namely, the Washington Post, the Washington Evening Star, and the Washington Daily News. It is logical that if the Evening Star and the Washington Daily News were to shut down, in all probability the Washington Post would show a greater circulation and probably a greater profit, because where there were three newspapers there would be only one, and naturally that one would fare better than the rest. But, insofar as the reading public of the District of Columbia is concerned, where are they? Are they better off? The answer, of course, is obvious.

I do not believe that the disappearance of the woolen industry is the best and safest thing for America.

"Pulling the Wool"—this is the type which was used in the editorial—has been the story of pulling down the walls of woolen mills, which meant bread and butter jobs to Americans, and defense capability for American soldiers. We need American prosperity to protect our friends in this troubled world. We must not destroy American defenses—and American strength. For we would then be destroying ourselves.

We have abundant testimony that second only to steel as a defense essential is the American textile industry.

I am for the textile industry because I am for American security

In conclusion, the subject which this editorial brings up is the point that we have been trying to make over and over again.

Today, we have the tragic situation of Vietnam. Who knows—and God forbid—we may have another such situation tomorrow. Yet we are leaning heavily and more heavily upon imports which are being produced—woolens, blankets, clothes, and cloth—to go on the backs of our American boys fighting in Vietnam. We are relying more and more upon these imports.

All I am saying to the administration and the people of this country is that they had better beware, because the more we eliminate spindles, the more we eliminate combs, the more we eliminate looms, the less likely will American domestic industry be able to meet the peaceful and military requirements of this great Nation of ours.

Mr. President, the reason why our mills are humming today is that there are fewer mills than there used to be. We are relying more and more upon imports. The aim must be to limit imports to a reasonable level, as was advocated by President Johnson.

I believe that the writer of the editorial is badly misinformed. He is greatly misinformed because he is arguing that the domestic industry cannot meet today's military demands. That may be true, but the answer and the reason for it are simple: We have allowed the American textile industry to go down the drain.

EXHIBIT 1

LIST OF WOOL TEXTILE BIDDERS AS OF JANUARY 8, 1951—NOW OUT OF BUSINESS

Centredale Textile Co., Pascoag, R.I.
Merrimac Mills, Methuen, Mass.
Crown Manufacturing Co., Woonsocket, R.I.
Ardross Worsted Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
New Jersey Worsted Mills, Garfield, N.J.
Waskanut Worsted Corp., Farnumsville, Mass.
Wm. H. Prendergast Mills, Bridgeton, R.I.
Rovner Worsted Mills, Philadelphia, Pa.
Verdun Manufacturing Co., Woonsocket, R.I.
Walther Manufacturing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
Diana Worsted Mills, Philadelphia, Pa.
Forstmann Woolen Co., Passaic, N.J.
The Bell Co., Worcester, Mass.
A-L Textile Co., Woonsocket, R.I.
Lorraine Manufacturing Co., Pawtucket, R.I.
Wortex Mills, Philadelphia, Pa.
Paragon Worsted Co., Providence, R.I.
Seymor Woolen Mills, Pawtucket, R.I.
Botany Mills, Inc., Passaic, N.J.
George Mabbett & Sons, Plymouth, Mass.
Shetucket Worsted Mills, Baltic, Conn.
Merlon Worsted Mills, West Conshohocken, Pa.
Roy Weaving Co., Brooklyn, N.Y.
Ferdinand W. Mostertz & Sons, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dunn Worsted Mills, Woonsocket, R.I.
Lincolnsfield Mills, New York.
Kanmak Textiles, Inc., New York.
Shamokin Woolen Mills, New York.
Guerin Mills, Woonsocket, R.I.
Bachmann Uxbridge Worsted Corp., Uxbridge, Mass.
Alcott-Alcalay Brothers, New York.
Metcalf Brothers & Co., New York.
Princeton Worsted Mills, Trenton, N.J.
American Woolen Co., New York.
Samuel Hird & Sons, Inc., Garfield, N.J.
Putnam Worsted Mills, Putnam, Conn.
Goodall Fabrics, Inc., New York.
William Whitman Co., Inc., New York.
Yorkshire Worsted Mills, Lenni, Pa.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW MORNING AT 10 A.M.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, in accordance with the order of Thursday, February 3, 1966, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) under the order of Thursday, February 3, 1966, the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 8, 1966, at 10 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture, the words of Jesus, John 14: 1: *Ye believe in God, believe also in Me.*

Almighty God, as we worship Thee and commune with Thee in prayer, may we have our faith deepened that in the warmth of Thy love, our minds may be open to Thy wisdom and a clear vision of Thy truth.

We beseech Thee to endue us with keen insight to see, with courage to obey, and with power to endure and may Thy presence be with us as a light upon the lonely way which we must walk.

Grant that in following Thy steps and obeying the Master's words, we may learn that the truth of Thy divine fatherhood is sure and all transfiguring.

May we be delivered from the cynicism of our time and the clouds of bitterness which it is casting over the earth and help us to believe in the great revelation that Jesus made of life that Thy grace can forgive, cleanse, and redeem all mankind.

In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 3, 1966, was read and approved.

CERTIFICATIONS TO THE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to sundry resolutions of the House agreed to on February 2, 1966, he did on February 3, 1966, make certifications to the U.S. attorney, District of Columbia, as follows:

House Resolution 699: The refusal of Robert M. Shelton to produce certain pertinent papers before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 700: The refusal of Calvin Fred Craig to produce certain pertinent papers before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 701: The refusal of James R. Jones to produce certain pertinent papers before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 702: The refusal of Marshall R. Kornegay to produce certain pertinent papers before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 703: The refusal of Robert E. Scoggin to produce certain pertinent papers before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 704: The refusal of Robert Hudgins to produce certain pertinent papers before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 705: The refusal of George Franklin Dorsett to produce certain pertinent papers before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow the Judiciary Committee be permitted to sit during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO—HERO OF TWO WORLDS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, Americans and Poles alike celebrate the anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Polish soldier and statesman. His unswerving dedication to the great cause of national independence for both the United States and Poland earned him the title of "hero of two worlds."

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Thaddeus Kosciuszko was a man of action, of great courage, and of an undying belief in the right of every nation to be free. When the American Revolution erupted, he hastened to this continent to fight for American independence. To the cause he brought great skill as an engineer and great personal valor, and in 1783 a grateful United States of America extended to him the privilege of American citizenship and the deepest thanks of the American Congress.

His task in America done, Kosciuszko returned to his beloved Poland to join in the struggle to prevent the third and final partition by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. The Polish patriots, led by General Kosciuszko, defeated the Russians at Raclawice and ably defended the beautiful city of Warsaw but were at last overcome by the superior numbers of the enemy. In the battle of Maciejowice on October 10, 1794, the gallant Poles were defeated and their leader was taken prisoner by the Russians. Released 2 years later, General Kosciuszko dedicated the rest of his life to efforts to obtain Polish independence.

Mr. Speaker, the torch of freedom has been passed to our generation of Americans and Poles. We gain inspiration from the great hero Thaddeus Kosciuszko and on this day reconsecrate our lives to the great cause of freedom to which he gave his best.

PROPOSAL TO FRIGHTEN NORTH VIETNAMESE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I also read in the public press over the weekend the suggestions of the gentleman from California on how to scare the North Vietnamese out of the war.

My father always used to tell me that the best test of somebody's prescription was if he was willing to use it himself. I would be willing to furnish two large plastic aces of spades about the size of a man, and if the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] would care to make himself a walking sandwich, as you sometimes see on the sidewalk, one on the front and one on the back, and walk right into Hanoi, he might be able to scare Ho Chi Minh to death.

THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. WELTNER. 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. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, it may be that Americans, in order to fulfill our obligations in southeast Asia, will someday need to choose between guns and butter. But surely we are not yet come to the point of choosing between guns and milk for the school lunch program. Yet the proposed budget appears to be making that choice for us, and making the choice against milk for schoolchildren.

It is proposed to cut $82 million from the next year's appropriation. This would mean a reduction of about $1 million for Georgia alone, and would increase the price of milk to schoolchildren to 10 cents a half-pint.

Mr. Speaker, the milk program has been one of the most successful and helpful of Federal school activities. It should, in my opinion, be one of the last, not one of the first, to go.

I have urged reconsideration of this cut, and invite my colleagues to join in an effort to save the school milk program.

VIRGINIA HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. MARSH. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of Members of the House that the month from January 19 to February 22 is Virginia Heritage Month.

I would also like to thank the Speaker for using the gavel he is using in presiding over the business of the House today. In connection with Virginia Heritage Month this gavel was presented this morning to the Speaker on behalf of the Governor of Virginia, the Honorable Mills Godwin, by the Harrisonburg High School Distributive Education Club—DECA—a local chapter of the Distributive Education Clubs of America and by the industrial cooperative training group of that same school.

These are the young people who in connection with their high school training are also learning skills of marketing and distribution relating to retailing and wholesale work in the service industries. Some receive training in technical and skilled jobs. They are visiting in Washington and on behalf of the Governor presented to the Speaker this gavel which was made from wood taken from Monticello, the estate of Thomas Jefferson near Charlottesville, Va.

It is a real pleasure to see these young people, who are not only developing their educational skills but also their technical and job skills in order to better prepare them for work in the adult world.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 12563, the Asian Development Bank bill.

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

There was no objection.

UNION OFFICIAL OPPOSES REPEAL OF 14(b)

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, although the fight to retain section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is now being waged in the other body, I continue to receive letters each day from Iowa citizens expressing their opposition to repeal of the section.

These many letters offer further evidence that Iowans in overwhelming numbers favor retention of section 14(b). I was particularly pleased to receive last week a letter from an Iowa labor official in which he expressed his thanks for my vote last year against the repeal legislation. Following are excerpts from his revealing letter:

> I was voted into these (union) offices on a secret ballot and my views are well known on my stand on 14(b). A secret ballot among the total membership I am sure would show that they also favor the retention of 14(b).
>
> The full-time paid union officials on the local levels take their instruction from above or this is my opinion of the situation. Privately they quite often take the opposite side of their superiors.

There can be no doubt that an overwhelming majority of the people of Iowa support retention of section 14(b) and the State's right-to-work law. They look to the other body in the hope that their wishes will prevail.

UNITED STATES SHOULD COUNSEL WITH VIETNAM ALLIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are all watching hopefully the strategy conferences in Honolulu between President Johnson and Premier Ky of South Vietnam.

It is most unfortunate, however, that the chiefs of state of Australia and South Korea—the only other nations with combat troops in South Vietnam—are not taking part.

Had the President urged that our combat allies be represented, this action would have demonstrated our desire for help at the strategy table as well as on the battlefield. Perhaps it would have encouraged other nations to send combat troops.

Recently Secretary of State Rusk pleaded vainly before the NATO Council in Paris for aid in Vietnam. In doing so, he echoed the distress of the American people. We are all concerned because we are receiving so little help, and worried about what lies ahead if we try to police the world virtually alone.

We can more reasonably expect help in carrying out war plans if we call our allies into council when plans are made. Counseling with Australia and South Korea at this time would be a step in the right direction, and hopefully would lead to broadened free world aid in the defense of South Vietnam.

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on any day this week other than today for the Speaker to recognize a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12563) to provide for participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank, a bill which has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that granting this unanimous-consent request would enable the House to take up under suspension of the rules perhaps tomorrow a bill to create a brand new international bank to go along with the existing multiplicity of international banks and other lending agencies? I am one of those Members of the House who has never seen a copy of the bill. I have had no opportunity to read the hearings or to know anything about the bill. Yet the bill would embark the United States upon the expenditure of perhaps billions of dollars.

Mr. ALBERT. This, of course, would not preclude the gentleman from reading the bill or the report, because I have specifically requested that consideration of the bill not be made in order until tomorrow or some later day in the week.

Mr. GROSS. Does the distinguished majority leader think that 40 minutes of debate on a bill of this magnitude is adequate?

Mr. ALBERT. In view of the background, I would think, since it was unanimously reported without opposition from either side of the committee it would be adequate. Further, if I may so advise the gentleman since we are trying to expedite the legislative business, we would like very much not to have any legislative business during the latter part of the week, and we would ask the indulgence of the gentleman, because many Members are interested in getting this matter disposed of as early as possible.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I inquire of the distinguished majority leader if this unanimous-consent request is granted, would this be programed on Tuesday or Wednesday and not on Thursday or Friday?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct in his assumption.

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

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

Mr. PATMAN. May I suggest to the gentleman that the hearings on this bill were conducted by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] who is chairman of the subcommittee. Everyone was heard who desired to be heard. In fact, they even solicited people who were in opposition to any kind of foreign aid to come before the committee to testify and one did come. The hearings were full and complete. Of course, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State and all the people who normally appear came and in addition a gentleman who has quite a reputation in the world as a financier on government budgets and things like that. He is very much in favor of the bill. I think the record is as near perfect as any record can be made. As it affects the situation at this time in southeast Asia, I believe a Member would have a feeling if he sees this bill and reads it, and I understand the gentleman says that he has not read the bill, but it was completed several days ago and will be available with the report tomorrow morning. So there will be the report and the bill available. This is a step in the direction of peace, I will say to the gentleman. It will do more in the direction of peace in southeast Asia so the experts believe than any other bill that we have before the Congress. It does not mean the outlay of very much money, certainly not at this time.

The committee that heard the testimony on this, the subcommittee, on both sides, Republicans as well as Democrats, were unanimously for it, and at the full committee meeting every person there was in favor of it. There was not a dissenting vote. Since it has been unanimously reported by those who know what the bill contains, I hope the gentleman will not feel constrained to object.

Mr. GROSS. If I believed for one fraction of a second there was a possibility that passage of this legislation would bring about peace in southeast Asia, I certainly would not object. But I would like to have the benefit of the expert testimony that the gentleman says the committee has had from the financiers, the State Department, and others. If the report is available tomorrow morning, then the granting of this unanimous-consent request means that the bill could be called up tomorrow afternoon, if I understand the gentleman. I want to help expedite the business of the Congress because I want to get out of here early this year, but not at the expense of voting for or against legislation about which I have no knowledge because it is being too hurriedly considered.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Would the gentleman go along if I changed my request to read, "may be brought up Wednesday of this week?"

Mr. GROSS. That would help.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify my request accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MINIMUM WAGE LAW—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8126) to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MULTER, ABERNETHY, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. NELSEN.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

DISPLAY OF THE FLAG AT THE GRAVE OF CAPT. WILLIAM DRIVER

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 12) to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day at the grave of Capt. William Driver in Nashville, Tenn.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make a simple inquiry. In similar bills there has been included language, omitted from this resolution, which would prohibit the flag from being flown between sunset and sunrise unless it is illuminated. I have been furnished with a copy of a proposed amendment to House Joint Resolution 12 which states, "the flag may not be flown pursuant to the authority contained in this act unless between the hours from sunset to sunrise it is illuminated."

I should like to ask the gentleman proposing or sponsoring the resolution today if it is the intent to offer that amendment in practically those words.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman's request, there is at the desk an amendment which I propose to call up and ask to have adopted, as the gentleman has outlined.

Mr. HALL. In other words, the flag may not then be flown unless it is illuminated from dusk until dawn?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. HALL. If that is the case, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

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

H.J. RES. 12

Whereas Captain William Driver, an American sea captain, gave the name "Old Glory" to the flag of the United States which is a name revered by all patriotic Americans;

Whereas Captain William Driver died in Nashville, Tennessee, on March 3, 1886, and is buried in the City Cemetery in Nashville, Tennessee, and his grave is a shrine visited by many tourists;

Whereas Post Numbered 5 of the American Legion in Nashville, Tennessee, has undertaken to erect a flagpole at Captain Driver's grave which will be lighted at night; and

Whereas the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first General Assembly of the State of Tennessee has memorialized Congress to grant permission to the city of Nashville, Tennessee, to fly the flag of the United States at Captain Driver's grave twenty-four hours each day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any rule or custom pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States as set forth in the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America", approved June 22, 1942 (36 U.S.C. 171–178) authority is hereby conferred on the appropriate officer of the city of Nashville, Tennessee, to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for twenty-four hours of each day at the grave of Captain William Driver located in the City Cemetery, Nashville, Tennessee.

With the following committee amendments:

On pages 1 and 2, strike all "Whereas" clauses.

On page 2, line 13, after the period, add the following sentence: "The flag may not be flown pursuant to the authority contained in this Act during the hours from sunset to sunrise unless it is illuminated."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

ACQUISITION OF THE ANSLEY WILCOX HOUSE, BUFFALO, N.Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2600) to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site.

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

H.R. 2600

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior shall acquire on behalf of the United States the real property described in section 2 of this Act, known as the Ansley Wilcox House, which real property is of national historic significance as the place in which Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President of the United States on September 14, 1901, following the assassination of President William McKinley. The Secretary shall maintain and preserve such property as a national historic site for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States.

SEC. 2. The real property referred to in the first section of this Act is more particularly described as follows:

All that tract or parcel of land, situate in the city of Buffalo, county of Erie, State of New York, and beginning at a point in the east line of Delaware Avenue distant 110 feet southerly from the southerly line of land of Catharine Marie Richmond, recorded in Erie County clerk's office in liber 247 of deeds at page 167; running thence easterly a distance of 110 feet;

Running thence southerly a distance of 60 feet to a point in the north line of land of Morris Michael, recorded in Erie County clerk's office in liber 531 of deeds at page 335; running thence easterly and along the north line of land of the said Morris Michael 64 feet more or less, and continuing easterly on a line extended from the land of Morris Michael a further distance of 174 feet more or less to the westerly line of Franklin Street; running thence northerly along the westerly line of Franklin Street 110 feet; running thence westerly 134 feet; running thence northerly and parallel with Franklin Street 59.51 feet more or less to a point distant 40 feet more or less easterly from the southeast corner of lands of Amelia Stevenson, recorded in Erie County clerk's office in liber 669 at page 299;

Running thence westerly 40 feet to the southeast corner of lands of the said Amelia Stevenson and continuing westerly in a line along the south line of the land of Catharine Marie Richmond a further distance of 174 feet more or less to the easterly line of Delaware Avenue; running thence southerly along the easterly line of Delaware Avenue 110 feet to the place of beginning.

And being subject to an easement as contained in a lease agreement dated January 6, 1959, between the landlord and the Liberty Bank of Buffalo covering a driveway ramp and automobile parking privileges, together with the right of ingress and egress to Delaware Avenue and Franklin Street, as contained in said lease.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, after line 16, add the following new section:

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than $250,000 for the acquisition of the real property described in section 2 of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

BURIAL BENEFITS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11006) to extend the statutory burial allowance to certain veterans whose deaths occur as a result of a service-connected disability.

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

H.R. 11006

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 902(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Where a veteran dies—

"(1) of a service-connected disability; or

"(2) who was (A) a veteran of any war; (B) discharged from the active military, naval, or air service for a disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty; or (C) in receipt of (or but for the receipt of retirement pay would have been entitled to) disability compensation;

the Administrator, in his discretion, having due regard to the circumstances in each case, may pay a sum not exceeding $250 to such person as he prescribes to cover the burial and funeral expenses of the deceased veteran and the expense of preparing the body and transporting it to the place of burial. For the purpose of this subsection, the term 'veteran' includes a person who died during a period deemed to be active military, naval, or air service under section 106(c) of this title."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under existing law, a burial allowance of $250 is paid to survivors of peacetime veterans who were discharged from active service for a service-connected disability, or who were in receipt of, or but for the receipt of retirement pay would have been entitled to, disability compensation. In the case of a veteran who has service during a period of war, the allowance is paid regardless of whether or not he had a service-connected disability.

The immediate effect of the legislation would be to authorize the burial allowance where a veteran has not applied for disability compensation but who nevertheless died of a service-connected disability.

The formal Veterans' Administration request for this legislation was based upon an individual case where the veteran died the day following his separation from service, while en route from his place of separation to his home. He was not a wartime veteran and was not discharged for a service-connected disability. Had he lived long enough to file a claim for disability compensation, his survivors would have been eligible for the $250 burial allowance inasmuch as his death was attributable to a period deemed to be active service, since an individual is considered to be on active service after his discharge and until he reaches his home if he is traveling by the most direct route. Under the circumstances, however, the burial allowance could not be paid.

This proposal was formally requested by the Veterans' Administration, and will correct the inequity described above.

