ever
Cherish thy memory, acknowledge thy charm."

Benediction: Rev. Joseph B. Flowers.

Recessional: "Festival March," Handel, Miss Mary Berner, organist.

Allen Organ Courtesy of Townsend Piano Co., Jackson, Miss.

CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES

May 30, 1965

Adkins, Loyd Hueston, B.A., Route 2, Raleigh.

Adkins, Mary Elaine Donald (Mrs.), B.A., Route 6, Box 110, Jackson.

Anderson, Alfred Lamar, B.M.E., Route 2, Forest.

Anderson, Linda Jean, B.S. Ed., Route 1, Box 313, Jackson.

Anderson, W. L., B.S., Route 1, Raymond.

Armstrong, Nancy Doris, B.A., Route 3, Box 128, Wesson.

Askew, John Henry, B.S., 405 21st Avenue, Hattiesburg.

Atkison, Ellen Delores, B.S., Box 424, Indianola.

Autrey, Anne Robin, B.A., 883 Cooper Road, Jackson.

Baddley, William Thomas, Jr., B.A., 206 North Monroe, Clinton.

Bailey, Roddie Festus, B.S., 249 Robin Road, Grenada.

Ballew, Judith Ann, B.A., 600 East McKinsey, Moberly, Mo.

Banks, Barbara Ann Clark, B.S. Ed., 709 Whitney, Memphis.

Barnes, Richard Grant, Jr., B.A., 1787 Cheswood, Jackson.

Barry, Carolyn Ann, B.A., 114 North 17th Avenue, Laurel.

Barlow, Kenneth Harold, B.S. Ed., P.O. Box 433, McComb.

Bass, Janice Marie, B.S. Ed., 806 Beauvoir, Columbia.

Baxter, Edward Lee, B.S., Box 233, State Line.

Bennett, Benny Joe, B.S., Route 5, Box 188A, Jackson.

Bibighaus, Alexander Joseph, III, B.S., 17 Bradley Boulevard, Greenville, S.C.

Birdsong, Dixie Faye, B.A., 2412 41st Avenue, Meridian.

Bishop, Walters Flowers, B.S., 4711 Clinton Boulevard, Jackson.

Blackwell, Claiborne Richard, Jr., B.S. Ed., 2337–24 Avenue, Meridian.

Blackwell, Marjorie Palmer (Mrs.), B.A., 123 North Denver Street, Jackson.

Blick, Lynette Agnes, B.A., 3011 Woodside, Jackson.

Bobo, Linda Sue McMullan (Mrs.), B.S. Ed., 737 Lakeland Drive, Apartment D–20, Jackson.

Booth, Linwood Hall, B.A., 3552 Cromwell, Jackson.

Boswell, Aubrey Allan, B.S., 380 Woody Drive, Jackson.

Boyd, James Cleveland, B.M.E., Route 1, Bogue Chitto.

Bozeman, Norma Jean, B.S., Route 1, Hazlehurst.

Bozeman, Thomas Earl, Jr., B.S. Ed., 231 Ainsworth, Hazlehurst.

Brandt, Robert Edward, B.A., 4323 Highway 80, West, Jackson.

Breeden, Roy Levern, B.S., 3565 Bowers, Jackson.

Breeland, Sylvia Jo, B.S. Ed., Route 5, Tylertown.

Broome, Edward Lewis, B.S., 224 Mount Salus, Clinton.

Brown, Gloria Margaret Nunley (Mrs.), B.A., 466 Boling Street, Jackson.

Brown, Frances Lorraine, B.S. Ed., 4207 Larchmont Drive, Jackson.

Brown, Syble Anne, B.S., Inverness.

Buchanan James Ellis, B.A., Blue Mountain.

Burgess, Jessie Harriet, B.S. Ed., Route 6, Box 235–A, Brookhaven.

Burnham, Carolyn Sue, B.S. Ed., 1216 Lamar, Yazoo City.

Burrage, Gloria Dean, B.S. Ed., Twin Pine Drive, Louisville.

Busby, James Hamilton, B.S., 1834 Saint Charles, Jackson.

Carter, Floydette Hawkins (Mrs.) B.A., Route 5, Box 188, Jackson.

Cartwright, Marilyn Elizabeth, B.A., 2566 Pennsylvania Avenue Extended, Warren, Pa.

Chapman, Kathryn Geneva Worsham (Mrs.) B.S., 1865 West Chase Street, Pensacola, Fla.

Chittom, Jimmy Harold, B.S., Route 5, Louisville.

Chittom, John Thomas, B.S., Box 312, Inverness.

Clark, Susan, B.S., 611 South 19th Avenue, Hattiesburg.

Clift, Shelby Jean, B.S. Ed., 1619 Dodson Drive, Atlanta.

Coggin, Larry Lee, B.S., 205 Ventura, Apartment 111 North Prentiss Street, Jackson.

Cole, Thomas Lyndal, B.S. Ed., Route 2, Crossville, Ala.

Coleman, Henri Lou, B.S., Route 4, Mendenhall.

Cooke, James Jerome, B.A., Route 2, Box 122, Vicksburg.