The increase in costs resulting from enactment of this proposal would be minimal.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. The bill will extend the $250 statutory burial allowance authorized by existing law to certain veterans who are denied such benefits because of the technical application of the law. I am confident that it was not the intent of Congress to deny the statutory burial allowance to any veteran whose death would be service connected, except for the fact that he had not yet had the opportunity to file a claim for service connection.

Existing law permits the grant of service connection for the death of any veteran while on route to his home following separation from military service. The statutory burial allowance, however,

is dependent upon the receipt of, or at least an application for, disability compensation while the individual is alive. Therefore, those veterans who have served during a period other than wartime and are killed while on route to their home following separation, are not entitled to the statutory burial allowance unless they filed a claim for compensation prior to separation from military service. This legislation will correct this situation and will insure that any veteran who dies as a result of a service-connected disability will be eligible for the burial allowance.

The Veterans' Administration supports this legislation and estimates that the cost would be minimal. I urge its passage.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today there are numerous veterans' bills to be considered. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on all bills considered today.

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

There was no objection.

DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11007) to provide statutory authority for the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assume the duties of Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator, or during a vacancy in that office, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 11007

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 210 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection (d) to read as follows:

"(d) There shall be in the Veterans' Administration a Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs who shall be appointed by the Administrator. The Deputy Administrator shall perform such functions as the Administrator shall designate and, unless the President shall designate another officer of the Government, shall be Acting Administrator of Veterans' Affairs during the absence or disability of the Administrator or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Administrator."

(b) The catchline of such section 210 is amended by adding "; Deputy Administrator" at the end thereof.

(c) The analysis at the head of chapter 3 of such title 38, regarding section 210, is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: "; Deputy Administrator."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 212(a) of such title 38 is amended by inserting immediately after the word "delegate", in the first sentence thereof, the following: ", or authorize successive redelegation of,".

(b) Such section 212(a) is further amended by inserting ", redelegations," immediately after the word "delegations" in the second sentence thereof.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides statutory authority for the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assume the duties of the Administrator during the latter's absence or disability or during a vacancy in that office. It would also authorize the Administrator to permit the redelegation of authority he may now delegate under existing law.

This proposal was formally requested by the Veterans' Administration and past experience has demonstrated the need for its enactment.

There would be no additional expenditure of public funds resulting from the enactment of this proposal.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. The bill will provide statutory authority for the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assume the duties of the Administrator during his absence or disability or during a vacancy in that office. This legislation was requested by the Veterans' Administration and there would be no cost involved.

Under existing practices, the Deputy Administrator assumes the duties of Administrator during his absence or during a vacancy in that office. Because certain statutes require the specific action of the Administrator as opposed to the Acting Administrator, the daily and routine functioning of the Office of Administrator is severely handicapped. This legislation merely gives to the Deputy Administrator, acting as the Administrator, the same statutory authority as is provided for the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. I urge its approval.

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

BENEFITS DURING HOSPITALIZATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11747) to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs if there is any basis for estimating the cost to the Veterans' Administration or the Treasury of the United States if this bill is passed?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would say that the cost estimate would be very difficult. When a man goes into the hospital, after 6 months the amount of money he receives is reduced because of the fact that the taxpayers are paying for his hospitalization. We found that it was very difficult to administer, the way it is intended, without making men stay out of the hospital who should come back in.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Veterans' Administration really to simplify an existing program, but the cost is very difficult to estimate. It should certainly be very small.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pursue this one step further.

I do understand, and I am generally sympathetic on this question of hospital administration and/or paying full or reduced allowances while in the hospital. I understand that this is to deter the veterans from leaving the facility before they have received maximum benefit of hospital and medical care, as well as reestablishing a new 6-month period for consideration for pay purposes by establishing a readmission within 6 months.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. Will the effect of this be a reduction or an increase in the expense to the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. As far as cost to the Veterans' Administration, I should think it would be a reduction. As far as money going to the veteran is concerned, the probability is that it will be the same.

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

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. On the point the gentleman was making earlier, as to the cost of this bill, the committee did inquire into it, and as the chairman has pointed out we are told that it was a matter extremely difficult to compute, but it was thought to be very small. I think the committee is unanimously of the opinion that it would be a very small additional cost.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, may I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

May I ask both the chairman and the ranking minority member if they are quite certain that this will appreciably affect the deterrent value of the basic law insofar as excessive bed utilization is concerned?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman is a doctor, and I should think his opinion would be better than mine. Mine is "yes."

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I subscribe to that.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

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

H.R. 11747

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of section 3203(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting the comma immediately after the words "upon a succeeding readmission for treatment or care" and inserting "within six months from the date of such departure,".

SEC. 2. Section 3203(f) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting the comma immediately after "admitted to hospitalization" in the third sentence and inserting "within six months from the date of such departure,".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall also apply to cases in which pension eligibility is subject to the provisions of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under existing law, the monthly compensation or retirement pay payable to a veteran without dependents, who is being furnished hospitalization or domiciliary or nursing home care by the Veterans' Administration, is reduced by one-half but not below $30 a month beginning the 1st day of the 7th calendar month following the date of admission. The same requirement applies to pension received by those veterans who are receiving this non-service-connected benefit under laws in effect prior to the enactment of Public Law 86–211, the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959.

When the veteran is discharged from the hospital, the amount withheld is paid to him in a lump sum in most instances. If the veteran leaves the hospital against medical advice or as a result of disciplinary action, the amount withheld from him may not be paid until 6 months after his departure.

The law also provides that where the patient is readmitted following a discharge against medical advice or as a result of disciplinary action, reduction shall be effective immediately upon his being readmitted from the date of readmission regardless of the time between episodes of hospitalization.

The bill would provide that the immediate reduction of withheld benefits following discharge against medical advice or as a result of disciplinary action shall apply only when the readmission occurs within 6 months following prior termination of the hospitalization or institutional care. Readmission after 6 months would be treated like an original admission in determining the time when the reduction or discontinuance of benefits will commence.

The measure was introduced at the formal request of the Veterans' Administration, and that agency advises that the additional cost to the Government will be small.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11747. This bill will liberalize the conditions under which monetary benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans into a Veterans' Administration hospital. Under existing law, monthly compensation and certain pension benefits, in the case of a veteran with no dependents, are reduced in half but not below $30 after 6 months of continuous hospitalization. If the veteran subsequently receives a disciplinary discharge or leaves the hospital against medical advice, when he is readmitted, the reduction in monthly benefits is effective immediately. This bill will not disturb the policy relating to the initial period of hospitalization, but will prevent the reduction of monthly benefits until the expiration of 6 months continual hospitalization, when readmission occurs more than 6 months following the initial discharge.

Section 2 of the bill will extend the same liberalization with reference to veterans in receipt of the aid and attendance allowance. Thus, in either situation, a readamission after 6 months would be treated like an original admission in determining the time when reduction or discontinuance of monthly benefits will commence.

The Veterans' Administration supports this measure and estimates that the additional cost will be minimal. I urge its approval.

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

PAYMENT OF TRAVEL EXPENSES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11748) to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care.

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

H.R. 11748

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 111(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Payment of the following expenses or allowances in connection with vocational rehabilitation, counseling, or upon termination of examination, treatment, or care, may be made before the completion of travel:

"(1) the mileage allowance authorized by subsection (a) hereof;

"(2) actual local travel expenses;

"(3) the expense of hiring an automobile or ambulance, or the fee authorized for the services of a nonemployee attendant."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, appropriate sections of title 38, United States Code, authorize the payment of actual necessary travel expenses, or a mileage allowance in lieu thereof to any person, to or from a Veterans' Administration office in connection with vocational rehabilitation and counseling pursuant to the war orphans educational systems program, as well as for the purpose of treatment, examination, or case. The prepayment of the mileage allowance in lieu of actual travel expenses is authorized by existing law, and this proposal would authorize similar action with respect to: First, round trip local travel expenses; second, expenses of hiring an automobile or ambulance; and third, the fee incurred by employment of a nonemployee attendant.

The legislation was formally requested by the Veterans' Administration, which advises that its enactment will result in no additional cost to the Government.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11748. This bill will permit the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility in connection with medical examination, treatment or care or vocational rehabilitation and counseling. Existing law authorizes the prepayment of a mileage allowance in lieu of actual travel expenses. To obtain actual travel expenses, however, a veteran must wait until services rendered have been completed and the travel has actually been accomplished. In many instances, disabled veterans do not have sufficient funds for completing their travel. This legislation will alleviate hardship to certain seriously disabled veterans by permitting the payment of actual travel expenses in advance in the same manner as a mileage allowance is presently paid. I urge its approval.

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

BROKERS' FEES FOR VA PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11927) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit deduction by brokers of certain costs and expenses from rental collections on properties acquired under the veterans' loan programs.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would again like to interrogate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Would this bill if passed not allow the brokers, either large or the small, to put up their money before the fact rather than after the fact as far as vouchers for services rendered and expenses incurred are concerned?

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I want to know why it is not a good idea for vouchers covering services rendered to be submitted before the fact. I can understand that in certain instances this can become weighty to some of the small operators. But I think it is still a good business principle. Will we obviate that by the passage of this law?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. All I can say to the gentleman is that this would save administrative costs. I also say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Tennessee, a member of the committee, has made a thorough study of this bill.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, a member of the committee.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. At the time this bill was presented I was the only one in the committee to offer any objection. I will be glad to answer.

I have gone into it, and I have a detailed letter from the Veterans' Administration as to the manner in which they

will administer this program. I think it is a good bill. It will save a lot of work on the part of the Veterans' Administration. It will cause local contractors to secure more work in repairing the properties of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's opinion, and I am impressed by the work he has done on it. I am not particularly interested in saving the Veterans' Administration, as an arm of the Government, a lot of work if it is going to be to the detriment of the taxpayers' money.

Let me see if I can rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of both of the gentlemen. In sum, it might be like this: In your opinion, would the Veterans' Administration pursue as avidly after the fact a check on vouchers that would no longer be required for services rendered and expenses incurred with the idea of reclaiming unjust funds paid out as they would if these vouchers are required before the fact?

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. Yes. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Here is what the bill would do.

First. Thousands of vouchers have to be processed to pay independent contractors for work, labor, and services furnished.

Second. Small contractors who of necessity can only operate on a cash basis and who must be paid upon completion of their work cannot afford to extend credit and cannot compete for Government work orders.

Third. Brokers are obliged to call in large contractors from other areas who are financially able to wait for payment.

Fourth. The Veterans' Administration is deprived of the benefit of the quality performance of local contractors who cannot afford to extend credit.

Fifth. Many management brokers do not have available financial resources necessary to advance payment.

In order to effectuate management improvement, and to avoid any loss on the part of the Administrator, strengthening of existing safeguards will be effected along the following lines:

First. Any management broker authorized to make these disbursements will have to be bonded.

Second. The present authority vested in the broker to expend up to $50 for emergency repairs only, remains unchanged.

Third. Brokers will be authorized to pay for those repair items not of an emergency nature, only when the regional office had previously authorized the services to be performed.

Fourth. Management brokers would be required to establish special bank accounts which would be utilized for deposit of rental income and disbursement of authorized expenses.

Fifth. Rental collections would be required to be deposited promptly with a copy of the deposit slip transmitted to to the Veterans' Administration.

Sixth. Management brokers would furnish VA with a monthly report itemizing all rentals collected and expenditures, and furnish the VA with a check for the net balance due.

Seventh. Brokers' reports would be supported by receipted vouchers and canceled checks.

Eighth. Veterans' Administration employees acting in the capacity of property management representatives, or other loan guaranty personnel as designated, who routinely visit and inspect VA owned properties and management broker operations would make such audit as might be required for full compliance on the part of the brokers.

Enactment of the proposed measure should largely eliminate thousands of vouchers presently processed for individual payments. The anticipated procedure would be more in line with conventional real estate management practices and would parallel procedures of the Federal Housing Administration which presently conducts these activities in a similar manner. Furthermore the greater numbers of local contractors who would be able to participate in the repair program conducted by the Veterans' Administration would promote prompter services and higher grade performance.

The proposed measure refers only to VA-owned properties and does not affect the rights or liabilities of veterans.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I may say to the chairman of the committee that I am perfectly satisfied, in view of the last explanation, and withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

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

H.R. 11927

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (6) of section 1820(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Without regard to section 3617, Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 484), or any other provision of law not expressly in limitation of this paragraph, the Administrator may permit brokers utilized by him in connection with such properties to deduct from rental collections amounts covering authorized fees, costs, and expenses incurred in connection with the management, repair, sale, or lease of any such properties and remit the net balances to the Administrator."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill would give the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs authority to permit brokers to deduct from rental collections fees for services rendered and authorized expenses incurred in connection with the managing of Veterans' Administration owned properties which had been acquired under the loan guaranty and direct loan programs. Under existing practice where a property is taken over by the Veterans' Administration, the property is given to a broker for management. This broker collects rent and performs the necessary property maintenance or arranges for such maintenance. Payment is presently made under regular vouchering procedures, and in some instances brokers advance maintenance expenses such as decorating, grass cutting, snow removal, and so forth. In other instances brokers with small accounts cannot feasibly make such advances.

The Veterans' Administration desires to permit payment for these services out of rents received from these properties, and proposed that such action be taken to the Comptroller General, who advised that such a procedure was not authorized, while not questioning the desirability of the proposal.

The Veterans' Administration advises that enactment of this proposal will simplify procedures in financing and managing of the acquired properties, and will result in some savings of administrative costs.

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

MEDICAL EDUCATION IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11631) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is another veterans' bill with which I am personally familiar, as it involves hospitalization. I would like to know if there is any information in this bill—which was not one that was also listed for suspension—as to whether or not this will lead to the general amalgamation and care under the recently passed medicare of Federal beneficiaries as well as civilian beneficiaries. There is a great tendency to federalize all of the hospital care-giving services. This will be aided and abetted by the medicare law, whether you are referring to medical care of civilian dependents of uniformed military personnel or medical care, H.R. 6565, which passed this body last year, for those over 65 years of age under the social security tax. In the opinion of the gentleman from North Carolina, is there any trend or tendency foreshadowed in the passage of this bill that would lead to lack of discrimination in care of those veterans for their general care under medicare applications or a Federal medical service application?

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, I would say none whatsoever.

The purpose of this bill, my own bill H.R. 11668, which is identical, is to write into law the situation which presently exists, and that is to recognize the function of education in the VA hospital system.

Mr. HALL. As the gentleman from North Carolina no doubt knows, the present VA hospital system is giving a portion of the medical education of the veterans, a portion of medical education, to one-half of the doctors who are being educated in the country today.

The primary functions, of course, of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration is the care and the treatment of patients. But in addition to that they take on the functions of the research that is going

on, as authorized, and also these educational programs.

In recent years the VA has entered into agreements with 86 of the medical schools in the country and 87 of the administration's hospitals of the country are affiliated with these medical schools. They work together and treat patients together.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I believe the country recognizes the advantages of such a relationship, and insofar as I know—and certainly I believe that we on the committee would know if there were any practices insofar as this bill is concerned designed to bring about the situation which the gentleman from Missouri describes. I believe our committee is now and has been since I have served on it, very diligent in trying to ferret out any type of nefarious plan such as that which the gentleman from Missouri suggests which would in any way detract from or depreciate the quality of the medical attention which is given to our veterans.

This bill simply writes into law that which is going on at the present time.

By hard work, ingenuity, and personal sacrifice this country has become the richest nation in the history of the world. The people have every right to enjoy the fruits of their labor, and it becomes our solemn obligation in the legislature to remove all man-made barriers to their legitimate pursuit of happiness. Everyone knows that health is one of the most highly valued components of happiness and security for the individual. We are, therefore, determined to achieve the best possible protection for the health of the American people. We know that we have the physical and economic resources to support this objective. It only remains for us to devise a national plan under coordinated public and private administration and financing. Legislation enacted by the 89th Congress has opened the way to this long dreamed of national goal, but a great deal more remains to be done. We have expressed our ideals and our desires, but the task of implementation will be a long and difficult one.

The first, the most obvious and substantive need is the recruitment and training of sufficient health service personnel to carry out the programs for which we have given authority and to which we have allocated funds. Without these people, we are certain to lose both our resolutions and our resources. To accomplish this objective, I have suggested that we make use of the Veterans' Administration system of hospitals and clinics. This system constitutes the largest centrally administered patient care facility in the Nation; it has well established relationships with practically all medical schools in the country as well as with hundreds of general universities; and it has on-going programs of education and training that can readily be expanded to accommodate many more students than are presently under the existing limits of authority and funding. In collaboration with medical schools and universities presently affiliated with the Veterans' Administration, an expansion of programs to train the much-needed health service personnel can be accomplished at a fraction of the cost that would be required if similar training resources were to be newly created. Our situation is like that of a family with a new baby; it is much less expensive to build another room on the house than it is to build and maintain a second house.

Moreover, the Veterans' Administration with the support of its university affiliates is uniquely qualified to expand its training functions in the areas of greatest need. No one will deny that physicians are in short supply, and we want to continue our efforts to improve this situation. But an even more immediate and compelling problem is the supply and ancillary and technical personnel who support and assist the physician and, therefore, make his services more efficient and make them available to a larger number of people. It is now estimated that a comprehensive health service team requires approximately 20 ancillary personnel to 1 physician; and this does not take into account the considerable numbers of people who must concern themselves with the administrative problems, fiscal problems, physical plant maintenance, and other nonmedical supportive functions.

The Veterans' Administration as a national resource for the training of health service personnel in areas of critical shortage has been largely ignored, or, as I have said on previous occasions, it is not being used in the most efficient and productive manner. It is important that our expanded efforts in the medical care field have the support of trained ancillary and technical personnel who have been developed in an environment that reflects the needs of the population that will ultimately be served. Again, I would point out the unique suitability of the Veterans' Administration hospitals and clinics to provide this training environment. In very many respects, the VA medical programs have anticipated the health related aspects of our Great Society legislation. Medical services that we have long provided for the more than 22 million American Veterans are very much like the type of services that we now propose to extend to other segments of the population. VA programs, in collaboration with medical schools and universities, have set a splendid example of high-quality health services recognized and acclaimed not only in this country but throughout the world. It is inconceivable that these highly developed and experienced services would be overlooked as a model for new programs that are being created for the future. It is equally incredible that this largest Federal unit in the medical care field will continue to be used at less than its optimum productivity in the field of health service manpower training at a time of such obvious need. In our zeal for innovation and the conquest of new social objectives, it is irrational to neglect existing accomplishments and valuable resources that are already at hand.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his answer.

I understand that the purpose of this bill is to write into law teaching as well as research and training and education which is, of course, the direct corollary of teaching.

I must say that I am familiar with this. I helped to write the original bill that set up the deans' committees, or asked the Veterans' Administration and the Congress to do it, at one time when we had a great backlog of people coming out of the medical department of the armed services back in 1945, 1946, and 1947, who needed specialized training. There are those in this day and age that now allege that we have more specialists than we have practitioners. I am not in general concurrence with this, but there are others who say that in order to keep this function going wherein time has overtaken events, a high degree of the specialists trained is no longer required; that the deans' committee or the deans encourage the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration hospitals to accept patients that might well jeopardize caring for others in the general practice in order to "maintain a balanced training program"; for example, traumatic cases off of the streets as the result of accidents and injury wherein ordinarily they would not supply care until such time as the other requirements for hospital admission, other than trauma, and the good Samaritan attitude had been invoked. This would be especially true where private non-Federal hospitals were available to do the job.

In the opinion of the gentleman who chairs the full committee, or the subcommittee, does the gentleman believe this will place the veterans hospitals in competition with private hospitals at a time when they are also going to be sorely taxed because of the abuse factor involved under the medicare law?

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, no, sir, I do not believe it will. I do not believe it will change the veterans' situation in any way from what it is today. It will make for a more cooperative arrangement.

I might add while I am on my feet that it is estimated this bill also will not involve any unnecessary costs. There will be no cost impact on the 1966 budget as a result of the passage of this bill. In this connection I quote from the VA report to the committee dated January 18, 1966:

> The enactment of legislation of this type would not of itself result in any increase in the training activities of our Department of Medicine and Surgery and, thus, would not have any necessary cost impact upon the budget of this agency. The importance of this legislation rests, as stated, upon the desirability of giving statutory recognition to all three elements of a complete hospital program; namely, treatment, research, and education.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am keenly aware of that.

Mr. Speaker, I only have two other questions. The primary purpose, of course, of the Veterans' Administration hospital is—and I believe we are all in agreement on this—medical care and treatment of the veterans. If teaching and if research and education become too great a factor other than medicare, is there any fear of detriment to the care of the veterans, based on the fact that

the Administrator, and I presume his medical director of veterans affairs, will have sole authority to appoint these committees without having written into the law any coordinating or corollary factor with the medical schools or hospitals?

In other words, this is not a one-way street, and we would not want this to affect the medical care of veterans, which I am sure the medical and surgical department plus the VA hospital directors will see to, but if we need a deans' committee to enhance medical training and education, why not let them have something to do in the naming of the committee?

Mr. KORNEGAY. Of course, in naming any committee somebody has to have the responsibility for it. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs felt that the administrator has the responsibility for the overall veterans' program, and the committees established will advise him and the chief medical director should have that authority. The deans' committees are policy committees on a local basis or regional basis as I understand it. The committee would have the duty of reporting back to the Administrator and then when it gets back here, the situation would be the same as we have so often, and that is looking to and relying upon the Administrator to carry out an effective program.

Mr. HALL. I repeat to the gentleman, there is no question in my mind but what these committees have served a great purpose in the past. I'm in favor of legalizing them. Furthermore, there is no question in my mind but what our system of Veterans' Administration hospitals should be in research and training and education as well as in actual hospital care—but certainly not to the detriment of the latter.

Let me ask the gentleman one final question. Is there any intention known to your subcommittee or to the committee on the part of the Veterans' Administration to set up a medical school or schools of its own under this authority or any other authority? You will recall at one time this was actually debated on the floor of the House.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Not to my knowledge or to the knowledge of any other member of the committee, I am so advised.

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

Mr. KORNEGAY. I will include as a part of my remarks, a table prepared by the Veterans' Administration showing the potential expansion of this program and I emphasize potential, not scheduled:

Potential expansion under H.R. 11631

	Estimated on-duty, fiscal year 1966	Estimated trainee and consultant salary costs	Projected on-duty, H.R. 11631	Projected trainee and consultant salary costs, H.R. 11631	Increase in on-duty, H.R. 11631	Increase in trainee and consultant salary costs, H.R. 11631
A. TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR PERSONS ENROLLED IN UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS OR IN POSTGRADUATE TRAINING						
Medical resident (noncareer)	4,800	$17,723,000	5,400	$20,671,000	600	$2,948,000
Medical resident (career)	459	5,485,000	500	6,195,000	41	710,000
Medical school student (nonpaid, primarily clinical clerkship)	9,000	(1)	11,000	(1)	2,000	
Medical intern	193	787,000	500	2,112,000	307	1,325,000
Consultants for medical residency and internship	(2)	[3] 2,000,000	(2)	2,500,000	(2)	500,000
Dental resident (noncareer)	45	238,000	123	673,000	78	435,000
Dental resident (career)	15	179,000	15	179,000		
Dental intern (noncareer)	40	162,000	125	528,000	85	366,000
Dental intern (career)	20	173,000	50	448,000	30	275,000
Dental school student (nonpaid, primarily clinical clerkship)	400		1,000		600	
Consultants for dental residency and internship	(2)	42,000	(2)	92,000	(2)	50,000
Dental hygienist (nonpaid)	452		1,500		1,048	
Dental assistant (nonpaid)	220		1,000		780	
Dental laboratory technician (nonpaid)			80		80	
Social work (stipend)	378	1,133,000	1,255	3,803,000	877	2,670,000
Social work (nonpaid)	142		475		333	
Psychology	810	3,428,000	3,225	16,196,000	2,415	12,768,000
Consultants for psychology training	(2)	275,000	(2)	1,138,000	(2)	863,000
Pharmacy (resident and intern)	36	170,000	52	244,000	16	74,000
Consultants for pharmacy training	(2)	15,000	(2)	50,000	(2)	35,000
Occupational therapy	317	248,000	402	314,000	85	66,000
Other P.M. & R. therapies (nonpaid)	773		1,006		233	
Dietetics	88	411,000	177	835,000	89	424,000
Medical technology	60	109,000	412	755,000	352	646,000
Certified laboratory assistant			200	240,000	200	240,000
Pathology assistant			27	150,000	27	150,000
Pathology fellowship			25	461,000	25	461,000
Student nurse (nonpaid)	4,270	[4] 294,000	7,350	[4] 515,000	3,080	221,000
Graduate nurse (nonpaid)	314		500		186	
Nursing service administration resident	1	2,000	3	7,000	2	5,000
Hospital administration resident	9	36,000	33	132,000	24	96,000
Audiology and speech pathology	110	568,000	170	886,000	60	318,000
Nurse anesthetist	23	(3)	50	132,000	27	132,000
Inhalation therapist	2	(3)	50	132,000	48	132,000
Hospital librarian	16	89,000	103	579,000	87	490,000
X-ray technician	43	(3)	68	82,000	25	82,000
Blind rehabilitation (nonpaid)	23		58		35	
Subtotal	23,059	33,567,000	36,934	60,049,000	13,875	26,482,000
B. TRAINING PROGRAMS TO PROVIDE HIGHER SKILLS TO REGULAR VA STAFF						
Chief pharmacist			6	51,000	6	51,000
Chief, nursing service	7	67,000	7	67,000		
Associate chief, nursing service for education	6	58,000	6	58,000		
Medical record librarian	5	9,000	26	67,000	21	58,000
Orthotist-prothetist	8	40,000	14	73,000	6	33,000
Prosthetic representative			3	17,000	3	17,000
Chaplain orientation	20	19,000	20	19,000		
Management analyst	8	58,000	14	105,000	6	47,000
Hospital administration (academic)	2	26,000	6	84,000	4	58,000
Administrative intern	2	1,000	5	4,000	3	3,000
Accountant	20	73,000	29	176,000	9	103,000
Supply management assistant	5	12,000	15	109,000	10	97,000
Personnel management assistant	40	187,000	50	235,000	10	48,000
Housekeeping officer	29	82,000	36	171,000	7	89,000
Laundry superintendent			16	84,000	16	84,000
Assistant engineer	15	108,000	15	108,000		
Assistant registrar	2	3,000	7	44,000	5	41,000
Registrar-section chief			12	67,000	12	67,000
Medical record librarian	5	9,000	26	67,000	21	58,000
Subtotal	174	752,000	313	1,606,000	139	854,000
Grand total	23,233	34,319,000	37,247	61,655,000	14,014	27,336,000

[1] An undetermined cost is engendered for food and quarters provided, under certain conditions, to clinical clerks.
[2] Number of consultants not available; they are paid on the basis of number of visits.
[3] Estimated at 25 percent of total cost of consultant services in VA hospitals.
[4] Cost of quarters, subsistence, and laundry provided to student nurses.
[5] Currently not a paid program. It is anticipated that it will be possible to pay trainees in this program at a later date.

Other financial requirements for purpose of expansion of D.M. & S. education and training under H.R. 11631

To obtain effective increased usage of VA hospitals and clinics for purposes of education and training, a preliminary survey indicates the following requirements, in addition to funds for trainee and consultant salaries:

(a) Dentistry:	
Salaries for instructional staff	$566,000
Additional dental operatories	424,000
Total	990,000
(b) Pathology and allied sciences training:	
Salaries for instructional staff	1,225,000
Tuition	22,000
Travel	25,000
Equipment	354,000
Supplies	185,000
Construction	62,000
Total	1,873,000
(c) Social work: Salaries for instructional staff	585,000
(d) Dietetics: Salaries for instructional staff	256,000
(e) Administrative services: Tuition	16,000
Recapitulation, other financial requirements:	
Salaries for instructional staff	2,632,000
Tuition	38,000
Travel	25,000
Construction and equipment (including dental operatories)	840,000
Supplies	185,000
Total	3,720,000

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with my remarks upon this bill, I may be permitted to include certain letters to the chairman of the committee and to me from persons interested in medical education in the State of Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11631. This bill would add the function of training and education of health service personnel to the already established functions of the Veterans' Administration hospital system. The 89th Congress has enacted considerable legislation in the health field including medicare which will require more basic resources and facilities for educating and training health personnel than ever before. Despite the fact that the Veterans' Administration is one of the Nation's largest employers of health service manpower, the agency has never been charged with responsibility or vested with the clear authority to engage broadly in the training of health service personnel. The limited amount of training accomplished in Veterans' Administration hospitals has largely been accomplished through the use of funds for patient care by enlarging the responsibility of the Veteran's Administration. As provided in this bill, we will permit the Veterans' Administration to assist in alleviating the shortage in health service manpower. For the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit letters that our committee has received from institutions engaged in medical education in the State of Indiana, all of whom express support for this legislation. I urge its approval.

The letters are as follows:

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
DIVISION OF SOCIAL SERVICE,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 7, 1966.

Hon. E. ROSS ADAIR,
House of Representatives,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ADAIR: Some weeks ago, I read a copy of the statement made on October 11, 1965, in the House regarding the Veterans' Administration as a potential resource for training of health service manpower.

The faculty of this school of social work believes that the grave shortage of both professional and technical personnel in the clinical field is a matter of national concern and strongly urges the adoption of House bill 11631, which would enlarge the scope of educational responsibility through amendments on code 38.

This school has worked cooperatively for many years with the Veterans' Administration facilities in Indianapolis and Marion. There is no doubt but that the Veterans' Administration has provided more clinical field placements for graduate students in social work than any other single agency in the country. It is uniquely qualified to make a still greater contribution to the education of personnel in the health field.

The faculty endorses this bill and we hope very much that you will support it.

Respectfully,

MARY HOUK,
Director.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY,
Lafayette, Ind., November 19, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: Your recent letter and the enclosures describing H.R. 11631 has been referred to me.

First, I wish to commend you for introducing this bill. Second, I wish to chide you for your neglect of one important mental health discipline in your remarks concerning the bill. The discipline which I refer to is that of psychology. Clinical and counseling psychologists are as seriously needed as are representatives of any of the specialty groups mentioned by you.

It is true that the Veterans' Administration does have a cooperative training program with 68 universities for the training of psychologists. Currently, as your data indicates, over 800 students are in training. This has been a highly successful program over the nearly 20 years of its existence. However, it has not been able to train enough personnel to meet the needs of the Veterans' Administration. Recently, the program has become somewhat less successful. Whereas a few years ago, the Veterans' Administration was able to employ approximately 50 percent of the graduates of the program, it is currently employing a much, much smaller percentage of the graduates. At least at our university, we are able to interest far fewer of our students in the cooperative program. The reasons for this decline in success are several. Mainly the VA program is no longer competitive with other programs. Stipends are lower than those available to students in other specialities of psychology many of which are not health related. Most training programs provide tuition payment. The VA psychology program does not. The most important reason is that the VA staff salaries in psychology are low as compared with other employment possibilities. Consequently, students do not look favorably upon VA employment and the staffs are becoming less adequate for training purposes.

The psychology program is an excellent example of a program which has been conducted outside of the medical framework. The cooperation is with university departments of psychology. It has probably been the most successful of all of the VA training programs.

Again I commend you on the intent of your bill. As a person who has worked closely with the Veterans' Administration in the training of psychologists, I am discouraged that the needs and contributions of psychology were not more specifically recognized.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. HADLEY,
Interim Head.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY,
Indianapolis, Ind., November 23, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: I have read with much interest the text of your bill (H.R. 11631) designed to authorize hospitals operated by the Veterans' Administration to conduct training and educational programs in cooperation with health educational institutions. I am confident that it would be a most helpful method of improving patient care to the veterans and would also offer valuable and much needed experience to young g aduates.

As you undoubtedly know, the number of internships and residencies available for dental graduates is very limited, and most VA hospitals could develop helpful programs.

If there is anything I can do in support of this bill please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

MAYNARD K. HINE, D.D.S.,
Dean.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, so far as I know the medical profession and the Veterans' Administration are in unanimous agreement on this bill. We have received hundreds of letters from medical schools and from doctors across the country, and I ask unanimous consent to include these letters at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. This bill has the primary purpose of recognizing education as a function of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, along with both medical research and the care and treatment of patients.

The Veterans' Administration has long engaged in the teaching of health personnel, but this activity has never received statutory recognition. The medical schools have unanimously requested that this situation be remedied, and the Veterans' Administration, in its report of January 18, 1966, stated:

> The enactment of legislation of this type would not of itself result in any increase in the training activities of our Department of Medicine and Surgery and, thus, would not have any necessary cost impact upon the budget of this agency. The importance of this legislation rests, as stated, upon the desirability of giving statutory recognition to all three elements of a complete hospital program; namely, treatment, research, and education.

The basic mission of the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery is the medical care and treatment of veterans. Nothing in this bill will in any way detract from the importance of this objective, but rather recognizes that if the Veterans' Administration is to continue the high quality of medical care which it has achieved, it is essential that environment conducive to teaching, learning, and research be maintained in the Veterans' Administration system of hospitals and outpatient clinics.

The Veterans' Administration has made a significant contribution in this area. Currently, 87 Veterans' Administration hospitals are actively affiliated with medical schools, and the Veterans' Administration has become the largest single source of clinical experience in connection with medical and health service education. Veterans' Administration facilities are being used increasingly by medical schools for the teaching of physical diagnosis in the preclinical years, and for clinical clerkships in the last 2 years of medical school. The existing Veterans' Administration program provides part of the hospital training for one-half of the Nation's new physicians. In 1964, 1,872 second-year medical students took their physical diagnosis work in Veterans' Administration hospitals, and 6,908 third- and fourth-year medical students were assigned to Veterans' Administration hospitals for a part of their medical clerkships. At the graduate level, some 3,000 residents hold appointments in Veterans' Administration hospitals. Moreover, the Veterans' Administration has also been playing an increasingly important role in providing on-the-job training for nursing and allied medical and administrative personnel. Sixty-nine Veterans' Administration hospitals provide basic professional training for 4,270 student nurses, and more than 2,900 other paramedical trainees receive a part of their professional education in the Veterans' Administration system.

The primary purpose of the bill is further implemented by a provision to give statutory recognition to the deans committee and other medical advisory groups which coordinate activities between the Veterans' Administration and affiliated hospitals, and will enhance their responsibilities. The amendments to the bill were recommended by the Veterans' Administration, and are purely perfecting to clarify the scope of these committees.

The letters referred to follow:

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
Palo Alto, Calif., November 5, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I am writing to tell you how very much all of us who are involved with the dean's committee, Veterans' Administration hospitals appreciate the vigorous effort that you and Mr. KORNEGAY are making to remedy what has become a very bad situation indeed. The introduction of H.R. 11631 cheers us all, and if enacted into law, it would go a long way toward remedying the very dangerous situation that now exists.

I have been involved with the dean's committee VA hospitals for 15 years, and as the dean of the University of Colorado School of Medicine, and now of Stanford's School of Medicine, I have chaired two such committees. Over the years, there has been a continual block, at the financial level, in terms of supporting programs of the highest caliber in these hospitals. Here at Stanford, we are putting a very substantial amount of University funds into our program at the VA hospital in an attempt to keep it at the same high level that we have achieved in the university's own hospital. On the other hand, our resources are badly stretched already, and like a good many other medical schools, we are beginning to wonder whether we can afford to continue an affiliation with the VA hospital, important as it has been to us.

We certainly stand ready to help in any way at all to try to achieve the end with which you are equally concerned; namely, medical care of the highest level at the VA hospitals and at the same time, maximum utilization of these important facilities in the training of health manpower for this growing Nation.

If at all possible, I would appreciate receiving 20 copies of your comments before the House of Representatives as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 18, 1965. We would also appreciate receiving some copies of H.R. 11631.

Thank you very much for your efforts in behalf of the dean's committee VA hospitals.

Very sincerely yours,
ROBERT J. GLASER, M.D.

SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY,
COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS,
San Francisco, Calif., November 12, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I have been delayed in my reply to your letter of November 3, 1965, relative to the improvement of the climate between Veterans' Administration and universities and medical schools and an improvement of the quality of patient care services, because of an extended meeting of the American Dental Association annual meeting in Las Vegas. I am a member of the Dean's Committee of the Veterans' Administration at the Palo Alto Veterans' Hospital and I am deeply interested and vitally concerned in favor of your H.R. 11631.

Enclosed are copies of two letters on this same subject, one dated June 4, 1965, from Sidney Raffel, M.D., acting dean of the University of Stanford, School of Medicine, and one dated June 10, 1965, written by me as dean, School of Dentistry, College of Physicians and Surgeons, University of the Pacific, to Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

I am heartily in favor of the remarks by you on the floor of the House on October 18, 1965, and concur in full with the speech made on the floor of the House by Mr. KORNEGAY on October 19, 1965.

If I can assist you in any way to secure the proposed amendments to title 38 of the the United States Code, please feel free to call on me.

I am very much in favor of your suggested improvement of veterans hospital facilities, and commend you for your interest.

Very truly yours,
JOHN TOCCHINI, D.D.S.,
Dean.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
STANFORD MEDICAL CENTER,
Palo Alto, Calif., June 4, 1965.

JOHN TOCCHINI, D.D.S.
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR DR. TOCCHINI: We address this letter to you as a court of last resort. It deals with aspects of the affiliation of this School of Medicine with the Palo Alto Veterans' Administration Hospital which is located on the Stanford University Campus and is associated with us as a Dean's Committee Hospital.

The problem we bring to your attention is not one of mediation. Our relationships with this hospital as well as with the area VA medical office and the Washington office of Dr. McNinch, Medical Director of VA Hospitals, has been excellent. The problem that we wish to present is one of economics, and it falls outside the control of these sympathetic administrative offices of the VA.

A number of issues which depend upon appropriate funding are currently giving us considerable difficulty. They include:

1. Establishment of a section for open heart surgery. Planning for this has been going on for well over a year, it has the enthusiastic concurrence of all levels of administration, and it was supposed to have been put into action in fiscal year (July 1, 1965). A first modification occurred early in the calendar year, when we were told that the sum initially planned for this had to be cut back to a level of $100,000 for the year. Later, the funding was further cut to approximately $70,000 for the year, the first half of this to be made available on July 1. Despite the limitations imposed by these restrictions, preparations were made to set up this service. Among other things, an outstanding young man was engaged to head this section, preliminary scheduling of patients was made, and various other technical moves were undertaken. We learn now that this first sum will not be available until January 1, 1966, and of course the question arises as to whether it can be depended upon even then.

2. The division of radiology has long suffered a shortage of professional personnel, a deficit which grows with increasing demands upon the service. We had hoped that a previously proposed increased staffing of 78 positions for the combined Palo Alto and Menlo Park Hospitals here would permit the addition of this and several other much needed professional personnel. Apparently these positions have been struck from the budget for fiscal year 1966, and simultaneously the Department of Radiology has been successful in locating an outstanding candidate for its opening at a time when no commitment can be made.

3. Other plans for which funds have not been provided include a clinical radioisotope facility, animal quarters, and the setting up of a convalescent surgical ward.

The budgetary restrictions which underlie these disappointments have not been imposed by the Veterans' Administration; it has made every effort to patch deficits as best it can throughout the country in face of a serious shortage of patching material. The difficulty is not easy to locate; I have learned that Congress seldom if ever reduces VA budget requests, yet individual hospitals rarely receive all the essential funds requested. It appears that the fault may be in the agreements reached between the Bureau of the Budget and central office of the VA; that the latter yields on important issues to saddle itself with a budget which is less than the total submitted by individual hospitals, and less than the minimum required for their best operation.

One other serious general budgetary difficulty in the VA hospital system lies in the dead period imposed by the lengthy budgetary cycle. New and important developments in therapy and management of patients occur frequently and are often costly. These cannot be applied to patients in VA hospitals without the long lag between request for funds and implementation. Urgent consideration should be given to methods by which needs may be provided as developments dictate.