Cooper, James Virgil, B.A., 102½ Fairmount, Clinton.

Cooper, Sudie Frances, B.S., Star Route, Morton.

Corbin, Sheila Jean, B.S. Ed., Route 1, Box 474, Vicksburg.

Cotten, Lora Odessa Thompson (Mrs.) B.S. Ed., Box 505, Clinton.

Covert, Benjamin Whitworth, Jr., B.S., Box 1701, Meridian.

Covington, Judieth Annette, B.A., 8 Hurlbert, Mobile, Ala.

Cox, Robert Harvey, B.S., 1653 Robinson Street, Jackson.

Cox, Sarah Louise, B.A., Box 13, Brandon.

Cox, Virginia Ryan (Mrs.) B.A., 2267 Alta Woods Terrace, Jackson.

Cupit, Mary Frances, B.S. Ed., Route 2, Brookhaven.

Daniel, Donnie Ladd, B.S., Post Office Box 131, Silver Creek.

Davenport, James Guython, B.A., Murfreesboro, N.C.

Davis, Lynda Katherine, B.M.E., 1004 Chicago Avenue, Pascagoula.

Denham, Hilda Elizabeth, B.A., 2207 Third Avenue, Laurel.

Dennis, Joe Rex, B.A., 691 Roosevelt, Forest.

Dillon, Mona Gayle, B.S., Box 64, Tylertown.

Dodge, Sarah Jean Bradshaw (Mrs.) B.S., Route 2, Box 298, Vicksburg.

Donahoe, Estelle Touchstone (Mrs.) B.S. Ed., Route 1, Box 69, Crystal Springs.

Douglas, Lavoid Edwin, B.S., Route 1, Box 200, High Springs, Fla.

Doyle, Gary Raymond, B.S., 3111 NW., 16th Street, Miami, Fla.

Droke, Patricia Ann, B.S. Ed., 525 Mt. Pleasant Road, Hernando.

Dudley, Alice Carol, B.S. Ed., Old Highway 51 North, Winona.

Duncan, Nancy Geraldine, B.A., 3111 Chaucer Lane, Memphis, Tenn.

Dykes, Verl Parker, B.S. Ed., 239 Moss Avenue, Jackson.

Earnhart, George Robert, B.A., 316 Calhoun Street, Jackson.

Early, Judith Goodwin (Mrs.) B.S. Ed., 3204 Lee Street, Pensacola, Fla.

Easterwood, Claude Braxter, Jr., B.S., 5013 Tulane, Jackson.

Edmondson, Judy Geren, B.S. Ed., 6220 Robin Hill Road, Nashville, Tenn.

Ellington, Barbara Ann, B.S. Ed., 920 North 69th Avenue, Pensacola, Fla.

Ellzey, Ronald Harrison, B.S. Ed., Box 466, Collins.

Evans, Marguerite Karen, B.A., Rolling Fork.

Faust, Ruby Carolyn, B.S. Ed., 315 Creston Jackson.

Fife, Katherine Sawyer (Mrs.) B.S. Ed., Hermansville.

Fillingim, Eugene George, B.S., Route 1, Box 263, Pensacola, Fla.

Finch, James Edward, B.M., 1609 West Capitol, Jackson.

Fisher, Byron Eugene, B.A., 406 East Main, Clinton.

Flowers, David Stevens, B.A., 24 Briar Drive Hampton, Va.

Fountain, Carol Howard, B.S., 231 East First Street, Forest.

Fulton, William Edgar, III, B.S., Apartment L., Clinton Villa, Clinton.

Furr, James Carl., B.A., 234 Texas Avenue, Jackson.

Galloway, Jamie Frances, B.S. Ed., 1202 Winfield Street, Fayette, Ala.

Gardner, George Barry, B.S., 1203 Linden Place, Jackson.

Gary, Glenda Sue, B.S. Ed., Newton.

Gill, Thomas Wallace, B.A., Box 455, Lucedale.

Gordon, Emily Carol, B.A., 103 South New Prospect, Clinton.

Gordon, Saundra Elaine, B.A., 1014 Adkins Boulevard, Jackson.

Gore, Kathryn Dianne, B.M., 1600 South Joyce Street, Apt. C–212, Arlington, Va.

Green, Howard Louis, Jr. B.S., 514 Gallatin, Hazlehurst.

Gregory, Nan Hollingsworth, B.S. Ed., 455 Stillwood, Jackson.

Guy, Patsy Lynn, B.S., Ruth.

Hackler, Jerry Jack, B.S., 4128 El Paso, Jackson.

Hamil, Iris Lucille, B.S., Sebastopol.

Hand, Noah Shelton, Jr., B.A., 4041 Meadowlane, Jackson.

Harkins, Delma Fontaine, B.S., Route 3, Box 127, Kosciusko.

Hartzog, Fred, B.S., 731 Dorgan Street, Jackson.

Hastings, Elizabeth Lurabell, B.A., 171 Vassar Drive, Pensacola, Fla.

Haughton, Jerry Wayland, B.A., Route 9, Box 612, Pensacola, Fla.

Hawkins, Roy Dell, B.A., Route 1, Weir.

Henson, Joan Hannah, B.S. Ed., Itta Bena.

Henderson, Patsy Ruth, B.S., Box 82, Louin.

Herrington, Russell Arnette, B.M., 519 South Prentiss, Jackson.

Hewitt, William Clifton, B.S., 509 West Street, McComb.

Hill, Gloria Jeannette, B.S. Ed., 539 Erie Street, Wylam, Birmingham, Ala.

Hill, Rollin, B.A., Dorchester Apartments, 665 South Skinker, St. Louis, Mo.

Hinman, Elizabeth Burgin (Mrs.) B.A., 2435 Drummond Street, Vicksburg.

Holly, Geneva Brister (Mrs.) B.S. Ed., 221 Nichols, Greenwood.

Hooks, Brenda Lucile, B.A., 303 West Monroe, Greenwood.

Hosey, Hardin Irwin, B.S. Ed., Route 1, Box 908, Bentonia.

Howington, Andrew Coy, B.A., 206 North Monroe, Clinton.
Hubbard, Cecil Edward, B.A., Lyon.
Hubbard, Sandra Mabry (Mrs.) B.S., Derma, Miss.
Huff, Nancy Gayle, B.S. Ed., 321 Jonte Terrace, Pascagoula.
Hughes, Michael Lavelle, B.A., 732 West Porter Street, Jackson.
Humphries, Linda Lee, B.A., 3401 Byers Drive, Monroe, La.
Hurst, Sylvia Lenore, B.A., 261 South Denver, Jackson.
Jackson, Gayle Marie, B.A., 2047 West Long Street, Orlando, Fla.
Jackson, Johnnie Smith (Mrs.), B.S. Ed., Route 2, Brookhaven.
Jacob, Marynell, B.A., 906 South Court, Cleveland.
Jahnke, Susan Rae, B.S., 6235 Reber Place, St. Louis, Mo.
Johansen, Oscar Wilhelm, B.S., 3252 North State, Jackson.
Johnson, J. D., B.A., 206 West Madison, Clinton.
Johnson, Mathew Bowen, B.S. Ed., 1043 Wynwood, Jackson.
Johnson, Mary Jane McDonald (Mrs.) B.A., 123 South Denver Street, Jackson.
Johnston, Larry Drake, B.S., 1218 Maria Street, Memphis.
Jolley, Doris Ann, B.S., Ed., Route 3, Box 119–A, Ocean Springs.
Jones, Cynthia Camille, B.S., Inverness.
Jones, David Harold, B.S., 2419 Cherry, Vicksburg.
Jones, Gerald Milton, B.S., 238 Deville Apartments, 712 North Jefferson, Jackson.
Jones, Jean Elizabeth, B.S. Ed., Senatobia.
Jones, Mattie Pearl, B.S. Ed., Route 1, Tillatoba.
Jones, William Sims, B.S., 1520 Robinson Street, Apartment 3, Jackson.
Kabarrubias, Cornelia Paulette, B.S., Post Office Box 24, Florence.
Kayse, Margin Ray, B.A., 710 SW.—Fifth Avenue, Hallandale, Fla.
Kelly, Phillip Lamb, B.S., Route 2, Box 179, Itta Bena.
Kellum, James Lewis, B.A., Route 4, Gloster.
Kellum, Paulette Wolfe (Mrs.), B.S. Ed., Route 4, Gloster.
Kern, Helen Bickerstaff (Mrs.), B.S. Ed., Route 2, Box 4, Jackson.
Keveryn, Dennis Seay, Jr., B.S., 626 Beaverbrook Drive, Jackson.
Kinard, Virginia Neal, B.S. Ed., 377 Naples Road, Jackson.
King, Mary Ruth Wahlstedt (Mrs.), B.S. Ed., 2825 Hemingway Circle, Jackson.
Kirby, Jerry Mearl, B.A., Route 2, Box 244, Mendenhall.
Kirton, Angela Lopez (Mrs.), B.E. Ed., 3815 Hawthorn, Jackson.
Knight, Frances Kay, B.S. Ed., Route 6, Box 101, Meridian.
Kurtz, Jacqueline Mable, B.A., 1042 SW. Seventh Avenue, Delray Beach, Fla.
Laesser, Jerald Edwin, B.S., 7740 SW. 53d Avenue, Miami, Fla.
Land, Jane Carlyle, B.A., 701 Berkshire, Clinton.
Lee, James Larry, B.S., 3962 Hanging Moss, Jackson.
Lee, Thomas Drayton, B.A., Box 370, Forest.
Leung, Kit Mui, B.A., 2B Sai Yeung Choi Street, 2/F Kowloon, Hong Kong.
Littell, Max Baer, B.S., 1407 Garden Park Drive, Jackson.
Little, Stella Marie, 3745 Northview, Jackson.
Lloyd, Margaret Gwendolyn, B.S. Ed., 417 North Fourth Street, Hayti, Mo.
Luen, Lau Yiu, B.S., 7–G Victory Avenue, 3d Fl. Kowloon, Hong Kong.
Lunceford, Judith Clarilee, B.A., Box 216, Sardis.
McCleskey, Rolfe Warren, B.S., Post Office Box 552, Gulf Breeze, Fla.
McCormick, John Charles, B.S., 342 Cedarhurst, Jackson.
McPhail, Boyd Leland. B.S., 657 Ewing Street, Jackson.
Madden, James Wesley, Jr., B.S. Ed.. Box 126, Walnut Grove.
Malone, Charlotte Lane, B.S. Ed., Rt. 5, Carthage.
Martin, James Lee, B.S., 5002 Clinton Boulevard, Jackson.
Martin, Twyla Sue, B.S., Box 375, Steelville, Mo.
Mask, Jerry Dale, B.S., 3218 Susan Circle, Jackson.
Massey, Shirley Ann Sloan (Mrs.) B.S. Ed. 119 Wellington, Bessemer, Ala.
May, Gale Burke (Mrs.) B.S. Ed., 111 North Prentiss, Apartment 104, Jackson.
Mazur, Sandra Josette, B.S. Ed., 1857 Westover, Jackson.
Meadows, George Edward, B.A., Pelahatchie.
Megginson. William James, III, B.A., 858 Brandon Avenue, Jackson.
Merrill, John Wayne, B.A., 170 West Vest, Marshall, Mo.
Miller, Chester Lewis, B.S., 2421 Sarullo Circle, Greenville.
Miller, Sarah Patsy, B.A., 3119 North Harrison Street, Arlington, Va.
Mitchell, Ernest Harold, B.S., Raymond.
Mitchell, Seth Wayne, B.S. Ed., 204 North Monroe, Clinton.