I should like to point out that the philosophy which led to the establishment of close associations of veterans hospitals with schools of medicine after the Second World War is one intended to provide the best possible medical care for veterans. There is ample testimony that this goal has been attained so far as possible within the recurrent budgetary difficulties under which we and other institutions have labored. The tentative proffering and then withdrawing of funds to support such developments has gone beyond vitiating plans of our VA hospital and medical school; it has repeatedly introduced frustrations into our combined efforts which has caused our faculty to wonder more and more seriously whether the game is worth the candle. As you might guess, the life of a medical faculty man is a very busy one, and when superimposed upon his efforts to achieve excellence in his job he is repeatedly confronted by hurdles where he should expect easing of the way, he begins to think of other more fruitful outlets for his energy.

On behalf of our medical faculty I would be greatly obliged to you if you could find a channel through which our current budgetary restrictions could be relieved, and in the longer run, through which the general fiscal handicap imposed upon the medical branch of the Veterans' Administration could be removed. The cause is a worthy one—better care for our veterans—and the returns on relatively moderate investments of additional funds could be enormous.

Thank you for your attention to this plea.

Respectfully yours,

SIDNEY RAFFEL, M.D.,
Acting Dean.

JUNE 10, 1965.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: During the legislative process that made the construction of new medical and dental schools a reality, you were of tremendous aid to all of us who were vitally interested in the legislation. I am taking the liberty, at this time, to ask your assistance in the solution of another problem.

Enclosed is a copy of the letter sent to me by Dr. Sidney Raffel, acting dean of the Stanford University School of Medicine. As a member of the dean's committee mentioned in the letter I am gravely concerned with the situation so succinctly outlined by Dean Raffel.

The presence of medical and dental internships in the hospitals operated by the Veterans' Administration is of mutual advantage to both the schools and the Administration. The schools obtain additional teaching facilities and the hospitals of the agency find it possible to provide a high quality of medical and dental care at a relatively low cost. This situation obtains in most teaching hospitals. Intuitively, I feel that subjecting a teaching institution to routine administrative and budgetary procedures may well significantly lower its efficiency as a teaching medium, particularly with respect to the impact that these procedures may have on the school faculties that make the teaching activities of the hospital possible. A loss in teaching efficiency accompanied by diminishing faculty interest leaves the schools associated with the program no other alternative than to withdraw. In this instance the schools and the highly important Government agency would both stand to lose.

From personal observations, I know Dean Raffel and the Stanford University School of Medicine are doing an exceptional job at the Palo Alto Veterans' Hospital. I would greatly appreciate it if you could give me some guidance as to whom I might contact in the Veterans' Administration or the Bureau of the Budget in order that I might be of some assistance to the Palo Alto Veterans' Hospital and the Stanford Medical School in finding a solution to the problems listed in the attached letter.

My best wishes for a very pleasant summer.

Sincerely,

JOHN TOCCHINI, D.D.S.,
Dean.

LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY,
Loma Linda, Calif., November 30, 1965.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House of Representatives, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for sending to me a copy of the legislative proposal to develop the full potential of VA hospitals in the training of health service personnel. I have carefully read the proposal and I am writing to indicate my strong support, believing that this would indeed make a significant contribution to the educational manpower problems of the country.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID B. HINSHAW, M.D.,
Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, Calif., December 1, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Your bill, H.R. 11631, is not only highly desirable, it is imperative that it be enacted by the Congress without delay.

The pace of technological advances in the health sciences is so rapid that without provisions for continuing education and training the future lot of health service personnel in the Veterans' Administration is bleak indeed. It is virtually certain that they will lose the battle against professional obsolescence.

In my opinion, Dr. McNinch, medical chief, and Dr. Hiniker, dental chief, are highly capable administrators who should be provided with the authority and funds to operate a training program which fulfills minimum requirements, at least. Am I correct in assuming that the enactment of H.R. 11631 will not only make clear the intent of the Congress but also insure that funds are appropriated to implement the program?

Yours sincerely,

JOHN W. KNUTSON, D.D.S., Dr. P.H.,
Professor of Preventive Dentistry and Public Health.

LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY,
Loma Linda, Calif., December 6, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: It gives me great pleasure to support your recommendations for the Veterans' Administration.

We have a very fine working relationship with the Long Beach Veterans' Hospital under the dental director, Dr. James Taylor. Even though the Long Beach Veterans' Hospital is some 65 miles from our school, we find that it does offer possibilities that we have not been able to explore due to the shortcomings that are outlined in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I sincerely hope that your proposed bill will become a reality so that: (1) the care to the veteran will improve; (2) the student will be trained in the hospital under legal recognition.

Sincerely,

CHARLES T. SMITH, D.D.S.,
Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY,
Los Angeles, Calif., November 24, 1965.

Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is most important that the partnership between the Veterans' Administration and schools of medicine and dentistry across the Nation be strengthened through the legislative proposal which you have submitted. The improved care of veterans through close association with university faculties will have a secondary spin-off to improve the Nation's health—the additional training available in veterans facilities throughout the Nation.

You have the support, Mr. TEAGUE, of the faculty of this school of dentistry.

Sincerely,

JOHN I. INGLE,
Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Berkeley, Calif., December 21, 1965.

Mr. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I wish to express my strong support of the legislation you are preparing that would amend existing law to add the function of training and education of health service personnel to the established functions of the Veterans' Administration hospitals.

I am particularly responsive to your recognition that the Nation needs many more qualified social workers to staff its health and welfare services, and your belief that maximum use should be made of Veterans' Administration facilities in the preparation of personnel.

Sincerely yours,

KERMIT T. WILTSE,
Acting Associate Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, Calif., December 10, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: Thank you for forwarding to me a copy of the legislative proposal which provides for meeting the health services manpower problem.

As a person engaged in the education of social workers for professional services, I should like to congratulate you on the initiation of this piece of legislation. Prior to assuming my present post as dean of the School of Social Welfare at the University of California, Los Angeles, I served for a considerable number of years with the Veterans' Administration in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, social service program. It was apparent then and it is doubly apparent now that the need for a greater number of highly qualified professional personnel in all of the disciplines was imperative if not only restorative but preventive programs were to be adequately advanced.

The Veterans' Administration is one of the Nation's largest providers of health and welfare services and the investment in the training of additional personnel is very much needed. I am sure you realize how expensive professional education is today, and the proposal that education in the various professional categories be supported from Federal funds is highly commendable. I sincerely hope this legislation will have the full support of the Congress.

Cordially,

EILEEN BLACKEY,
Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 20, 1966.

Hon. OLIN TEAGUE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: As a person interested in the development of qualified personnel to serve our veterans who have so splendedly served this Nation of ours, I hope and trust you will continue to press for passage of H.R. 11631 which was introduced at the last session of Congress. The passage could not but helpfully achieve the encouragement and renewed growth and vigor of health service training programs of the Veterans' Administration.

Expressing appreciation of your efforts I remain,

Very sincerely yours,
NORRIS E. CLASS,
Professor.

UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 18, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: Listening to the President's state of the Union speech a few evenings ago reminded me that I have not yet added my voice to those in the academic community supporting your proposal to broaden the charge to the Veterans' Administration to include training of health personnel.

As the dean of the School of Social Work, University of Southern California, I know the importance of your proposal. Over the years since 1959 when I became dean of this school we have placed 6 to 10 students each year in Veterans' Administration facilities for field work. Although such students and their supervisors do contribute to patient care and will continue to do so, it is unrealistic to say that such is the sole reason for having students in a health care facility. The stimulus and status afforded by having students in training is very important and should be one of the recognized functions of VA.

We heartily endorse your proposal.

Sincerely,
MALCOLM B. STINSON, *Dean.*

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
January 24, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for the recently received copies of H.R. 11631. This legislation to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel has long been needed and we hope it will receive early and favorable action. I am communicating with my congressional representatives requesting their support of the legislation.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES C. COBLE.

SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE,
San Diego, Calif., January 20, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just had the opportunity to read H.R. 11631, and am delighted and pleased that you are introducing this important measure in this congressional session. I am gratified, too, that you are taking the responsibility for introducing this bill since you perhaps have greater knowledge on veterans' affairs, and speak with more authority in this area than almost anyone else.

It has been the thought of many of us who have been closely related to the programs of the Veterans' Administration that there has long existed a need for congressional sanction and support of the training and educational responsibilities of the Veterans' Administration. The quality of services to veterans is, as you are well aware, directly dependent upon the education and training of such personnel. The Veterans' Administration has magnificent opportunities to facilitate such educational training, but it has always been handicapped in making these readily available because of the lack of congressional sanction.

If any of us can be of help in securing needed action on this legislation, please let us know.

Very truly yours,
ERNEST F. WITTE,
Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
Columbia, Mo., February 1, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: The members of this department fully support your bill, H.R. 11631. The training facet of the Veterans' Administration program, dealing with several kinds of mental health personnel, is felt by us to be legitimate and essential from the standpoint of the interests of the VA. It is also highly beneficial to educational programs which the Federal Government is encouraging and assisting in other ways. We feel that it is important that these training functions be made explicit and that they be encouraged and supported.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM H. LICHTE,
Professor and Chairman.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, Calif., January 18, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Quite naturally we are vitally interested in the relationship between the Veterans' Administration and the schools of medicine. I would like to receive a copy of H.R. 11631 for study and also would like to know if you are proposing other legislation for training of paramedical personnel.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN R. AMBERG, M.D.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
St. Louis, Mo., November 29, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I heartily support your bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code clarifying the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to training and education of health service personnel.

As a professional educator and researcher, I have worked with the VA for many years as a member of the Advisory Committee on Social Work, as a consultant in the development of their social work research program, and in my university as both a recruiter and a trainer for staff. I have had firsthand experience with the difficulties existing under the present law, both in recruiting and in getting trained those who are interested in moving into the VA or who are already in the VA and should have additional training. I have repeatedly seen promising people who might otherwise have been interested in VA bypass that organization because of the much more realistic approach that other programs and fields have taken to supporting education and I have seen promising people already employed by the Veterans' Administration leave that organization in order to obtain advanced training because the present provisions for further training by VA are not only nonpreparative but inadequate. This has resulted and can only result in a reduction in both quality and quantity of veteran care. I am sure I reflect the judgment of most educators who have worked with the Veterans' Administration in their present training program and you may be assured of my full support of your proposal.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM E. GORDON,
Professor of Research.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
Columbia, Mo., November 22, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I read with a great deal of interest your legislative proposal which will permit the VA to relate closely to universities and medical schools in developing training programs for health service personnel.

My particular interest in your proposal is the training of social work and recreational personnel within VA facilities. You have made a succinct case for the VA to grow its own personnel in the medical and the ancillary services within VA facilities and related to the assistance which can be given by universities in this effort.

I am particularly interested in this aspect of your proposal because of VA facilities scheduled to be built close to our medical center here at the University of Missouri. It would be mutually desirable that a veteran's facility as is planned here should allow educational programs to be arranged for within the facility. This would certainly be true for the training of social work students and students in recreation.

I feel, as you do, that the VA has depended upon the universities and practicing agencies to develop personnel and then hire them away to satisfy its own staff needs. Today, many governmental departments and bureaus are helping train their own personnel by offering teaching grants, research grants, traineeship grants and facilities. To me, it is only logical that the VA keep pace by entering into partnership with universities on the same basis.

In planning new VA facilities I firmly believe that attention should be paid to adequate space, adequate equipment and adequate personnel to enhance the relationship between VA and university educational efforts for training personnel in the various VA occupation categories.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR W. NEBEL,
Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI AT KANSAS CITY,
Kansas City, Mo., November 11, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I appreciate the opportunity of reading your remarks concerning the need for developing a firmer relationship between the Veterans' Administration and the universities to develop the full potential of VA medical care facilities and potentiality for training of health service personnel.

As a dean of a school of dentistry which has been actively associated with the health training programs in two Veterans' Administration hospitals (Kansas City and Wadsworth), I am quite enthusiastic about the possibilities of affording more training for Veterans' Administration personnel and others through cooperative programs of Veterans' Administration hospitals and schools of dentistry as well as schools of

medicine. We have had and do have at the present time, residents at these two hospitals who are in cooperative programs with our school of dentistry. It is our distinct feeling that the quality of patient care is improved by these programs and that they also contribute to the improvement of dental health for the public at large.

Sincerely,

HAMILTON B. G. ROBINSON,
Dean.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
St. Louis, Mo., January 5, 1966.

Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: Recently I have had occasion to read House bill 11631 which would seem to improve the effectiveness of the Veterans' Administration in contributing to manpower needed under the national health program. I am writing because of a long association with the Veterans' Administration in my educational capacity at the State University of Iowa, Rutgers University, and now at Washington University in St. Louis.

The Veterans' Administration's contribution to educating people for the health professions would, in my opinion, be difficult to exaggerate. They have shown leadership in upgrading the quality of professional care and what they have done to improve services for the veterans has had an important impact on the level of services in other health programs as well. Certainly I have found their training facilities extremely valuable to the professional schools and the universities with which I have been associated.

I know that Congress faces many and competing concerns. This particular bill, however, seems to me to be one which merits a high priority since it would do much to improve an already valuable service.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

WAYNE VASEY,
Dean.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Chapel Hill, November 9, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I sincerely appreciate your meaningful letter of November 3, with the enclosed comments as an extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, relating to the proposed legislation for the Veterans' Administration. I am most favorable to the objective and plan you have in mind, since I am keenly aware of the operations of the veterans hospitals, with the reality that there exists a great potential for the further education and training of all health personnel, including dentistry.

Our relationships with the veterans hospitals in this State have been minimal due to lack of finances and programing at the veterans hospitals.

The dental manpower problem, as well as the associated auxiliary personnel, is acute in the fact that dental education is not producing an adequate number of dentists and auxiliary personnel. I am confident that with a broader scope of interest and funding, the veterans facilities could be used in a far more effective manner for the best interest of the Veterans' Administration, dental education, and the citizens of this country.

Thanking you for your leadership and consideration of this important item.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. BRAUER,
Dean.

THE BENJAMIN ROSE INSTITUTE,
Cleveland Ohio, November 9, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I have read with great interest your presentation to the House of Representatives, on October 18, 1965, of the potential important role of the Veterans' Administration in the education and training of health personnel, based upon your excellent analysis of the availability of health personnel to meet the health needs of the citizens of the United States.

For some 10 years I have had the privilege of working with the Department of Medicine and Surgery, first as a member of the Special Medical Advisory Group, and more recently as a member of the Social Work Advisory Council. In these years I have been increasingly impressed by the important contribution which the Veterans' Administration has made to the professional education of physicians, nurses, social workers, and other professional groups essential in health care. At the same time, it has been perfectly obvious that only a small portion of the available potential for education can be used under the existing legislation governing the mission of the Veterans' Administration.

As you pointed out to the Members of the House, recent enactments by the Congress make it imperative that attenion be given to increasing the supply of health personnel as rapidly as possible. The Veterans' Administration is surely one of the most important resources which can be made readily available for education and training of high quality for large numbers of health personnel which the country so desperately needs.

I commend and support the legislation which you have proposed which will make possible full utilization of the potential of the Veterans' Administration for education of health personnel.

Sincerely yours,

MARY L. HEMMY,
Executive Director.

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI,
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE,
December 23, 1965.

Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge with appreciation your letter of December 16 containing an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in relation to amendments of the U.S. Code clarifying the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration in the training and education of health service personnel.

This matter has been discussed locally by members of the medical school staff and in several national groups with which I have had some contact. In each instance it has been the tenor of the discussion to indicate a high degree of favor for such a step. My personal feeling is in accord with this and I can only say, that any effort to dignify the educational features of the Veterans' Administration and to protect them from the creeping paralysis of familiarity and administrative intrusions deserves wholehearted support. My lack of knowledge of legislative matters restricts any comment that I might make concerning the wording of your proposals. So far as I can judge, they solidify the potential of improvement and progress.

Thank you for permitting me to read this material.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD A. GALL, M.D.,
Director.

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI,
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE,
Cincinnati, Ohio, November 18, 1965.

Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: The provisions of H.R. 11631, a bill amending title 38 of the U.S. Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to training and education of health service personnel, have been carefully considered.

Both as dean and as chairman of the Dean's Committee of the Cincinnati Veterans' Administration Hospital, I wish to strongly endorse this legislation recognizing an extremely important facet of the dean's committee hospital operations which heretofore has had no official backing.

To my personal endorsement, I would like to add that of the members of the dean's committee itself, which met at luncheon today and specifically requested that its support of the type of legislation you have in mind be conveyed to you.

Sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD G. GRULEE, Jr., M.D.,
Dean.

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY,
Cleveland, Ohio, November 18, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. TEAGUE: The legislative proposal outlined in your letter of November 3, 1965 is most timely. I am heartily in favor of developing the full potential of VA medical care facilities in the training of health service personnel. I also concur in your opinion that this will further strengthen the VA-university relationship and will further improve the present high quality of patient care services available to eligible veterans.

The decline in the ratio of active non-Federal dentists for every 100,000 (misprinted as "1,000" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) from 49.9 in 1950 to 44.9 in 1963 is particularly serious when the demand for dental health care for our population is increasing. Proposed increases in the number of dental students to be enrolled in the future appear unlikely to reverse this trend. The training of ancillary personnel so that each dentist may serve effectively a larger number of patients appears to be the most feasible solution to the problem. Utilization of the VA facilities to this end is highly desirable.

As a member of the dean's committee at this university I have had direct responsibility for the dental internship program at the affiliated VA hospital. We have also arranged for our senior students to receive a part of their training experience in hospital procedures there. Both these programs could be expanded to the benefit of dental education and also to the improvement of the health care of the veteran patient.

I shall be happy to support your action in every way possible.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL E. BOYLE, D.M.D.,
Dean.

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY,
Cleveland Ohio, January 12, 1966.

Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I am writing to express my support for House bill 11631, which clarifies responsibility of Veterans' Administration to retain an educational function and to contribute to the supply of sorely needed skilled manpower in the field of social work.

Our own situation is a case in point. For the past 20 years the School of Applied Social Sciences of Western Reserve University has

used the facilities of Veterans' Administration in the Cleveland area for field work placements of social work students. Our enrollment is increasing and hence our need for expanded resources for field work placements. This year we have placed two field instructors, employed by the school, at the Cleveland Veterans' Administration hospital in order to increase the number of students in placement there. We have had excellent cooperation from the Veterans' Administration in this expansion.

Your bill, recognizing the educational responsibility of a Veterans' Administration hospital, would be greatly welcomed by us. It would permit the further development of Veterans' Administration facilities, which would afford greater flexibility to the school in deploying its resources, and hence contribute to the overall supply of manpower in the social work field.

Sincerely,

HERMAN D. STEIN,
Dean and Professor of Social Work.

NASHVILLE, TENN.,
January 5, 1966.

Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman of House Veterans' Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Strongly urge passage of House bill 11631 especially for enlargement of scope of educational responsibility through amendments on code 38. Schools of social work need continued and enlarged training units for social work students in Veterans' Administration hospital to meet rapidly increasing demands for social workers in the health field. Established agency policy for its educational program would enable effective planning of training units on a continuing basis.

SUE SPENCER,
Director, University of Tennessee, School of Social Work.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE,
Knoxville, November 16, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I read the extract of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning H.R. 11631 with great interest. As a university faculty member primarily concerned with the education and training of clinical psychologists, and as a former psychologist in the employ of the Veterans' Administration, I can endorse your legislation heartily. It has long been my conviction that the training efforts of the Veterans' Administration have been severely hampered because it has not been legally constituted as a training agency. While much commendable work in this area has been successfully pursued, certainly the scope of training and numbers of personnel trained have been impeded.

The establishment of advisory bodies to supervise training for health service personnel strikes me as being an excellent notion. I suppose, in essence, that this is not too different from the dean's committee notion but certainly extends and broadens the concept to encourage and invite collaboration and participation by other health service educators and scientists. It is without any hesitation that I commend the principle of this proposed legislation. I wish you every good fortune in its pursuit.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. ANKER, Ph. D.,
Associate Professor.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,
Austin, January 10, 1966.

Congressman OLIN TEAGUE,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I was delighted to learn of your introduction of H.R. 11631 to amend title 38 of the United States Code. I have felt for some time that the role of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel should be strengthened significantly.

I want to tell you, also, of my widespread support for your bill among my colleagues. We genuinely hope that favorable action will soon be forthcoming on your very worthwhile proposal.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE PARKER, Ph. D.,
Assistant Professor, Assistant Dean of Graduate School.

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK,
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,
Austin, January 19, 1966.