Moak, Sandra Sue, B.A., 358 Woodie Drive, Jackson.
Moore, Patricia Irene, B.S. Ed., Box 334, Lambert.
Montgomery, Clarence Chester, B.M.E., Box 65, North Carrollton.
Montgomery, William Franklin, Jr., B.S., 1320 North West, Apartment 105, Jackson.
Morris, James Polk, III, B.S., 302 Avenue H, Kentwood, La.
Morris, James Riley, Jr., B.M.E., Box 291, Raymond.
Moseley, Lonnie Bondurant, B.S., Hoover Lake, Florence.
Mullins, Lillie Brenda, B.M., Box 294, Mendenhall.
Munday, Linda Sue, B.S. Ed., 1207 Farmer Street, Cleveland.
Myers, David Al, B.A., Box 92, Pinola.
Myers, Monroe Hugh, B.S., Route 2, Morton.
Nelson, Tedd Lee, B.A., 3121 Northwest 16th Street, Miami, Fla.
Nettles, Cecil Yvonne Pierce (Mrs.) B.S. Ed., Route 1, Smithdale.
Nettles, Charles Philip, B.S., Route 1, Smithville.
Newman, Janet Olivette Basford (Mrs.) B.S. Ed., 324 Windsor Drive, Jackson.
Norris, Bonnie Dean, B.S. Ed., Route 1, Box 127, Shaw.
O'Bryan, Everett Delmar, B.A., Box 213, Syracuse, Mo.
Oliver, Mary Kay, B.S. Ed., Highway 25, South, Amory.
Osborne, Ilar Willard, Jr., B.S., Tallulah, La.
Pahlman, Mary Ann, B.S., Route 1, Bay St. Louis.
Parker, James Earl, B.A., Pheba.
Parker, Thomas Moody, B.S., Hinds Junior College, Raymond.
Peacock, Janice Elizabeth, B.A., Stella Route, Box 268–C, Florala, Ala.
Pearson, Patricia Ann, B.A., Box 188, Tutwiler, Miss.
Peeples, Ethel Ann, B.A., Glendora.
Pennebaker, James Bruce, B.S., Route 1, Lucedale.
Pereira, Raymond Lawson, B.A., 101 East Main Street, Clinton.
Perkins, Mary Lynn, B.S. Ed., Prairie Point.
Perritt, Mary Louise Way (Mrs.) B.S. Ed., Box 313, Wesson.
Phillips, Cindy Ellen Segraves (Mrs.) B.S. Ed., Apartment 11, Clinton Villa, Clinton.
Pittman, Robert Edward, B.S., 607 Berkshire Street, Clinton.
Polk, Joyce Saulters (Mrs.) B.S. Ed., Box 93, Forest.
Polk, Noel Earl, B.A., 815 Williams, Picayune.
Polk, Sandra Fay, B.S. Ed., Route 3, Box 438, Columbia.
Powell, Martha Alice, B.S., 2015 Briarwood Drive, Laurel.
Powell, Thomas Allen, B.S., 912 Pine Lake Drive, Jackson.
Pugh, James Edwin, Jr., B.A. Box 822, Clinton.
Pugh, Martha Fortune, B.S., 1504 St. Charles, Jackson.
Putnam, Sandra Crowell, B.S. Ed., 276 B South Prentiss, Jackson.
Quick, Shelly Smyly (Mrs.) B.S. Ed., Box 211, Clinton.
Quisenberry, William Young, III, B.S., 309 East Main, Clinton.
Rainey, Cecil Baxter, B.S., 3434 Rainey Road, Jackson.
Rankin, John Shelton, Jr., B.A., 2672 Emerald Drive, Jackson.
Ratcliff, Frances Tabb (Mrs.) B.A., 323 Redwood Avenue, Jackson.
Ray, Bobby Rand, B.S., Ed., 115 West Lakeview, Clinton.
Ray, Mary Jane, B.S. Ed., 1455 East Meadowbrook Road, Jackson.
Ray, William Glen, B.S., Route 1, Box 13A, Terry.
Reed, Johnny Moore, B.S., 2438 Belverdere Drive, Jackson.
Reese, Frances Carolyn Norwood, B.S., 1315 North Jefferson, Apartment 214, Jackson.
Reynolds, Frances Alice, B.A., 264 Line Street, Grenada.
Roberts, Willie Ray, B.A., Route 3, Guntown.
Rodgers, Betty Gail, B.S. Ed., 444 College Street, Pontotoc.
Rodgers, Frances Gleaton (Mrs.), B.M., Box A, Delta Station, Jackson.
Rogers, Charles Keith, B.A., Silver Creek.
Rogers, Linda Joyce, B.A., Route 1, Carthage.
Rogers, Robert Hartley, B.S., 139 First Street, North, St. Petersburg, Fla.
Ross, Mary Elizabeth, B.A., 509 Merriweather, Jackson.
Russum, Ronald Kay, B.S. Ed., Route 2, Forest.
Saliba, Minnie Patricia, B.A., 1001 Williams Street, Pascagoula.
Sandifer, Theresa Gaile, B.S. Ed, 603 Avenue G, Bogalusa, La.
Sawyer, Byron Randolph, B.S. Ed., 130 Bon Air, Jackson.
Scarborough, James Jackson, B.A., 308 East Jefferson, Kosciusko.
Scales, Roy Williams, B.S., Roosevelt Street Park, Morton.
Schaffer, Frances Currey (Mrs.), B.S. Ed., 108 Second Avenue, Vicksburg.
Screws, Carolyn Ann., B.A., 240 Leonard Avenue, Chicago Heights, Ill.
Shaw, Herman Sidney, Jr., B.S., 1829 East Drive, Jackson.
Shearer, Hugh Kenneth, B.S. Ed., 5660 Heard, Jackson.
Sheppard, Ann Barker (Mrs.), B.S. Ed., Brandon.
Shirley, Fred Z., B.A., 4617 McRaven Road, Jackson.
Shivers, Billie Rae, B.S., 803 Franklin Drive, Clinton.
Simmons, Charles Thomas, B.S. Ed., 5045 Tulane Drive, Jackson.
Simmons, Jane Ellen, B.A., Box 407, Kosciusko.
Skinner, Ruth, B.A., Route 4, Box 185B, Union.
Simoneaux, Michel Saville, B.M.E., 2909 Bienville Avenue, New Orleans, La.
Simrall, Bell Newell, III, B.S., Redwood.
Smith, Doris Kay, B.S. Ed., Route 2, Box 252, Brookhaven.
Smith, Estelle, B.A., Route 3, Box 88, Brookhaven.