Hon. OLIN TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I am writing to you in support of your bill H.R. 11631, which will clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration in the training and education of health service personnel. This bill, if passed, will be of great assistance in expanding educational opportunities for a variety of health service personnel, including social workers.

Social workers in medical settings are extremely scarce in the State of Texas. In good part, this relates to the paucity of sound educational programs, in hospitals where graduate students may be placed for their field instruction experiences. The hospitals of the Veterans' Administration do provide an excellent training ground. If they were further developed, social work education could be more productive.

We make some use of VA hospitals at the present time, but this could be expanded and improved. As you have pointed out the VA "has no legal mandate to engage broadly in the training of health service personnel." By being concerned only with its own recruitment needs for social workers it has not done enough to add to the larger pool of social workers from which all agencies draw, including the VA. This is both parochial and self-defeating, and I am pleased that your bill would change this. The establishment of local advisory bodies at individual hospitals with a broader focus than the training physicians will assure the high quality of the educational program as well as its coverage of other significant personnel.

Sincerely yours,

JACK OTIS,
ACSW Director.

THE WORDEN SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SERVICE, OUR LADY OF THE LAKE COLLEGE,
San Antonio, Tex., January 14, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In our interest to improve policy guiding the Veterans' Administration educational program, we are writing to you, as chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to express our firm support for H.R. 11631. Our interest in this program stems from an extended period of association with Veterans' Administration hospitals, clinic, and regional office throughout Texas affiliated with the Worden School of Social Service in the professional social work education of graduate students by providing field instruction in social work.

We believe that enactment of this bill will enable the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration to carry more effectively its educational functions through the establishment of advisory committees representing the Veterans' administration and affiliated educational institutions involved in the education of health service personnel. In addition, the allocation of funds specifically for education and training will insure the maintenance of an educational program to meet increasing demands for more personnel in the health field, including professional social workers. Such provision would eliminate the present need to divert funds from patient care to education. This would safeguard the allocation for direct services to veterans.

More specifically in order for schools to educate and train more students, we shall need a major expansion of field instruction facilities. In order to achieve this expansion, we look to the Veterans' Administration which has been one of the largest single field instruction resources for social work students.

Since the Veterans' Administration is in a most unique position to help increase the number of needed personnel in the health field, we are respectfully requesting that you give this measure your careful consideration. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

SISTER M. IMMACULATE,
Director.

C. J. COLLINS,
Associate Professor of Social Work.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS DENTAL BRANCH,
Houston, Tex., November 11, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: Thank you for your letter of November 3 and for the legislative proposal concerning the Veterans' Administration.

The proposed legislation which you have introduced should do much to alleviate the present situation and make possible a more realistic utilization of the resources of the Veterans' Administration for trainng and research. Viewed from the present situation, it would seem that lack of such legislation will result in a deterioration of the medical care of veterans.

The principal question that I would have would be whether or not the legislation that you propose will provide or make possible the necessary funds to implement the program.

You are to be commended for this legislative proposal which, if passed, should reverse the apparent trend downward of medical care in the Veterans' Administration hospitals and provide excellent training facilities for medical personnel on a more realistic basis than is possible at the present time.

Sincerely,

JOHN VICTOR OLSON,
Dean.

WACO, TEX.,
December 21, 1965.

Congressman OLIN TEAGUE,
Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Committee, Bryan, Tex.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I am writing to express my approval of H.R. 11631 which you have introduced to the House of Representatives. As a social worker in the VA hospital, Waco, where I have supervised student social workers, it was necessary to reduce time spent working with patients in order to do this. Because of this it was necessary to limit the number of students who could be trained. As you know, a facility this size offers unlimited training opportunities for all kinds of medical personnel. H.R. 11631 will make professional education available for so many who are interested and needed in the health field.

Sincerely yours,

LUDELLA M. KELLER.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY,
Washington, D.C., November 17, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Thank you very much for sending me your letter of November 3,

1965, in which you enclosed your text of your bill, H.R. 11631, and further comments on the need for continuous education in the health fields.

I can only tell you that I heartily subscribe to the legislation which you proposed. I served for 5 years on the Special Medical Advisory Group in the central office of the Veterans' Administration and at the present time I am a member of the dean's committee of the Washington Veterans' Administration Hospital. This experience and association at the Veterans' Administration program has convinced me that additional educational opportunities are needed to continue the high standard of health care given in the veterans' hospitals.

The dean's committee was indeed a step forward and has brought in active participation of medical and dental school administrators in aiding and staffing veterans' hospital facilities. We, at Georgetown University School of Dentistry, have close liaison with the Naval Dental School at the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda and at the Walter Reed Dental Research Institute. At these two institutions, we supply members of our faculty to lecture and conduct courses in the various educational fields. The courses are well organized by these two activities and we merely supply the professional staff to conduct the educational program. At the end of the year, my university grants academic credits to the persons involved taking the courses if they have been successful, of course, in passing the examinations, and these credits may be used toward advanced degrees which is always a stimulus to any student.

During my time on the Special Medical Advisory Group for the Veterans' Administration, I was struck by the fact that they were having trouble securing young interns and young men into the Public Health Dental Service and we attributed it largely to two factors: first, the interns were securing a whole lot less money than were other interns in the country and, secondly, the continuing educational program was entirely too limited.

I am the immediate past-president of the American Association of Dental Schools and I am fully aware that the problem exists in other parts of the United States as well as locally for I have learned this through discussion with my fellow deans and through observation for the programs of the Veterans' Administration in many areas of the United States.

Please be assured that we in the American Association of Dental Schools, and here in Washington, at Georgetown University School of Dentistry, will lend our facilities and whatever talents we may have to assist you in implementing this program which you have proposed. The advisory bodies, which you also suggest, is indeed excellent for it will bring in the interest of the community and make them more aware of the fine work that is being done in the Veterans' Administration health services.

As a dentist in dental education, I can assure you that you can count on the dentists for their support.

My sincere appreciation for your submitting this program to me for comment.

Very sincerely,

C. V. RAULT, D.D.S., *Dean.*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS, INC.,

Washington, D.C., November 17, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,

Chairman, Veterans' Administration Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: Thank you very much for sending me a copy of your proposal for development of the full potential of VA medical care facilities in the training of health service personnel.

We are interested in this approach and believe it would make an important contribution to the total health manpower pool, as well as improved service for patients in VA's facilities. Shortly, we shall provide you with a more careful analysis of your proposal.

Sincerely yours,

RUDOLPH T. DANSTEDT,

ACSW Director.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS, INC.,

Waco, Tex., December 17, 1965.

Congressman OLIN TEAGUE,

Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Committee, Bryan, Tex.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I am chief social worker at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Waco, Tex. During the past 15 years I and my social work service staff have been committed to the professional education of graduate students from the School of Social Work, University of Texas and the Worden School of Social Service, Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio, Tex. Throughout these years offering supervised internship training has meant that the two staff members giving their time have had to reduce their time available for social services to patients.

While management is willing and eager to participate in professional education; nevertheless, the reality of a heavy treatment load has made it necessary to restrict the number of students to no more than four in an academic year. I personally regret this as I know our setting affords an unusual social work educational opportunity and at the same time encourages students trained in a clinical setting to seek professional employment in the Veterans' Administration or another medical auspice.

It was, therefore, a real pleasure to learn that you have introduced H.R. 11631 to make professional education available for medical and ancillary medical personnel, a recognized mission of the Veterans' Administration. Allocation to accomplish this goal will enable the VA hospitals to greatly increase training opportunities in this country's outstanding medical facilities.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD N. PUGH,

Chairman, Committee on Social Work Education, Central Texas Chapter, N.A.S.W.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA, MEDICAL CENTER, SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY,

Birmingham, Ala., November 18, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,

Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: Our attention has been drawn to H.R. 11631 which you introduced in the House to provide the legal basis for expanding training programs in Veterans' Administration hospitals affiliated with university medical centers such as exists in Birmingham, Ala. We are heartily in favor of your legislative proposal.

The University of Alabama School of Dentistry enjoys a very fine cooperative relationship with the Veterans' Administration hospital here and we are particularly proud of the current Veterans' Administration research construction program which will physically link the university with the hospital. In addition, our training efforts are augmented by a similar relationship in the dental clinical sciences.

In recent years members of the faculties of the University of Alabama School of Dentistry and the Medical College of Alabama have been concerned with the educational programs at the Birmingham Veterans' Administration hospital. It is our feeling that the educational programs at the Birmingham Veterans' Administration hospital have suffered because of a lack of financial support from the Veterans' Administration. In an attempt to maintain high quality educational programs which are comparable with those in the medical center it has been necessary for our faculty to subsidize the training programs at the Veterans' Administration hospital by giving freely of their time. As you realize, it is impossible to continue this over an extended period of time without more realistic support from the Veterans' Administration.

It is significant to note that the entire professional dental staff at the Birmingham Veterans' Administration Hospital received their dental training and specialty training at the University of Alabama School of Dentistry. Presently, we are training two career residents for the Veterans' Administration hospital. Although the Veterans' Administration hospital has provided the stipends for these individuals, the dental staff at the Veterans' Administration hospital has not had the primary responsibility of training these individuals.

We agree with your concept that all possible educational opportunities ought to be used to the utmost and that the full potential of the Veterans' Administration hospital in this area has not been reached. Although one immediate effect of such training programs is to improve dental services to veterans, another valuable benefit is the improvement of services rendered by trainees to all the public at some point in time. Training programs of any kind have a salutary and upgrading effect on the teachers as well as trainees and is one factor which accounts for our interest in the matter.

Finally, I cannot but agree with Mr. KORNEGAY's remarks published in the October 19, 1965, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning the tendency of the Budget Bureau to legislate by its unilateral administrative actions in this as well as in many other instances. Thus, the intent of Congress must be thoroughly documented by congressional action as you are so ably doing with H.R. 11631.

I would like to congratulate you for your legislative proposal and the faculty at the University of Alabama School of Dentistry heartily endorses your proposal.

Sincerely yours,

C. A. MCCALLUM,

Dean.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA, MEDICAL CENTER, MEDICAL COLLEGE OF ALABAMA,

Birmingham, Ala., November 8, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,

Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: Thank you very much for sending me your legislative proposal designed to permit the Veterans' Administration in partnership with the universities and medical schools in the Nation to develop the full potential of the VA medical care facilities in the training of health personnel and to improve the care of veterans by giving legal recognition and added strength to the university relationship.

On behalf of my colleagues of the faculty of the Medical College of Alabama, I would like to congratulate you and to report the enthusiastic endorsement of this proposal by our faculty. The Birmingham Veterans' Administration hospital and the Medical College of Alabama, as well as the University of Alabama School of Dentistry, have for many years enjoyed an exemplary relationship and have provided outstanding care to veteran patients from this region of the United States.

During recent years, however, this relationship has been threatened by a failure to maintain the necessary financial support for our deans committee, Veterans' Administration hospital to continue quality programs comparable to those in the university hospital.

In addition, this relationship has been threatened by a failure to understand the necessary educational programs which must accompany exemplary patient care in a university setting.

Your legislative proposal (H.R. 11631), if enacted, would certainly go a long way toward alleviating this latter difficulty.

Very sincerely,

S. RICHARDSON HILL, Jr., M.D.,
Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
Little Rock, Ark., November 8, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman From the State of Texas, Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I received with appreciation and delight your recent letter and the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which presented your bill which would make education one of the missions of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration. While I can add little to that you have said in support of this measure, I do appreciate the opportunity to let you know the attitude of a medical school such as ours toward our VA hospital.

We consider the VA hospital here in Little Rock an integral part of the School of Medicine of the University of Arkansas. Indeed, members of the professional staff at the VA hospital who meet our qualifications are given academic titles and recognition on the same basis as are faculty members salaried through the University. Our junior medical students in Medicine and Surgery receive instruction in the VA hospital under supervision of the professional staff of the VA hospital in the same manner that they receive instruction in the University Hospital. If one views this arrangement with the eyes of an accountant, one can arrive at the conclusion that the VA hospital is supplying the University of Arkansas School of Medicine with free faculty members. On the other hand, if one probes into what really happens within a VA hospital under this type of arrangement, it is revealed that the medical care of our veterans is greatly enhanced. This occurs as a result of insistence upon the part of a medical school that physicians who receive academic appointments and teach medical students be highly qualified. Physicians with excellent qualifications are attracted to a VA hospital in which they can receive university recognition through academic appointment and participate in the teaching of medical students. As a result of these factors, the veteran within a medical school affiliated hospital receives the best of medical care.

In our university hospital we constantly strive to upgrade our facilities and keep current with advances in medicine. When a VA hospital is integrated with the medical school, as is true here in Little Rock, we of the medical school constantly are striving to have the VA hospital also keep pace with medical advances. I believe all of this accrues to the benefit of veteran medical care.

Thank you again for having written me.

Sincerely yours,

WINSTON K. SHOREY, M.D.,
Dean.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SERVICE ADMINISTRATION,
Tempe, Ariz., January 28, 1966.

Re H.R. 11631

Hon. OLIN TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: House bill 11631 is designed to make more effective use of the Veterans' Administration capacity for training manpower in the health services. As we understand the bill, it would more clearly define this function and enable the VA to more effectively plan and execute its contribution to training in this vital area of skilled manpower in which grave shortages still exist. You may be interested in comments from those who have collaborated in the educational process with the Veterans' Administration. I am, therefore, taking this opportunity to make a few comments which, it is hoped, may be of some value to you.

The schools of social work are all faced with the common problem of expanding the sound clinical work experience resources of their school in order that they may train the additional students who are so badly needed in both public and private health, education, and welfare programs. Since World War II the Veterans' Administration has maintained an enviable record of service to professional education in the clinical disciplines and it has constituted the largest single resource for field instruction available to schools of social work. From my experiences, both as a student who was fortunate enough to receive training in a Veterans' Administration facility and, subsequently, from faculty and administrative positions in two graduate schools of social work I can only commend the Veterans' Administration program for its dedicated, effective, and most needed services.

The medical and hospital facilities of the Veterans' Administration constitutes the largest unit in the Federal field in the care of patients and it seems highly essential that they be utilized in the fullest and most productive manner possible for the advanced and technical training of health service personnel. Certainly, in social work education, the demand for increasing the resources for professional education is clear where there is a need for at least 15,000 more qualified social workers to man existing programs and an expanding requirement to give leadership and direction in the areas that will require greatly increased numbers of new personnel as the result of the Federal legislation passed in the last session of the Congress. In a time of great competition for scarce manpower, the Veterans' Administration needs to be strengthened in its development of a manpower pool.

I can strongly endorse the purposes and intent of House bill 11631, both from past experience and the current demonstrated needs for the continued full utilization of the Veterans' Administration facilities in the training of social workers and other health personnel.

Sincerely yours,

HORACE W. LUNDBERG, Ph. D.,
Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER,
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK,
Denver, Colo., December 28, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: It is very exciting to learn that you are sponsoring House Bill 11631 which, among other things, would add "the training and education of health personnel" to the VA's already established functions of patient care and medical research. As you probably know, the social service departments of the VA installations are used substantially for providing the field instruction for students in the graduate schools of social work in this country. These social service departments provide field instruction for both first- and second-year graduate students and in a variety of method areas, such as social casework, social group work, and community organization.

Here at the University of Denver we have had a long and close association with the social service departments at the Veterans' Administration hospital, but it seems to me that your bill would provide a "legal base" on which the hospital could establish its education program. Such a provision should lead to an expansion of the field instruction facilities and correspondingly there might be a further increase of social work traineeships provided by the Veterans' Administration. This expanded program would be of tremendous benefit to the graduate schools of social work which are hard pressed to produce as many graduates as possible. The VA hospitals are a rich resource for the field instruction of students. They have a well-qualified staff, a great variety of cases and in many instances, as here in Denver, the facility is quite near a campus of a graduate school of social work.

Therefore, I want you to know that we would fully support your bill and trust that it will be enacted into law in the not too distant future. Do let me know if there is anything I could do to help you in the further support of your bill.

Yours most sincerely,

E. M. SUNLEY,
Director.

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER,
Denver, Colo., November 17, 1965.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: I have reviewed your remarks as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 18, 1965, and am in full accord with the proposed H.R. 11631. The Veterans' Administration is certainly in an excellent position to contribute more heavily to the training of health specialists.

The one suggestion I would make is that any proposed legislation (if it is not simply an administrative decision) also consider modifying the composition of the Special Medical Advisory Group by the addition of one psychologist and one social worker. You will note in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 20, page 27237, that training programs in these two areas involve an investment of some $4,400,000 on the part of the VA each year, second only to the cost of the medical residency program. If not already available, expert consultation should be provided to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on training in these areas.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. LITTLE,
Chairman, Department of Psychology.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO,
MEDICAL CENTER,
Denver, Colo., January 4, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: At a recent meeting of the dean's committee for the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Denver, Colo., your bill (H.R. 11631) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel was presented by the hospital director and discussed at some length by our committee.

This committee and I wish to assure you of our unanimous and enthusiastic support of this bill. If it is passed, we believe it will be the most significant piece of legislation affecting the university-Veterans' Administration relationship since the passage of Public Law 293 by the 79th Congress of January 3, 1946.

This university established a dean's committee relationship with the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Logan, Colo.,

shortly after Public Law 293 was enacted. This relationship was continued when the Veterans' Administration hospital was moved to Denver in 1951 and is still continuing. The association of the university and the Veterans' Administration hospital has been of mutual benefit to both of us. It is our sincere desire that this association not only continue but become even closer through the exchange of ideas, facilities, and personnel.

In the early years of this unique association which has done so much for both patient care and medical education, many dedicated, talented, and energetic young physicians were attracted to Veterans' Administration medicine. The Veterans' Administration hospital facilities were generally not quite up to the standards of the university hospitals, but Congress appeared willing to appropriate the necessary funds and a spirit of optimism prevailed both in the Veterans' Administration and in the medical schools. For a few years it could be said that the veterans hospitals did indeed furnish medical care second to none for their patients.

However, it appears to many of us in the medical schools that in the past 5 or 10 years the momentum of Veterans' Administration medicine has been lost. Many of the dynamic, promising young Veterans' Administration physicians have become disenchanted with the delays of bureaucracy and frustrated with the inadequacies of the Veterans' Administration budget and have left the Veteran's Administration. Many of them have joined university staffs, for which we are grateful, but in general the Veterans' Administration hospitals have not, for the most part, been able to replace them with men of equal stature.

Although the total Veterans' Administration appropriation has increased each year, the Veterans' Administration hospitals have not been able to keep abreast of the university hospital in space facilities, equipment or staff.

By an extraordinary effort the Veterans' Administration hospitals have generally been able to maintain patient care, and we believe that such care in the Denver Veterans' Administration hospital is comparable to that offered at Colorado General Hospital. How long this can continue is very questionable. Our per diem costs at the university hospital are currently in excess of $50. How can the Veterans' Administration be expected to maintain the same level of care at a rate of at least $15 less than this figure.

It is in the area of teaching that the Veterans' Administration has had to economize in order not to lower the standards of patient care. Sufficient staff and facilities have not been provided to train physicians at the academic level expected by the medical schools, and only a token effort has been possible in the training of other health service personnel.

The placing of the responsibility for the training of health service personnel on the Veterans' Administration as provided by your bill appears to be a reasonable first step, but unless adequate funds can be apportioned for this training, the responsibility becomes a milestone both for the hospital and the university.

My committee and I, therefore, urge you to foster this bill with the full strength of your office and also to make certain that the funds necessary for its implementation are provided. You may depend upon our full support and cooperation.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. CONGER, Ph. D.,
Vice President for Medical Affairs,
Dean, School of Medicine.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT,
SCHOOL OF DENTAL MEDICINE,
Hartford, Conn., December 30, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Your legislative proposal with regard to developing the full potential of VA medical care facilities in the training of health services personnel and giving legal recognition and added strength to the VA-university relationship has my enthusiastic endorsement.

The VA-university relationship can and should be encouraged to the utmost. University leadership in the development and supervision in the training and education of health service personnel and patient care services would tend to bring into being medical resources that would be tagged with a margin of excellence.

The need is great. The facilities and resources that are currently present in the VA are tremendous. The universities have already demonstrated their desire to participate in the VA medical program. The universities have also demonstrated that they offer the logical milieu for quality leadership. What is now needed is the type of legal sanction and fiscal and moral support that your proposed legislation would provide.