Smith, Jon David, B.S., 106 Donna Drive, Jackson.

Smith, Syble Katherine, B.A., 3182 Casann Cove, Memphis.

Speed, Roger Burkett, B.S., Box 274, Collins.

Spencer, Peggy Harrell (Mrs.) B.A., Terry.

Stephens, Carl Clinton, Jr., B.S., 1740 Smallwood, Jackson.

Stewart, Helen Patricia, B.S., Gillsburg Road, Osyka.

Stewart, Michael Scott, B.A., 3434 McKinley Street, Lake Charles, La.

Stovall, Clement Ewing, Jr., B.S., Post Office Box 668, Clinton.

Stowers, Lewis Hunter, III, B.A., 363 Northside Circle, Jackson.

Strum, Marvin Kent, B.A., 156 Alabama Drive, Jacksonville, Ark.

Sudbeck, Paul Thomas, B.S., Route 3, Box 451, Florence.

Sumrall, Dudley Denton, B.A., Route 6, Meridian.

Swartz, Martha Ann, B.S., 828 15th Avenue, Laurel.

Tate, Jerry Clayton, B.A., West.

Terry, Bobby Sweede, B.A., 406½ College Street, Clinton.

Thompson, Curtis Webb, Jr., B.S., 125 Texas Avenue, Parkside Apartments 104, Jackson.

Trotter, Henry Alexander, B.S. Ed., Route 2, Bolton.

Tullos, Jerry Earl, B.S. Ed., Route 2, Box 213, Jackson.

Tutor, Barbara Dean West, B.S. Ed., 915 East Lynn Circle, Greenville.

Tweedy, Nancy Jo, B.A., 5216 Meadow Oaks Park Drive, Jackson.

Van Devender, Carolyn Lee, B.S. Ed., 369 Naples Road, Jackson.

Versen, Gregory Ryan, B.A., 3101 Laughlin, Vicksburg.

Walker, Brent Durr, Jr., B.S., Route 1, New Hebron.