The training of residents and health service personnel in the various phases of dentistry would be enhanced significantly if programs of excellence were sponsored in VA hospitals. VA-university hospitals could provide training and education to students, residents and paradental personnel in a manner that would contribute greatly to the much needed manpower we will require for the future health of our society and of the country.

Yours sincerely,

LEWIS FOX,
Dean.

MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA,
Augusta, Ga., November 9, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House of Representatives,
Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: This will indicate my support of H.R. 11631 which will amend the terms of operation of Veterans' Administration hospitals so that their educational functions are recognized.

It has been obvious for some time that if the VA hospitals now affiliated with medical schools are to participate effectively in new advances, that more realistic and flexibile connections would be necessary. As I interpret the wording of the amendment, this would be possible. I hope the Congress will pass this bill, and I will do what I can to support it.

Yours sincerely,

W. G. RICE, M.D.,
Dean.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
Evanston, Ill., December 27, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I am very honored by your request to comment on the plan you have proposed for increased utilization of the resources in the Veterans' Administration for health service manpower training. I have been associated with the Veterans' Administration for a number of years as a consultant to the Hines Hospital and the Veterans' Administration research hospital. I have been very impressed with your fine efforts in behalf of the Veterans' Administration and in the improvement of the medical care to the veteran. You are in large part responsible for the great advances that have been made in the medical care programs.

In order for the Veterans' Administration facilities to be used effectively for training health service manpower funds must be provided to maintain the hospitals at a level of operation comparable to those in other university teaching hospitals. It is only when medical care is supported at this level that the educational programs can provide proper training for health service personnel. It must be recognized that educational programs do put additional demands on hospitals but they also result in better overall care.

If the required funding can be provided I think your program is a very wise one and can contribute substantially to the very heavy demands that new legislation placed on the health professions. In making your proposal you again recognized the substantial contributions that the Veterans' Administration can make not only to the veteran patient but to all our people.

I would be very happy to discuss any of these points in more detail if you are interested.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. D. COOPER.

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
December 28, 1965.

Mr. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: In response to your letter of December 14, 1965, I should like to reply and support your proposed legislation supporting the Veterans' Administration as a potential source for health service manpower training.

The Veterans' Administration is presently involved in substantial educational programs and its cooperative effort with medical schools as well as its training programs for other health disciplines is an important contribution to the health service manpower of this country. To assure high quality of such training efforts and to properly identify this important effort, I believe that increased financial support for health service manpower training within the Veterans' Administration is necessary and would be beneficial to all concerned.

Sincerely,

MADISON B. BROWN, M.D.,
Associate Director.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
Chicago, Ill., December 8, 1965.

Hon. OLIN TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: At the meeting of the Special Medical Advisory Group of the Veterans' Administration, which was held last Monday, I was asked to convey to you the unanimous support of the members for the bill, H.R. 11631 which you, supported by Congressman KORNEGAY, have introduced into the 89th Congress. This foresighted legislation will, if passed, greatly strengthen the ability of the Veterans' Administration to care for its patients and will provide the means for greatly increasing the size of the national pool of medical and scientific persons and will greatly strengthen the educational resources of the medical schools affiliated with the Veterans' Administration. You are indeed to be commended for introducing this much needed legislation and if there is any way that the Special Medical Advisory Group can be of help, we should be happy to be of service.

You may reach me by letter or telephone, at my office or by telephone at my home in Winnetka, Ill., Hillcrest 6-2267.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. WARTMAN, M.D.,
Chairman, Special Medical Advisory Group, Veterans' Administration.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
Urbana, Ill., November 29, 1965.

Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: Thank you for your letter concerning legislation designed to add strength to the Veterans' Administration-university relationship. The Columbus area advisory committee to the VA which is composed of chairmen of cooperating departments of psychology in the area, has taken strong affirmative action on this matter to which I subscribe.

Sincerely yours,

LLOYD G. HUMPHREYS,
Department of Psychology.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
Chicago, Ill., December 22, 1965.

Hon. OLIN TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I have just read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 18. Please permit me to congratulate you on a superior piece of work. It has long been needed. I have never written a letter of this type before, but I wanted you to know that I consider this report truly commendable.

I should also like to absolutely and positively congratulate you on the high esteem that you have received by the members of SMAG, the veterans, and the people in the Veterans' Administration who know what is going on in the service, not only because you have helped them, but also because you have been so fair, so energetic, so thorough, and so hard working.

As a consultant of the Air Force Surgeon General for 5 years; as a consultant to the Great Lakes Naval Hospital for at least that length of time; as a consultant to Hines Veterans' Administration Hospital for nearly 20 years; as an area consultant, and as a member of SMAG, I would like to make several suggestions:

I believe there is a need for a study of closer liaison between the Veterans' Administration and the various military groups; the possibility of sharing and exploring rare type equipment, units, personnel and facilities; a study of what can be done to increase productivity and availability and training in the scarce specialties such as pathology, radiology, physiatrics, psychiatry, anesthesiology and the technicians in these various areas; there should be a group formed from the civilian areas, the military, and the Veterans' Administration that will study and make recommendations relative to these groups. I definitely feel that there is a need for special studies of the aforementioned.

In confidence, I wonder if there really isn't a need for a Department of Medicine to increase the efficiency of the various medical departments such as Indian Affairs, Public Health Service, Army, Navy, Air Force, etc. I know there would be resistance to such a recommendation from each and everyone of the bodies concerned. However, I do feel that it would have many advantages even if it did not have the concerted action of all the agencies at the higher echelon working toward this end. I know a little progress has been made in this direction, but all too little, in my opinion.

Also, there is a real need of a group who will work in the medical manpower area. This group must know our shortages of nurses, technologists, physicians, et al., and develop coordinated programs for eliminating the deficiencies and distributing the resources in an equitable manner.

I have had contact, on a fairly high level, with many of these organizations, and would be happy to serve the defense or civilian groups in any way possible.

Again, my sincere and heartfelt congratulations on the wonderful job you are doing.

With best wishes for the holiday season.

Very sincerely,

MAX S. SADOVE, M.D.,
Consultant, Special Medical Advisory Group, Veterans' Administration.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
MEDICAL CENTER,
Kansas City, Kans., November 17, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I have read with interest your recently circulated letter and attached extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 18, 1965, in which you describe very accurately some of the problem areas which exist between Veterans' Administration hospital facilities and medical schools in this country. Your remarks are a fair and accurate description of the situation which now exists, as were the remarks of your colleague, Representative KORNEGAY.

H.R. 11631, which you were introducing in an attempt to help improve this situation, is indeed a step in the right direction. This bill as it now is written would clarify and expand the responsibilities of the Veterans' Administration for the training and education of health service personnel. May I point out to you, however, that while clarifying and enlarging the responsibilities of the Veterans' Administration in these areas is important, the fundamental principle that needs to be explored by your committee in this area is the matter of the funding of such activities. The experience of the University of Kansas Medical School and our relationship with the Kansas City, Mo., Veterans' Administration hospital has been that there is no misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the responsibility envisioned between the affiliation of the two institutions. There is a consistent crisis involving the financial support given to the local Veterans' Administration hospital and a clear lack of understanding on the part of the Bureau of the Budget that Veterans' Administration hospitals that are affiliated with medical school teaching hospitals must be funded in an entirely different manner than other nonaffiliated, nonteaching veterans hospitals.

I support the remarks of you and your colleague. I support the basic concepts of H.R. 11631. I would urge you and your committee as you consider enlarging and clarifying the responsibilities of the Veterans' Administration with respect to training and education of health service personnel to be also extremely careful to examine carefully the funding of such operations. The potential of the already proven Veterans' Administration hospital—medical school affiliation concept in the training of health service manpower is unlimited. A more realistic approach to the funding of such activities is essential before the potential can be realized.

Very truly yours,

JACK D. WALKER, M.D.,
Assistant Dean and Chairman, Dean's Committee.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
Louisville, Ky., November 5, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I have read the legislation which you propose. It is a most interesting concept and is badly needed. I would suggest, however, that the advisory body be constituted as the dean's committee. I personally would not commit my institution without some voice in the operation of the program. I am sure you will realize our concern with quality control in medical education, no matter where carried out.

Sincerely yours,

DONN L. SMITH, M.D.,
Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY,
Lexington, Ky., November 24, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: Thank you for the invitation to comment on the legislative proposal which you have introduced, relative to the training of health service personnel in the facilities of our Nation's Veterans' Administration hospitals. It is my desire to offer my strong support of this new legislation which clarifies the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to training and education of health personnel.

In my opinion, this is a most logical and, in fact, an inevitable development. The entire pattern of health care, particularly in the Federal Services, supports the view that it is unnatural to separate training and education from health care and research. These functions logically go hand in hand, lending strength to one another. It is my opinion that the lack of formal involvement in training has had a detrimental effect on the overall development of the health care programs of the Veterans' Administration. Enactment of the legislation which you propose will contribute needed assistance to the over-all training mission of the Nation, and will result in superior patient care for the veterans of our country.

Having stated my general support, I now wish to direct some comments more specifically to dentistry and its relationship to the subject.

There is a critical need for more opportunities for advanced training of recently graduated dental students. The trend toward specialization, internship, and residency programs is clearly increasing. Unfortunately, the facilities for support of this trend are inadequate. The Veterans' Administration has the organization and the facilities which could contribute in a significant way to the current problem. In fact, the Veterans' Administration could provide an important impetus to the overall picture of advanced education in dentistry.

I wish to express the opinion that H.R. 11631, as written, almost ignores dentistry. Its wording reflects a suboptimal incorporation of dentistry in the total health program of the Veterans' Administration.

I wish to record my displeasure with this feature of the legislation which has been proposed.

As a new college of dentistry, we have recently established a formal relationship with the local VA hospital. I have become impressed, during the past 2 years, with the generally unsatisfactory relationship of dentistry to the total health care program of the Veterans' Administration. In fact, it is my impression that a meaningful relationship between a college of dentistry and its university, with the Veterans' Administration, is barely possible with the present level of staffing and over-all support. I mention this because of its relevance to the legislation under consideration. I cannot be enthusiastic about the prospects of the Veterans' Administration entering into formal emphasis on training unless, in the case of dentistry, it is willing to make good programs possible through adequate administrative and budgetary support. May I urge your attention to the greater emphasis upon the po-

tential role of dentistry in the total health program of the Veterans' Administration.

I wish to emphasize my strong support of the new legislation which you propose. Please accept my thanks for the excellent leadership you are providing in this area.

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN L. MORRIS, D.D.S., Ph. D.,
Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND,
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK,
Baltimore, Md., November 11, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: Your thoughtfulness in calling to my attention your proposed legislation, H.R. 11631, to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel, is appreciated very much.

The school of social work at the University of Maryland is one of the newest and one of those growing most rapidly. An essential element in the development of the school has been the availability of a limited number of field instruction opportunities in the Veterans' Administration regional office in Baltimore and in Maryland VA hospitals.

We have been most appreciative of the high quality of the instruction which these afford our students. We are most appreciative of the willingness of the managers of these facilities and the chiefs of social work services to extend themselves in making such field instruction available.

However, if this school's enrollment is to be expanded to meet the urgent need for professional social work personnel there must be a corresponding expansion of field instruction opportunities. It is our hope that we can emphasize especially the development of training for social work positions in the health services. Because of the high professional standards which characterize social work services in the Veterans' Administration regional offices and hospitals it will be especially helpful if these training facilities can be expanded substantially and if the social work leadership of the Veterans' Administration can work closely with this school and others in experimental efforts to increase the effectiveness of social work education for the health services.

I am impressed by the possibilities inherent in H.R. 11631, and I look forward to calling it to the attention of members of the Maryland delegation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

VERL S. LEWIS, *Dean.*

BALTIMORE COLLEGE OF DENTAL SURGERY, DENTAL SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND,
Baltimore, Md., November 5, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I have reviewed with a great deal of interest the material which you sent me with your letter of November 3, 1965.

My reaction to your proposal is twofold. First, I would commend you for a forward-looking idea which should provide both breadth and depth to the already excellent program of the Veterans' Administration. Secondly, I would offer my wholehearted support to your efforts in expanding the education and training potential in the VA hospital system. As a member of a deans' committee, I think I have some insight to the problems which you so beautifully outlined in the October 18, 1965, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It has always been by view that the Veterans' Administration medical facilities provide an unlimited source of clinical teaching material as well as the opportunity for teaching institutions to exploit their best potentials in the service and research areas.

Best wishes for success in implementation of what will surely promote a close liaison between this Government agency and the Nation's health science centers.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. SALLEY, *Dean.*

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY,
Lexington, Ky., December 27, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is written in support of the bill currently before the House of Representatives—H.R. 11631—dealing with a training and education of health services personnel in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

I write to lend my strong support as a member of a VA dean's committee dealing with the Veterans' Administration hospital here in Lexington, Ky. Our relationships with this particular Veterans' Administration hospital in relation to teaching and training of health personnel have been most outstanding in the past, and it is my sincere belief that enactment of this particular piece of legislation will add measurably to the capability of the Veterans' Administration hospital and contribute to training and education of health service personnel.

Sincerely yours,

PETER P. BOSOMWORTH, M.D.,
Professor and Chairman.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY,
New Orleans, La., December 3, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I would like to congratulate you on your legislative proposal. As a member of the deans' committee of the veterans' hospital in New Orleans, La., I know some of the restrictive problems the personnel have encountered in trying to improve their program. We have worked hard together with the staff now at the hospital trying to solve as best we can personnel shortages, both there and in the university. The hospital staff has been most helpful to us in our dental school by supplying well-trained personnel in fields where we have been lacking; and also we have tried to contribute with our specialists to their needs. We will continue to serve each other as best we can and we hope that you will be able to impress your colleagues with the necessity of this legislature.

Many thanks to you.

Very sincerely,

E. E. JEANSONNE, D.D.S.,
Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY,
Lexington, Ky., December 15, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: I am writing to support H.R. 11631, a bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to training and education of health service personnel.

The University of Kentucky is affiliated with the Veterans' Administration hospital in Lexington, Ky. It is important to the teaching function of this institution that the facilities and patients of this hospital be used to optimal advantage in training our medical students and house officers. The legislation cited above would implement this endeavor to a striking degree. The staff of this institution would appreciate any help in obtaining favorable action on this legislation. I am sure the medical service of the veterans of this country as well as the medical education in general would be improved if this legislation is enacted.

Thank you very much.

Yours sincerely,

HAROLD D. ROSENBAUM, M.D.,
Professor and Chairman.

SIMMONS COLLEGE,
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK,
Boston, Mass., January 11, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Our high regard for Veterans' Administration facilities as training centers for our students prompts me to urge support of H.R. 11631. This bill should not only continue good training, but make for better patient care, two helpful concomitants. As an educator, and as a veteran, and as a former director of a veterans' service center, I am urging general support for this measure.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT F. RUTHERFORD,
Director.

THE FLORENCE HELLER GRADUATE SCHOOL FOR ADVANCED STUDIES IN SOCIAL WELFARE, BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY,
Waltham, Mass., December 15, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: Your recent letter about H.R. 11631 was forwarded to me in Rome, where I am engaged on some consultation with a department of the Italian Ministry of the Interior. I am so impressed with the purposes and approach of the proposed legislation that I hasten to write you from this distance. Few in America have grasped as well as you have the central dilemma in assuring America a continuation of top level medical care for all of its citizens. That dilemma is made up of a population growing more rapidly than anyone expected, unforeseen progress in medical science, and a serious lag in the preparation of health personnel, especially the auxiliary health workers who are now needed at least in the ratio of 20 for each physician, if we consider national averages.

I have followed the work of the Veterans' Administration, its Department of Medicine and Surgery and, especially, its social work service, for many years, and have been impressed with training and service potential which this vast enterprise holds.

If the proposed bill is adopted, and supported in appropriations, America's health will be in a much more secure state, having a new source for producing skilled manpower. It is especially significant that this end can be gained by making use of an already established national agency, rather than creating new and more costly mechanisms for the same purpose. It goes without saying that the medical care of Veterans' Administration beneficiaries will also be enhanced.

I hope that your farsighted proposal receives the wide support it deserves.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT MORRIS,
Professor of Social Planning.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK,
Boston, Mass., November 23, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: As dean of a school of social work which places students

for field work in institutions of the Veterans' Administration, I favor very enthusiastically the principles incorporated in H.R. 11631, as stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 18, 1965.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN MCDOWELL, *Dean.*

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
Detroit, Mich., November 22, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: I have very carefully studied your proposed legislation which will amend title 36 of the United States Code. This is extremely important legislation, which I support fully. If enacted, it will prove of immense benefit to universities, medical schools, and the Veterans' Administration.

Wayne State University is expanding its medical school, and in the process of expansion, is developing a medical center. This center will call upon all elements of the university and will depend upon the Veterans' Administration hospital in connection with its educational and research program. The legislation you propose is of fundamental importance to our medical center.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST GARDNER, M.D., *Dean.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY,
Ann Arbor, Mich., November 24, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I have read the material which you recently sent me regarding H.R. 11631, and I am in agreement that the full potential of the Veterans' Administration medical care facilities for training health personnel should be developed. The legislative proposal which you suggest would recognize this potential and would be most important in bringing about effective relationships between the Veterans' Administration facilities and the universities and health science schools of the United States.

I shall be most happy to support H.R. 11631.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM R. MANN, *Dean.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY,
Ann Arbor, Mich., December 1, 1965.

Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: The VA-university area advisory council has carefully considered your proposed bill (H.R. 11631) to broaden the Veterans' Administration mission to include education and training as a basic responsibility. This council, primarily concerned with training in psychology, enthusiastically endorses your proposal as in accord with our conception of the appropriate role and function of the VA.

As you correctly note in your speech of October 18, 1965, the functions of education, research, and patient care are inseparable. Excellent patient care can be provided only in a setting where the other functions are also present.

The council is likewise strongly in favor of your second proposal to broaden the base of liaison between the universities and the VA. As a group of university psychology department chairmen and representatives, we can assure you of our cooperation, both in urging the passage of the proposed legislation and in being willing to participate in such liaison activities, after the legislation is passed.

Sincerely,

Wilbert J. McKeachie, Chairman; Dr. Joseph Reyher, Michigan State University; Dr. Charles M. Solley, Wayne State University; Dr. Robert J. Wherry, Ohio State University; Dr. George W. Albee, Western Reserve University; Dr. Leonard Goodstein, University of Cincinnati; Dr. Eckhard Hess, University of Chicago; Dr. Ronald E. Walker, Loyola University; Dr. William A. Hunt, Northwestern University; Dr. Delton C. Beier, Indiana University; Dr. Donald Peterson, University of Illinois; Dr. Jesse G. Harris, Jr., University of Kentucky; Dr. John M. Hadley, Purdue University; Dr. Marvin Kahn, Ohio University; Dr. Dorothy Marquis, Ann Arbor VA; Dr. John Brownfain, Dearborn VA; Dr. Bernard Mikol, Dearborn VA; Dr. Harold Raush, University of Michigan; Dr. Elton Ash, VA Central Office; Dr. H. Robert Albrecht, Chillicothe VA; Dr. John Mason, Battle Creek VA; Dr. David Ehrenfreund, Southern Illinois University.

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS,
Detroit, Mich.

Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Your proposal with respect to expanding the health training program of the Veterans' Administration has been forwarded to me in London. I have read it attentively and am in complete agreement with your view that judicious use of VA facilities would result in a substantial speeding up of the output of needed professional personnel.

Speaking with respect to clinical psychology, which is the only area about which I am really informed, I would suggest that a substantial increase in the number of trainees could be handled with the present permanent staff; i.e., the supervision of these advanced students by experienced clinical psychologists would be feasible with relatively slight expansion of the permanent psychological staff.

The major bottleneck in the field of psychology is actually at the universities. My staff is presently training every student possible with our faculty. We could not increase our allocation of trainees to the VA hospitals near Detroit without some aid in hiring at least one new staff member. We can give the basic (without an increase in faculty) science training but not the work in clinical skills, which is mostly handled individually. Thus, if your proposal is to be maximally effective, the VA may have to be authorized to make modest grants to universities to subsidize added staff in clinical programs. I believe that even this would leave your suggestion as by far the cheapest way to obtain the much needed output.