Walker, Frances Simpson (Mrs.), B.A., 3125 Drummond Street, Vicksburg.

Walker, Thad Oscar, B.S., Box 304, Baker, Fla.

Wallace, Ethel Mae, B.S., Pontotoc.

Walther, James Glenn, B.A., Route 1, Box 814, Cantonment, Fla.

Watkins, Belva Jane, B.A., 1103 Second North, Vicksburg.

Watson, Tenry Barnes, B.S., Box 22, Brandon.

Weaver, Dianne, B.S., Box 84, West.

Wesson, Thomas Wilson, B.S., Route 1, Tupelo.

West, Karen Jeannette, B.S. Ed., 626 North Union Place, Tulsa, Okla.

Westbrook, Kenneth Ray, B.A., P.O. Box 225, Yazoo City.

Whatley, Gwindelin Jenell Crimm (Mrs.), B.S. Ed., Route 1, Forest.

White, Jane Ellen, B.A., Box 306, Mendenhall.

Wiggers, Bert Edward, B.A., 1312 33d Street, Columbus, Ga.

Wilkinson, Linda Taylor (Mrs.) B.S. Ed., 1819 Raymond Road, Jackson.

Williams, Jacquelyn Jean, B.A., Hughesville, Mo.

Williams, Van Wagner, III, B.S., Box 269, Pontotoc.

Wolfe, Mary Frances, B.S. Ed., Route 1, Box 140, Silverhill, Ala.

Wooldridge, Judith Ann, B.S. Ed., Box 428, Hayti, Mo.

Wright, Peggy Jo, B.S. Ed., 159 Semmes Street, Canton.

Yeary, Patricia Kay Patterson (Mrs.), B.A., Box 44, Mount Hermon, La.

Yeary, Ronald Lee, B.A., 1216 Hilltop Drive, Cleburne, Tex.

Younge, Ethel Charlene, B.S., 533 Frederica, Jackson.

McNeel, Harry Brantley, Jr., B.S., 2746 Old Canton Road, Apartment A-14, Jackson.

HONORS PROGRAM GRADUATES

With high honors

Howard Green, Jr., "The Granny Knot and the Square Knot," mathematics, Prof. W. E. Strange.

David H. Jones, "A Limited Study of Plausible Reasoning," mathematics, Prof. W. E. Strange.

With honors

Henri Lou Coleman, "The 'Weakening' of Cauchy's Convergence Theorem," mathematics, Prof. W. E. Strange.

William James Megginson III, "The Political and Journalistic Significance of the Gazette of the United States—National Gazette Dispute, 1791–1793," history, Prof. Jack W. Gunn.

Richard G. Barnes, Jr., "James Baldwin: A Writer's Retreat from Art," English, Prof. Louis E. Dollarhide.

William Montgomery, "The Effect of Epinephrine and Norephinephrine on the Cardiovascular and Respiratory Systems," biology, instructor Charles E. Price.

Donnie Lad Daniel, "The Mississippi Economy and the Development Process," economics, Prof. D. Gray Miley.

Ilar W. Osborne, "The Revenue Act of 1964 and Its Effect on the Economy of the United States," economics, Prof. D. Gray Miley.

Jerald Edwin Laesser, "Residential Home Construction in the United States," economics, Prof. D. Gray Miley.

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREES OF MASTER OF ARTS AND MASTER OF EDUCATION

Sunday, May 30, 1965

Master of arts

Eleanor Foster Terry (Mrs. Bob), 406½ East College, Clinton.

B.A. Mississippi College, Clinton.

Graduate major: English.

Thesis: Representative children in William Faulkner's fiction.

Master of education

Helen Taylor Barlow (Mrs. J. L.), 703 West Northside Drive.

B.S. Mississippi College, Clinton.

Graduate major: Elementary education.

Helen Fisher Beall (Mrs. V. R.), Route 5, Box 222, Winnsboro, La.

B.A. Greenville College, Greenville, Ill.

Graduate major: Social studies.

Jean Flinn Carroll, 506 Taylor, Jackson.

B.S. Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss.

Graduate major: Secondary education (mathematics).

Linda Elizabeth Cooper, 4019 Pinehill Drive, Jackson.

B.A. Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss.

Graduate major: Social studies.

Carroll Talmadge Crow, 1307 South Walnut, Tallulah, La.

B.S. Arkansas A. & M. College, College Heights, Ark.

Graduate major: The school principalship.

Ford Dawson, 501 Berkshire Street, Clinton.

B.S. Boston University, Boston, Mass.

Graduate Major: The School Principalship.

Charlen Dumas Godard (Mrs. C. G.), 4627 Estelle Drive, Jackson.

B.A. Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss.

Graduate Major: Elementary Education.

Nelda Denson Hardage (Mrs. T. W.), 220 Colonel Circle, Jackson.

B.S. Mississippi College, Clinton, Miss.

Graduate Major: Secondary Education (Mathematics).

Thomas Wayne Lee, Louise.

B.S. Delta State College, Cleveland, Miss.

Graduate Major: Combined Sciences and Education.

Chiri Meesukh, 88 Slakhin Rongmuang, Bangkok, Thailand.