Very truly yours,

ROSS STAGNER, *Chairman.*

LONDON, N.W.3, ENGLAND, *December 3, 1965.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
MEDICAL SCHOOL,
Ann Arbor, Mich., November 18, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I attach the very greatest importance to the legislative proposals which you have sponsored which recognize the great service to the people of the United States that can be achieved through a more effective relationship between the universities and medical schools of the Nation and the Veterans' Administration medical care facilities. These facilities represent an invaluable portion of the total educational potential of the United States for physicians, nurses, dentists and—of great importance—related health workers. The formal recognition of the educational potential and responsibility of the Veterans' Administration is necessary in order that this potential benefit for the people can be realized.

I am taking the liberty of writing to the congressional delegates from the State of Michigan to advise them of my assessment of the great importance of H.R. 11631 and to ask them to consider lending it their support.

If there is anything I can do to further the effort you have initiated, I will be glad to respond to your request.

Sincerely yours,

W. N. HUBBARD, Jr., M.D., *Dean.*

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF HUMAN MEDICINE,
East Lansing, Mich., November 16, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House of Representatives, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: I am writing to support your legislative proposal concerning strengthening of the relationship between the Veterans' Administration and the medical schools of the United States.

It is clear that developing social legislation is pointing the way toward medical school leadership in the provision of community service and improving the quality of care of the citizens of the United States. One of the most important medical resources we have is, of course, the chain of Veterans' Administration hospitals.

I have looked with alarm at indications of deterioration of the relationship between medical schools and some of the veterans' hospitals, and any legislation with a goal of strengthening this relationship has my heartiest endorsement.

Sincerely,

ANDREW D. HUNT, Jr., M.D., *Dean.*

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS,
Minneapolis, Minn., November 8, 1966.

Mr. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House of Representatives, U.S. Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I appreciate receiving from you the copy of extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 18 and 19, 1965, concerning the introduction of H.R. 11631.

As the director of this school of social work (considered by more than a few as one of the leading schools) which has a teaching partnership relationship to the Veterans' Administration hospital and regional outpatient clinics, I assure you I believe your proposal has more than a little merit. I, for one, would welcome the outcomes proposed in your bill.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. KIDNEIGH, ACSW, *Director.*

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
COLLEGE OF MEDICAL SCIENCES,
Minneapolis, Minn., November 24, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House of Representatives, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I am pleased to have an opportunity to respond to the provisions of your bill, H.R. 11631, which will amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel.

The University of Minnesota College of Medical Sciences was the first medical school

to affiliate with a Veterans' Administration hospital in 1946. This affiliation has been most beneficial to both parties. The retention at the Veterans' Administration hospital of superior medical scientists and clinical physicians in this medical community, the opportunity for the University of Minnesota to offer graduate medical education to a larger number of physicians, the availability of clinical material and laboratory facilities in support of education and research performed by the staff and residents at the Veterans' Administration hospital, and the expansion of services for clinical clerkships for medical students are all important contributions to the educational program of this university. Through the guidance of the university it has been possible to staff the Minneapolis Veterans' Administration Hospital with superior physicians, many of whom are recognized nationally for their scientific competence. Because of this staff support, the residency staff of the Minneapolis Veterans' Administration Hospital has been one of the largest in the entire system. The research accomplishments of the staff have attracted nationwide attention and the research program is comparable to many conducted by medical schools of this country.

At the University of Minnesota the dean's committee has organized this affiliation in such a way that the Veterans' Administration is an adjunct to our mandated program. We have refrained from tying our program to the affiliation in a dependent manner either educationally or fiscally. A severance of this affiliation would not be catastrophic to our overall program. It would call for a redeployment of our students among other affiliated programs in the Twin Cities. This could be done with some difficulty, but would clearly be feasible.

It is most proper to recognize, in a legal manner, the Veterans' Administration role in the training and education of health service personnel. The contribution in this role during the past 20 years has been spectacular, but little or no appreciation of this fact has been given officially.

The local dean's committee arrangement has functioned satisfactorily; policy memorandum No. 2 has served to guide our affiliation in a constructive manner. Your bill would provide that this advisory group be appointed by the Administration, and you have indicated that this would be a significant means of maintaining a high degree of decentralization. To the contrary, I believe this would lead to more centralization. In fact, numerous administrative changes in the Veterans' Administration in the past 10 years have produced more and more centralization. No longer are we permitted to conduct our educational programs at the affiliated hospital with a high degree of compliance with local customs and patterns of operation. I would say that this is one of the major difficulties in the system. The Veterans' Administration is striving to operate all of its hospitals across the Nation in a similar manner when, in fact, medical care varies considerably from one part of the country to another. For example, the dollars allocated to care for a patient for 1 day is standard in the Veterans' Administration whether the care is rendered in New York City, Los Angeles, Minot, or Minneapolis. This system fails to recognize the reality of the economics of medical care.

The operation and maintenance of the physical facilities are financed on a standard basis yet the physical facilities vary from a modern, centralized single building to old, remodeled complexes of numerous buildings. The latter certainly require more dollars in heat, housekeeping, and maintenance.

It is essential that educational programs in medicine maintain an exemplary level of medical care. To accomplish this there must be flexibility and adaptability on the part of the staff and the hospital administration. Our affiliated program at the Veterans' Administration hospital provides the staff to meet these demands but the dean's committee has no means of influencing the budget for keeping the quality of medical care at a level comparable to that offered in the university hospitals. In fact Administrator Driver in speaking to the deans of the medical schools of this country at the meeting of the Association of American Medical Colleges in Philadelphia on November 1, 1965, admitted that his central office staff, with all the statistics collected by the Veterans' Administration, was unable to present an adequate budget which would be acceptable to the administration. He called on the deans to help him substantiate his budget request. The cost of quality medical care is no secret in this country; the squeeze on the budget for rendering medical care to the veterans can only reduce the quality of care still further. The danger, other than to the veteran himself, is a disruption of this excellent and productive medical school affiliated program of proven value over the past 20 years.

I have read Mr. KORNEGAY's comments with interest. He has, in my opinion, pinpointed the problem. The medical program has not been financed adequately. It may be possible to obtain funds to support the educational role, but this cannot solve the impasse, as the real problem is that affiliated hospitals conducting an active patient care program cannot finance an acceptable level of medical care with the limited funding that the present system provides.

May I congratulate you on taking steps to improve the medical care rendered the veterans of our Nation and hope you and your colleagues will take steps to insure a more acceptable operating budget for affiliated hospitals.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT B. HOWARD, M.D., *Dean.*

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY,
Minneapolis, Minn., December 10, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This letter will express support of the legislative proposal known as H.R. 11631 which you have introduced into the House of Representatives.

The passage of your bill will strengthen the partnership between dental schools, medical schools, and the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration is not utilizing its professional personnel to the best advantage of our Nation. The reason for this seems to be that the Bureau of the Budget places most of its emphasis on service and not on education.. Hence, any teaching is a byproduct of service. With proper support the role of education could be increased a great deal and the health care would be second to none. Just as research has improved service to veteran patients, so would teaching. With this improvement in instruction, VA hospitals could be integrated more fully into the university health science complexes.

There is a great need for more hospital training for dentists throughout our Nation. Because we think this is so important, we are planning to institute internship and residency programs in our university hospitals and some auxiliary facilities scattered throughout Hennepin County. Proper budgeting for our VA hospitals here in Minneapolis and elsewhere would make it possible to increase and expand all internship and residency programs to help fill this need. Support of education in veterans hospitals would be beneficial to the health of our veterans and the entire populace. Appropriation of funds specifically for this activity would enhance the quantity and quality of instruction. Not only would the patients in the VA hospitals receive better service, but also all patients in the area would benefit from the establishment of new patterns of improved comprehensive care.

Service to our veterans will become second rate without improvement in the liaison and integration between VA hospitals and university institutions. I hope your endeavors will be successful.

Respectfully yours,

ERWIN M. SCHAFFER, *Dean.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI
MEDICAL CENTER,
Jackson, Miss., November 9, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: This letter is to express support for the bill H.R. 11631 which you have introduced. I believe that the addition of medical education to the mission of the Veterans' Administration will do a great service both to the Veterans' Administration medical care programs and to the Nation as a whole.

As you have so clearly pointed out, the VA system provides a great national resource which should be fully utilized in training programs to better try to meet the national need for personnel in the health field.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT Q. MARSTON, M.D.,
Vice Chancellor and Dean.

THE CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
Omaha, Nebr., November 12, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I was indeed pleased to receive the reproduction of an extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the House which included your statement regarding the Veterans' Administration as a potential resource for health service manpower training. I also acknowledge with admiration the attached statement of Mr. KORNEGAY.

These statements accurately describe the accomplishments, the potential and current difficulties of the liaison between the Veterans' Administration hospitals and the medical schools of this country. I would add the comment that the hospitals of this country, except for the Veterans' Administration hospitals, have for some time, as one of the services which they provide the public, included education and training among their objectives and as an activity inseparable from good patient care.

The proposed amendment to section 4112 of title 38, United States Code, dealing with medical advisory groups, prompts me to comment upon the functions of the deans' committee as a result of my own experiences with this type of relationship with the Omaha Veterans' Administration hospital and the Lincoln Veterans' Administration hospital. Our relationship is not a secondary one in relation to our utilization of other hospital facilities for medical education. In the case of the Creighton University School of Medicine, the affiliation with the Omaha Veterans' Administration hospital provides an essential affiliation to provide needed clinical resources for this school of medicine. I agree with the intent to broaden the number of disciplines involved in the relationship between the hospital and the university, but would urge a clarification of the influence of the deans' committee or the local advisory bodies at the individual hospitals so as to give a more certain legal status to permit the deans' committee or the local advisory body to effectively bring the benefits of the university to the provision of health

care within the hospital. In our own experience, the necessity of more than one medical school being involved in a single Veterans' Administration hospital, and this is not a unique situation, has made more difficult the operation of an extra government committee as an influence upon the effectiveness of the hospital.

The remarks of Mr. KORNEGAY include a description of the difficulty of recruiting and retaining competent health personnel in the Veterans' Administration hospital. One of several factors making this recruitment and retention difficult has been the unfavorable comparison of Veterans' Administration hospital salary schedules with the usual faculty salary schedules. The present salary scales, particularly with regard to the more competitive medical specialties, have not been catastrophic for the Veterans' hospital only because of the ability of the university to assign members of its faculty to the services of the hospital. Medical educators can effectively develop and maintain medical school affiliated Veterans' Administration hospitals as medical centers only if the sums available for the support of professional personnel provide both an adequate number of positions and a competitive salary scale together with a clear-cut role for the advisory group or the deans' committee to effectively influence rather than only advise regarding professional appointments.

I commend your proposed legislation and am willing to assist its presentation in any manner you or your committee may suggest.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. EGAN., M.D., *Dean.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
December 15, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Several weeks ago I received a communication from you regarding a proposed bill which would provide for more extensive involvement of the Veterans' Administration in the training of personnel in medical and associated professional areas. It is my opinion that this proposal deserves enthusiastic support. Especially in view of the current and anticipated shortages of professional personnel in the health field, the facilities of the Veterans' Administration could provide excellent opportunities to contribute materially to such training programs. As a matter of fact, I feel that it is remiss not to use such facilities to the fullest possible extent at a time when staffing needs are so urgent.

Furthermore, I am also convinced that active programs of research should receive adequate support. It is my understanding that at the present time funds for research in many Veterans' Administration hospitals must be gleaned from allocations for patient care. These should not be alternative channels for expending funds, but supplemental programs, each of such importance that it can be supported without imposing limitations on the other. Active training and research programs benefit all facets of health care, and doubtless would have positive effects on meeting staffing needs in Veterans' Administration programs.

I am very glad to indicate my support of the bill you have introduced.

Sincerely yours,

DON W. DYSINGER, *Chairman.*

UNIVERITY OF OREGON MEDICAL SCHOOL,
Portland, Oreg., November 17, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I am replying to your letter concerning the relationship of Veterans' Administration hospitals and medical schools.

During the past two decades the members of our dean's committee and our faculty have been impressed in particular with two facets of this relationship. First, the improvement in patient care has been notable. Second, the opportunities for improving the training of medical personnel have been utilized to considerable advantage.

We believe this relationship should be strengthened and supported for better care of veteran patients, improving teaching methods for residents, and increasing research in the causes and prevention of disease.

Yours sincerely,

D. W. E. BAIRD, M.D., *Dean.*

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS,
Eugene, Oreg., November 18, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Thank you for calling my attention to H.R. 11631. It is another step in the right direction, i.e., of using Veterans' Administration facilities more wisely.

You cannot emphasize too strongly the interdependence of patient care and research. The Veterans' Administration already has made important research contributions to the treatment of long-term neuropsychiatric patients—through the work of the Perry Point group, Fairweather's project at Palo Alto, and Ellsworth's research both at Fort Meade and Roseburg VA hospitals. This research has impact in part as a function of the number of professional persons, of all disciplines, who become familiar with it. The training period is one effective time to give the neophyte physician, nurse, social worker, etc., acquaintance with these new methods.

You deserve commendation for another important feature of the bill: the liberalizing of medical advisory group membership. Having served for approximately 3 years on the Roseburg VA hospital medical advisory board, a group distinguished by representation from nursing, social work, and psychology professions in addition to physicians, I can attest to the increased effectiveness of the multidisciplinary group. Broad spectrum representation seems to increase the likelihood of seeing the entire hospital as a dynamic system with a few major missions, to which each discipline makes important and unique contributions. I believe that this results in a better use of the person resources of the institution.

In summary, you have my support for H.R. 11631. How would you like for me to manifest that support?

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK R. FOSMIRE, Ph. D.,
Professor of Psychology, Director, Clinical Training Program.

REED COLLEGE,
Portland, Oreg., January 24, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Representative from Texas,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I wish to make a few comments concerning two bills (H.R. 11631 and H.R. 7728) which are now before your Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

During the past 18 years I have occasionally worked with staff members of the VA hospital here in Portland, on research projects involving the use of radioisotopes in medicine. I have been impressed not only by the high competence of these physicians but also by their alertness to new developments in medicine and their desire to take maximum advantage of these developments in the operation of the hospital. It has seemed to me, however, that, due to restrictions on its operations, the hospital's full potential has not been realized. The two House bills referred to above will lift these restrictions and thereby enhance the value of the hospital to the community. For this reason, therefore, I want to record my full, unqualified support of H.R. 11631 and H.R. 7728.

I am particularly interested in the fact that H.R. 11631 will open the way for VA hospitals to make important contributions to the education and training of undergraduate students in this country. During 1962–64 I served as head, Special Projects in Science Education of the National Science Foundation, and through this experience I learned something of the needs of many small colleges of the United States of America. I believe that VA hospitals in certain areas could cooperate with small colleges in those areas to mutual advantage. This is one special reason why I hope H.R. 11631 will be enacted during this session of the Congress.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR F. SCOTT,
Professor of Chemistry.

P.S.: A year ago I published an article in which I put together some of my observations on the training and education of chemists. Since certain parts of this article may be of interest to you, I will enclose a reprint for your files.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON,
Seattle, Wash., January 12, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Your letter and a draft of your bill concerning utilization of the Veterans' Administration as a potential resource for health service manpower training has been referred to me for comment.

In view of the critical shortage of health service personnel in all categories, it seems to me essential that all available training resources be used to the maximum. We have been utilizing the facilities in this locality in the training of students in clinical psychology and would like to continue to do so. I would, however, like to make one suggestion. Where paramedical personnel are being trained in a Veterans' Administration hospital, it would seem to me highly desirable to have a representative of the disciplines involved included by specification on the deans' committee of the hospital. At present, the deans' committees are composed (exclusive, as far as I know) of the members of the staff of the Medical School. Schools of nursing, social work and psychology are not represented. While this has not proven to present any insuperable difficulties, training would be more effective and the departments concerned would be more inclined to utilize training facilities if they were represented on the deans' committee.

Sincerely,

C. R. STROTHER, Ph. D.,
Director, Mental Retardation and Child Development Center.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON,
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK,
Seattle, Wash., January 17, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have reviewed your legislative proposal H.R. 11631 and find myself not only in complete agreement with the proposal, but also hope that the Congress will see fit to make the changes which you suggest.

Your proposal clarifies immensely the relationship between the Veterans' Administration and educational institutions in the matter of student stipends and scholarships, and this will, no doubt, strengthen the Veterans' Administration in its efforts to make inroads upon the manpower shortage.

I am equally, if not more, enthusiastic about your proposal to broaden the makeup of the deans' committees which advise veterans' installations. Although the medical profession is undoubtedly tremendously important in the guidance of the treatment programs in veterans' establishments, it must be recognized that other professions are also heavily involved. The broadening of the deans' committees will, in my judgment, have the effect of improving the services offered by Veterans' Administration programs.

I endorse your recommendations and am grateful for your constructive support of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. BRINK, *Dean.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
MEDICAL CENTER,
Madison, Wis., November 8, 1965.

Hon. OLIN TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I am in receipt of your communication regarding a legislative proposal relative to the Veterans' Administration.

I believe any effort to permit the Veterans' Administration with its tremendous resources to participate in the expansion of the medical education effort is to be commended. I think it is highly desirable that the manpower needs of this country be faced realistically.

At the University of Wisconsin we regard our local Veterans' Administration hospital as an important facility for teaching. This, of course, has the effect of improving the quality of medical care for the veteran. Such mutually beneficial relationships should be continued and expanded. I applaud your efforts to amend the present law.

Sincerely yours,

PETER L. EICHMAN, M.D., *Dean.*

THE MENNINGER FOUNDATION,
Topeka, Kans., November 17, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: For many years I have wanted to see education in the Veterans' Administration hospitals acquire the dignity and importance which it really deserves. Paul Hawley and the rest of us of that era longed for something like this. I am referring to the bill which you have introduced into the House to permit the Veterans' Administration to develop its full potential in connection with universities, medical schools, and other educational centers. Thank you.

Sincerely,

KARL MENNINGER, M.D.

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA,
COLLEGE OF DENTISTRY,
Iowa City, Iowa, November 19, 1965.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is a grateful acknowledgement of your letter of November 3d and the attached reproduction of an extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House.

I am heartily in accord with your proposal. I believe that the objectives are perfectly sound. I believe that the implementation of your program will offer improvement to the medical schools, to the Veterans' Administration hospitals and, most importantly, to the adequate care of veteran patients.

A copy of this letter is being sent to Representative JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER along with my suggestion that he give the bill his hearty support.

Sincerely,

GEORGE S. EASTON, D.D.S., *Dean.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA,
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE,
Iowa City, Iowa, December 6, 1965.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to endorse in as strong a fashion as possible your legislative proposal concerning the participation of Veterans' Administration hospitals in medical education. We all know that they have been so involved for many years, although this has not been spelled out even in permissive legislation. At this particular time it is necessary to mobilize all possible support for medical education in view of our country's tremendous health needs. The legislation which you propose would do much to strengthen both the patient care in Veterans' hospitals which is already good and medical education which must be expanded.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT C. HARDIN, M.D.,
Dean, Vice President, Medical Services.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 11631

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before the first sentence and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In order to more effectively carry out the functions imposed on the Department of Medicine and Surgery by subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator, acting in cooperation with schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and nursing; other institutions of higher education; medical centers; hospitals; and such other public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations as the Administrator deems appropriate, shall carry out a program of training and education of health service personnel."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4112 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by amending the subheading thereof to read "§ 4112. Advisory bodies", (2) by inserting "(a)" immediately before the first sentence thereof, and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In each case where the Administrator has a contract or agreement with any school, institution of higher learning, medical center, hospital, or other public or nonprofit agency, institution, or organization, for the training or education of health service personnel, he shall establish an advisory committee (that is, deans committee, medical advisory committee or the like). Such advisory committee shall advise the Administrator and the Chief Medical Director with respect to policy matters arising in connection with, and the operation of, the program with respect to which it was appointed and may be established on an institutionwide, multidisciplinary, basis or on a regional basis whenever such is found to be feasible. Members of each such advisory committee shall be appointed by the Administrator and shall include personnel of the Veterans' Administration and of the entity with which the Administrator has entered into such contract or agreement. The number of members and terms of members of each advisory committee shall be prescribed by the Administrator."