B.A. University of Thammasat, Bangkok, Thailand.

Graduate Major: The School Principalship.

Carolyn C. Moore (Mrs. Wayne), 223 East Lakeview Drive, Clinton.

B.M.E. Georgetown College, Georgetown, Ky.

Graduate major: elementary education.

Marjean Patterson, Box 311, Clinton.

B.A. Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City, Tenn.

Graduate major: guidance.

Bobby Jean Shoops (Mrs. R. C.), Route 2, Yazoo City.

B.S. Delta State College, Cleveland, Miss.

Graduate major: elementary education.

Mary Turk Shows (Mrs. O. H.), Box 34, Ellisville.

B.S. University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Miss.

Graduate major: elementary education.

Margie E. Vaughan (Mrs. W. L.), Route 1, Yazoo City.

B.M. Belhaven College, Jackson, Miss.

Graduate major: elementary education.

RECIPIENTS OF HONORARY DEGREES

May 30, 1965

Doctor of laws

Mr. Howard J. Cleland, Jackson, Miss.

Doctor of divinity

Rev. L. Gordon Sansing, Jackson, Miss.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. PURCELL), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. ST. ONGE, for Monday, September 13, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. FARNUM (at the request of Mr. DINGELL), for Monday, September 13, 1965, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. YOUNGER (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 15 minutes, on September 16.

Mr. CALLAWAY, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLFE (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa), for 20 minutes, on Wednesday, September 15.

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa), for 30 minutes, Thursday, September 16.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. MAILLIARD to revise and extend remarks made during consideration of S. 1903 and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama in four instances.

Mr. BOW.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. BROCK.

Mr. CONTE.

(The following Members (at the request of SMITH of Iowa) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. DINGELL.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 76. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Heiland;

S. 135. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Kam Oi Hu;

S. 136. An act for the relief of Angel Lagmay;

S. 192. An act for the relief of Maria Liberty Burnett;

S. 440. An act for the relief of Jose L. Rodriquez;

S. 454. An act for the relief of Lee Hyang Na;

S. 517. An act for the relief of John William Daugherty, Jr.;

S. 521. An act for the relief of Maria Gioconda Femia;

S. 573. An act for the relief of Dr. Sedat M. Ayata;

S. 584. An act for the relief of Ming Chup Chau;

S. 586. An act for the relief of Maria Tsillis;

S. 614. An act for the relief of Evangelia Moshou Kantas;

S. 653. An act for the relief of George Paluras (Georgios Palouras);

S. 703. An act for the relief of Kimie Okamoto Addington;

S. 828. An act for the relief of Cha Mi Hi;

S. 853. An act for the relief of Charles N. Legarde and his wife, Beatrice E. Legarde;

S. 861. An act for the relief of Alva Arlington Garnes;

S. 879. An act for the relief of Kim Sa Suk;

S. 971. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elena Guira;

S. 1084. An act for the relief of Shu Hsien Chang;

S. 1170. An act for the relief of Chung J. Clark;

S. 1186. An act for the relief of Kris Ann Larsen;

S. 1209. An act for the relief of Specialist Manual D. Racelis;

S. 1736. An act for the relief of Jennifer Ellen Johnson Mojdara; and

S. 1919. An act for the relief of Laura MacArthur Goditiabois-Deacon.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 725. An act to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters;

H.R. 727. An act to provide for the administration of the Coast Guard Band;

H.R. 1402. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Rosendo Barahona;

H.R. 1892. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Richard G. Smith, U.S. Air Force, retired;

H.R. 2305. An act for the relief of Zenaida Quijano Lazaro;

H.R. 3039 An act to amend section 1006 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned, under certain conditions, to make payment of pay and allowances to members of an armed force under his jurisdiction before the end of the pay period for which such payment is due;

H.R. 3128. An act for the relief of Angelo Iannuzzi;

H.R. 3684. An act for the relief of Maj. Alexander F. Berol, U.S. Army, retired;

H.R. 5989. An act to amend section 27, Merchant Marine Act of 1920, as amended (46 U.S.C. 883);

H.R. 6431. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain forms of nickel be admitted free of duty;

H.R. 7779. An act to provide for the retirement of enlisted members of the Coast Guard Reserve;

H.R. 8027. An act 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;

H.R. 8218. An act for the relief of Walter K. Willis;

H.R. 8333. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a program of cash awards for suggestions, inventions, or scientific achievements by members of the Armed Forces which contribute to the efficiency, economy, or other improvement of Government operations;

H.R. 8351. An act for the relief of Clarence L. Aiu and others;

H.R. 8469. An act to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8761. An act to provide an increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

H.R. 9854. An act for the relief of A. T. Leary;

H.R. 10586. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10775. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 504. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 15, 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:

1576. A letter from the Assistant Executive, OASA (R. & D.), Office of the Assistant Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting report on research and development contracts during the period January 1, 1965, through June 30, 1965, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1577. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report that it conducted no commissary activities outside the continental United States during fiscal year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 596a; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1578. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases, as of June 30, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1190. An act to provide that certain limitations shall not apply to certain land patented to the State of Alaska for the use and benefit of the University of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7919. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska: Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9515. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 553. Resolution providing additional funds for further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 68, 89th Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 987). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of Conference. H.R. 4750. An act to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes; (Rept. 988). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee of Conference. S. 618. An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli; (Rept. No. 989). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 579. Resolution for the consideration of S. 2042, a bill to amend section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 990). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 580. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 10232, 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, water systems, and waste disposal 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 991). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 581. A resolution for the consideration of H.R. 6519, a bill to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), as amended, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 992). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. S. 1516. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 9830. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize reimbursement to a State or political subdivision thereof for sidewalk repair and replacement or to make other arrangements therefor; with amendment (Rept. No. 994). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 3351. A bill to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 9734. A bill to amend the Northern Pacific Halibut Act in order to provide certain facilities for the International Pacific Halibut Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 996). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee of Conference. H.R. 8283. An act to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; (Rept. No. 1001). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1623. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1958, relating to a continuing study by the Secretary of the Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource; without amendment (Rept. No. 1002). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 7608. A bill to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 997). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 9351. A bill to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota; with amendment (Rept. No. 998). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ULLMAN: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 9587. A bill to provide for the free entry of a Craig counter-current distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.; without amendment (Rept. 999). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 9588. A bill to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1000). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 11049. A bill to amend section 18(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide an orderly procedure for adjudicating the propriety of bank mergers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 11050. A bill to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 11051. A bill to clarify and amend the act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to extend the life of certain vessels under the provisions of such act from 20 to 25 years, approved June 12, 1960 (Public Law 86–518, 74 Stat. 216); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 11052. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide mortgage insurance, and authorize direct loans by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, to help finance the cost of constructing and equipping facilities for the group practice of medicine or dentistry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11053. A bill to prohibit banks from engaging in the business of personal property leasing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11054. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11055. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 11056. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 11057. A bill to amend chapter 93 of title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit unauthorized disclosure of information acquired in connection with certain security clearance investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 11058. A bill to prohibit the use of appropriated funds by officials or agencies of the Government for the purpose of influencing the vote in any referendum or election held pursuant to an act of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11059. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 11060. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations and volunteer rescue squads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 11061. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 11062. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 11063. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11064. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 11065.A bill to amend section 18(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide an orderly procedure for adjudicating the propriety of bank mergers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 11066. A bill to authorize wartime benefits under certain circumstances for peacetime veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 11067. 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. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11068. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11069. A bill to amend section 18(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide an orderly procedure for adjudicating the propriety of bank mergers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.J. Res. 662. 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. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 663. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Con. Res. 509. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on crime in the District of Columbia and House Report No. 176, entitled "District of Columbia Crime;" to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H. Con. Res. 510. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to refer the matter of a study of a plan for providing a new supply of water for the Great Lakes to the International Joint Commission; 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. BURKE:

H.R. 11070. A bill for the relief of the Troubadors Drum & Bugle Corps of Bridgeport, Conn.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 11071. A bill for the relief of Cheng Pong Sing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 11072. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Woman's Party, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 11073. A bill for the relief of Brother Albin Larwa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 11074. A bill for the relief of Alexis E. Lachman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11075. A bill for the relief of Gdala Wierzbicki and Rosa Wierzbicki; to the Committee on the Judicary.

By Mr. MACKIE:

H.R. 11076. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irma Veres and her son, Tibor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 11077. A bill for the relief of Miss Benigna S. Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11078. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Di Maggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

270. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Jeanne Struck of Novalo, Calif., and others, relative to seating the congressional delegation from the State of Mississippi, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1965

(Legislative day of Monday, September 13, 1965)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers and our God, whose mercy is like the wideness of the sea, amid all life's changing scenes, make us ever conscious of Thy overshadowing presence. In spite of the hellish gravitation of evil, we thank Thee for the unquenchable impulse toward the high and holy Thou hast planted within us.

Open our eyes, we pray, to see and touch the hem of Thy garment not just on the outer rim of the universe where whirling orbs seem always to chorus, "forever singing as they shine, the hand that made us is divine," but also in the human love which hallows our individual lives and sanctifies our homes and shines in the kindly light which guides our steps.

Gird us, with all our shortcomings to be exemplars of a love which at its best bears witness to Thee and which alone is the balm to burn barriers away and to cure the hurt of the world.

We ask it in the name of that One through whose life there flows Thy love for all mankind. Amen.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1965

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Following the recess, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 9811.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs, and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield me 3 minutes on the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 13, 1965, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 14th semiannual report of the Office of Minerals Exploration, Geological Survey, from the Secretary of the Interior as prescribed by section 5 of the act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its territories, and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 14, 1965.*

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY ASTRONAUTS COOPER AND CONRAD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, I wish to inform the Senate that Astronauts Lt. Col. L. Gordon Cooper and Comdr. Charles Conrad, Jr., and members of their families will visit the Senate at about 4 o'clock this afternoon. It is anticipated that at that time there will be a recess of some duration.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance, the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Special Ad Hoc Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the remainder of my time, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar to the International Atomic Energy Agency only.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.