(b) The analysis of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Medical Advisory Group" and inserting in lieu thereof "Advisory bodies".

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 16, strike out the period and insert "(i.e., deans committee, medical advisory committee or the like),"

On page 2, line 20, strike out the period and insert "and may be established on an institutionwide, multidisciplinary basis or on a regional basis whenever such is found to be feasible."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support this vital piece of legislation which our chairman has sponsored. I hope that H.R. 11631 can be speedily enacted into law. It carries the approval of many fine institutions in my State of Florida and I am happy to include as a part of my remarks some letters of support of this legislation from officials at our great University at Gainesville.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA,
Gainesville, November 18, 1965

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: In reference to the legislative proposal concerning Veterans' Administration partnership with universities and medical schools, I should like to make a few comments which might be useful in the deliberations of your committee.

The University of Florida, through the J. Hillis Miller Health Center, and its various colleges, is in the process of planning affiliation with the Veterans' Administration hospital under construction in Gainesville. The history of this hospital and its planned affiliation is probably no more than an average example of the difficulties encountered by the Veterans' Administration because of legal and budgetary restrictions. Unquestionably, officials and representatives of the Veterans' Administration have a very definite desire to utilize the facilities of Veterans' Affairs for educational programs in the health field. However, even in planning the affiliation of a new hospital, the difficulties are so numerous that frequently one wonders whether a true affiliation of such a hospital can become possible at all.

1. First of all, the planning of the hospital cannot include its potential mission as an educational institution because space is assigned exclusively on the basis of patient care.

2. There is no overall policy for the utilization of VA facilities for education in the health field as a whole. Our deans' committee called at the University of Florida, the VA Hospital Advisory Council, is probably unique inasmuch as it has on its membership the deans of the college of nursing, college of health-related professions, and college of pharmacy in addition to the dean of the college of medicine.

3. Fiscal policy makes it difficult to plan an educational program in advance. Decisions can only be obtained on urgent problems rather than for long-range plans.

These are only a few of the reasons for which any deans' committee may find it very difficult to deal effectively with the affiliation program. The suggested bill H.R. 631 could greatly help toward alleviating this situation. I fully agree with your statement in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that it is exceedingly wasteful that the Federal Government is not able to utilize fully the facilities offered by the Veterans' Administration for educational purposes while at the same time being engaged in many activities aimed at supporting health education.

If I could be of any assistance in your attempts to improve this situation, I would be very happy to be informed.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL SUTER, M.D.,
Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA,
Gainesville, November 18, 1965.

Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I have read with interest and enthusiasm the material concerning H.R. 11631. It is, in my opinion, clearly an excellent development. For some time now, the health services have found growing responsibilities in the general hospital programs in spite of the awkward policy structures that have been the rule. This bill will certainly be a step in the right direction in improving matters.

I speak to this as a departmental chairman of psychology and more than 15 years of intermittent consulting with the Veterans' Administration.

Let me at this time express my general appreciation for your efforts in the health areas.

Sincerely,

WILSE B. WEBB,
Chairman.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA,
COLLEGE OF HEALTH RELATED PROFESSIONS,
Gainesville, November 16, 1965.

The Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I am grateful to you for sending me a copy of the extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of October 18, 1965, which includes your remarks regarding the use of the Veterans' Administration as a potential resource for health service manpower. I have been affiliated with the Veterans' Administration program for clinical psychologists for more than 17 years and from this vantage, I would heartily commend, endorse, and support your recommendations.

For a number of years I was on the faculty at Duke University Medical School before coming to the University of Florida's J. Hillis Miller Health Center. In this latter center, a number of health related professions as well as physicians are being trained and the excitement and potential for effective training and patient-care services which derives from our own example encourages me to support your proposal on the basis of some experience.

Shortly, a Veterans' Administration hospital will be opened alongside our teaching hospital at the University of Florida and I feel that your proposals for the advisory committee structure would enormously enhance the training opportunities in the Veterans' Administration hospital. On an informal basis, the very essence of your proposal is being worked out, but it would certainly be more appropriate to have it legally established and encouraged in other settings as well as our own. Your proposal should certainly function to provide training to meet the needs for a wider range of desperately needed health workers.

Again, may I commend you, sir, for your articulate and foresighted presentation.

Very truly yours,

LOUIS D. COHEN, Ph. D.,
Professor and Chairman.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in connection with our consideration today of House Resolution 11631, I would like to call to the attention of the House the endorsement of this measure by the dean of the School of Dentistry of the Medical College of Virginia at Richmond, Dr. Harry Lyons. This bill calls for the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration to carry out a program of training and educating health service personnel in cooperation with schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and nursing. Dr. Lyons' endorsement of the bill came in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, which I am pleased to include at this point in the RECORD:

MEDICAL COLLEGE OF VIRGINIA,
Richmond, Va., November 22, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I applaud your proposed legislation with reference to the Veterans' Administration and the training and education of health service personnel. The implementation of such a program would be a significant contribution to the health and welfare of our people.

Sincerely,

HARRY LYONS,
Dean.

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

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

EDUCATION AND OTHER BENEFITS FOR VETERANS OF SERVICE AFTER JANUARY 31, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12410) to enhance the benefits of service in the Armed Forces of the United States and further extend the benefits of higher education by providing a broad program of educational benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and certain members of the Armed Forces; and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12410

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966".

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

SEC. 2. Part III of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after chapter 31 thereof the following new chapter:

"Chapter 34—Veterans' educational assistance

"Subchapter I—Purpose—Definitions

"Sec.
"1651. Purpose.
"1652. Definitions.

"Subchapter II—Eligibility and Entitlement

"1661. Eligibility; entitlement; duration.
"1662. Time limitations for completing a program of education.
"1663. Educational and vocational counseling.

"Subchapter III—Enrollment

"1670. Selection of program.
"1671. Applications; approval.
"1672. Change of program.
"1673. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses.
"1674. Discontinuance for unsatisfactory conduct or progress.
"1675. Period of operation for approval.
"1676. Education outside the United States.

"Subchapter IV—Payments to Eligible Veterans

"1681. Educational assistance allowance.
"1682. Computation of education assistance allowances.
"1683. Measurement of courses.
"1684. Overcharges by educational institutions.
"1685. Approval of courses.
"1686. Discontinuance of allowances.

"Subchapter I—Purpose—Definitions

"§ 1651. Purpose

"The Congress of the United States hereby declares that the education program created by this chapter is for the purpose of (1) enhancing and making more attractive service in the Armed Forces of the United States, (2) extending the benefits of a higher education to qualified and deserving young persons who might not otherwise be able to afford such an education, (3) providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose careers have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty after January 31, 1955, and (4) aiding such persons in attaining the vocational and educational status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country.

"§ 1652. Definitions

"For the purposes of this chapter—

"(a)(1) The term 'eligible veteran' means any veteran who (A) served on active duty for a period of more than 180 days any part of which occurred after January 31, 1955, and who was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable or (B) was discharged or released from active duty after such date for a service-connected disability.

"(2) The requirement of discharge or release, prescribed in paragraph (1)(A), shall be waived in the case of any individual who served at least two years in an active-duty status for so long as he continues on active duty without a break therein.

"(3) For purposes of paragraph (1)(A) and section 1661(a), the term 'active duty' does not include any period during which an individual (A) was assigned full time by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians, (B) served as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, or (C) served under the provisions of section 511(d) of title 10 pursuant to an enlistment in the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard or as a Reserve for service in the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Air Force Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve.

"(b) The term 'program of education' means any curriculum or any combination of unit courses or subjects pursued at an educational institution which is generally accepted as necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"(c) The term 'educational institution' means any public or private secondary school, vocational school, correspondence school, business school, junior college, teachers' college, college, normal school, professional school, university, or scientific or technical institution, or any other institution if it furnishes education at the secondary school level or above.

"(d) The term 'dependent' means—

"(1) a child of an eligible veteran;

"(2) a dependent parent of an eligible veteran; and

"(3) the wife of an eligible veteran.

"Subchapter II—Eligibility and Entitlement

"§ 1661. Eligibility; entitlement; duration

"Entitlement

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), each eligible veteran shall be entitled to educational assistance under this chapter for a period of one month (or to the equivalent thereof in part-time educational assistance) for each month or fraction thereof of his service on active duty after January 31, 1955.

"Entitlement limitations

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), in no event shall an eligible veteran receive educational assistance under this chapter for a period which, when combined with education and training received under any or all of the laws listed below, will exceed thirty-six months—

"(1) Parts VII or VIII, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1(a), as amended;

"(2) title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952;

"(3) the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956;

"(4) chapters 31, 33, and 35 of this title.

"(c) Whenever the period of entitlement under this section of an eligible veteran who is enrolled in an educational institution regularly operated on the quarter or semester system ends during a quarter or semester, such period shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester. In educational institutions not operated on the quarter or semester system, whenever the period of eligibility ends after a major portion of the course is completed such period shall be extended to the end of the course or for twelve weeks, whichever is the lesser period.

"(d) If an eligible veteran is entitled to educational assistance under this chapter and also to vocational rehabilitation under chapter 31 of this title, he must, if he wants either, elect whether he will receive educational assistance or vocational rehabilitation. If an eligible veteran is entitled to educational assistance under this chapter and is not entitled to such vocational rehabilitation, but after beginning his program of education becomes entitled (as determined by the Administrator) to such vocational rehabilitation, he must, if he wants either, elect whether to continue to receive educational assistance or whether to receive such vocational rehabilitation. If he elects to receive vocational rehabilitation, the program of education under this chapter shall be utilized to the fullest extent practicable in determining the character and duration of vocational rehabilitation to be furnished him.

"§ 1662. Time limitations for completing a program of education

"Delimiting period for completion

"(a) No educational assistance shall be afforded an eligible veteran under this chapter beyond the date eight years after his last discharge or release from active duty after January 31, 1955.

"Correction of discharge

"(b) In the case of any eligible veteran who has been prevented, as determined by the Administrator, from completing a program of education under this chapter within the period prescribed by subsection (a), because he had not met the nature of discharge requirements of this chapter before a change, correction, or modification of a discharge or dismissal made pursuant to section 1553 of title 10, the correction of the military records of the proper service department under section 1552 of title 10, or other corrective action by competent authority, then the eight-year delimiting period shall run from the date his discharge or dismissal was changed, corrected, or modified.

"Savings clause

"(c) In the case of any eligible veteran who was discharged or released from active duty before the date for which an educational assistance allowance is first payable under this chapter, the eight-year delimiting period shall run from such date, if it is later than the date which otherwise would be applicable.

"§ 1663. Educational and vocational counseling

"The Administrator may arrange for educational and vocational counseling for veterans eligible for educational assistance under this chapter. At such intervals as he deems necessary, he shall make available information respecting the need for general education and for trained personnel in the various crafts, trades, and professions. Facilities of other Federal agencies collecting such information shall be utilized to the extent he deems practicable.

"Subchapter III—Enrollment

"§ 1670. Selection of program

"Subject to the provisions of this chapter, each eligible veteran may select a program of education to assist him in attaining an educational, professional, or vocational objective at any educational institution (approved in accordance with chapter 36 of this title) selected by him, which will accept and retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution finds him qualified to undertake or pursue.

"§ 1671. Applications; approval

"Any eligible veteran who desires to initiate a program of education under this chapter shall submit an application to the Administrator which shall be in such form, and contain such information, as the Administrator shall prescribe. The Administrator shall approve such application unless he finds that such veteran is not eligible for or entitled to the educational assistance applied for, or that his program of education fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter, or that he is already qualified. The Administrator shall notify the eligible veteran of the approval or disapproval of his application.

"§ 1672. Change of program

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), each eligible veteran (except an eligible veteran whose program has been interrupted or discontinued due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application) may make not more than one change of program of education.

"(b) The Administrator may approve one additional change (or an initial change in the case of a veteran not eligible to make a change under subsection (a)) in program if he finds that—

"(1) the program of education which the eligible veteran proposes to pursue is suitable to his aptitudes, interests, and abilities; and

"(2) in any instance where the eligible veteran has interrupted, or failed to progress in, his program due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application, there exists a reasonable likelihood with respect to the program which the eligible veteran proposes to pursue that there will not be a recurrence of such an interruption or failure to progress.

"(c) As used in this section the term 'change of program of education' shall not be deemed to include a change from the pursuit of one program to pursuit of another program where the first program is prerequisite to, or generally required for, entrance into pursuit of the second.

"§ 1673. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses

"(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any type of course which the Administrator finds to be avocational or recreational in character unless the eligible veteran submits justification showing that the course will be of bona fide use in the pursuit of his present or contemplated business or occupation.

"(b) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any course of flight training other than one given by an educational institution of higher learning for credit toward a standard college degree the eligible veteran is seeking.

"(c) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any course of apprentice or other training on the job, any course of institutional on-farm training, or any course to be pursued by open circuit television (except as herein provided) or radio. The Administrator may approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in a course, to be pursued in residence, leading to a standard college degree which includes, as an integral part thereof, subjects offered through the medium of open circuit television, if the major portion of the course requires conventional classroom or laboratory attendance.

"(d) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible person in any course which is to be pursued as a part of his regular secondary school education, but this subsection shall not prevent the enrollment of an eligible veteran in a course to be pursued below the college level if the Administrator finds that such veteran has ended his secondary school education (by completion or otherwise) and that such course is a specialized vocational course pursued for the purpose of qualifying in a bona fide vocational objective.

"(e) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of any eligible veterans, not already enrolled, in any nonaccredited course below the college level offered by a proprietary profit or proprietary nonprofit educational institution for any period during which the Administrator finds that more than 85 per centum of the students enrolled in the course are having all or part of their tuition, fees, or other charges paid to or for them by the educational institution or the Veterans' Administration under this chapter or chapter 31 or 35 of this title.

"§ 1674. Discontinuance for unsatisfactory conduct or progress

"The Administrator shall discontinue the educational assistance allowance of an eligible veteran if, at any time, the Administrator finds that according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the educational institution, his conduct or progress is unsatisfactory. The Administrator may renew the payment of the educational assistance allowance only if he finds that—

"(1) the cause of the unsatisfactory conduct or progress of the eligible veteran has been removed; and

"(2) the program which the eligible veteran now proposes to pursue (whether the same or revised) is suitable to his aptitudes, interests, and abilities.

"§ 1675. Period of operation for approval

"(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any course offered by an educational institution when such course has been in operation for less than two years.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

"(1) any course to be pursued in a public or other tax-supported educational institution;

"(2) any course which is offered by an educational institution which has been in operation for more than two years, if such course is similar in character to the instruction previously given by such institution;

"(3) any course which has been offered by an institution for a period of more than two years, notwithstanding the institution has moved to another location within the same general locality; or

"(4) any course which is offered by a nonprofit educational institution of college level and which is recognized for credit toward a standard college degree.

"§ 1676. Education outside the United States

"An eligible veteran may not pursue a program of education at an educational institution which is not located in a State, unless such program is pursued at an approved

educational institution of higher learning. The Administrator in his discretion may deny or discontinue the educational assistance under this chapter of any veteran in a foreign educational institution if he finds that such enrollment is not for the best interest of the veteran or the Government.

"Subchapter IV—Payments to Eligible Veterans

"§ 1681. Educational assistance allowance

"(a) The Administrator shall pay to each eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education under this chapter an educational assistance allowance to meet, in part, the expenses of his subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, equipment, and other educational costs.

"(b) The educational assistance allowance of an eligible veteran shall be paid, as provided in section 1682 of this title, only for the period of his enrollment as approved by the Administrator, but no allowance shall be paid—

"(1) to any veteran enrolled in a course which leads to a standard college degree for any period when such veteran is not pursuing his course in accordance with the regularly established policies and regulations of the educational institution and the requirements of this chapter, or of chapter 36;

"(2) to any veteran enrolled in a course which does not lead to a standard college degree for any day of absence in excess of thirty days in a twelve-month period, not counting as absences weekends or legal holidays established by Federal or State law during which the institution is not regularly in session; or

"(3) to any veteran pursuing his program exclusively by correspondence for any period during which no lessons were serviced by the institution.

"(c) The Administrator may, pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe, determine enrollment in, pursuit of, and attendance at, any program of education or course by an eligible veteran for any period for which he receives an educational assistance allowance under this chapter for pursuing such program or course.

"(d) No educational assistance allowance shall be paid to an eligible veteran enrolled in a course in an educational institution which does not lead to a standard college degree for any period until the Administrator shall have received—

"(1) from the eligible veteran a certification as to his actual attendance during such period or where the program is pursued by correspondence a certificate as to the number of lessons actually completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution; and

"(2) from the educational institution, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, that such veteran was enrolled in and pursuing a course of education during such period and, in the case of an institution furnishing education to a veteran exclusively by correspondence, a certificate, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, as to the number of lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution.

"(e) Educational assistance allowances shall be paid as soon as practicable after the Administrator is assured of the veteran's enrollment in and pursuit of the program of education for the period for which such allowance is to be paid.

"§ 1682. Computation of educational assistance allowances

"(a) (1) Except as provided in subsection (b) or (c) (1), while pursuing a program of education under this chapter of half-time or more, each eligible veteran shall be paid the monthly educational assistance allowance set forth in column II, III, or IV (whichever is applicable as determined by the veteran's dependency status) opposite the applicable type of program as shown in column I:

"Column I	Column II	Column III	Column IV
Type of program	No dependents	One dependent	Two or more dependents
Institutional:			
Full-time	$100	$125	$150
Three-quarter time	75	95	115
Half-time	50	65	75
Cooperative	80	100	120

"(2) A 'cooperative' program means a full-time program of education which consists of institutional courses and alternate phases of training in a business or industrial establishment with the training in the business or industrial establishment being strictly supplemental to the institutional portion.

"(b) The educational assistance allowance of an individual pursuing a program of education—

"(1) while on active duty, or

"(2) on less than a half-time basis,

shall be computed at the rate of (A) the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same program to pay, or (B) $100 per month for a full-time course, whichever is the lesser.

"(c) (1) The educational assistance allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing a program of education exclusively by correspondence shall be computed on the basis of the established charge which the institution requires nonveterans to pay for the course or courses pursued by the eligible veteran. Such allowance shall be paid quarterly on a pro rata basis for the lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution, as certified by the institution.

"(2) In the case of any eligible veteran who is pursuing any program of education exclusively by correspondence, one-fourth of the elapsed time in following such program of education shall be charged against the veteran's period of entitlement.

§ 1683. Measurement of courses

"(a) For the purposes of this chapter—

"(1) an institutional trade or technical course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level involving shop practice as an integral part thereof, shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of thirty hours per week of attendance is required with no more than two and one-half hours of rest periods per week allowed;

"(2) an institutional course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of twenty-five hours per week net of instruction (which may include customary intervals not to exceed ten minutes between hours of instruction) is required; and

"(3) an institutional undergradute course offered by a college or university on a quarter- or semester-hour basis for which credit is granted toward a standard college degree shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of fourteen semester hours or its equivalent is required.

"(b) The Administrator shall define part-time training in the case of the types of courses referred to in subsection (a), and shall define full-time and part-time training in the case of all other types of courses pursued under this chapter.

"§ 1684. Overcharges by educational institutions

"(a) If the Administrator finds that an educational institution has charged or received from any eligible veteran pursuing a program of education under this chapter any amount for any course in excess of the charges for tuition and fees which such institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveteran students, who are enrolled in the same course to pay, he may disapprove such educational institution for the enrollment of any eligible veteran not already enrolled therein under this chapter and any eligible veteran or person not already enrolled therein under chapter 31 or 35 of this title.

"(b) Any educational institution which has been disapproved under section 1734 of this title shall be deemed to be disapproved for the enrollment under this chapter of any eligible veteran not already enrolled therein.

"§ 1685. Approval of courses

"An eligible veteran shall receive the benefits of this chapter while enrolled in a course of education offered by an educational institution only if such course is approved in accordance with the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 36 of this title.

"§ 1686. Discontinuance of allowances

"The Administrator may discontinue the educational assistance allowance of any eligible veteran if he finds that the program of education or any course in which the eligible veteran is enrolled fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter or chapter 36, or if he finds that the educational institution offering such program or course has violated any provision of this chapter or chapter 36, or fails to meet any of their requirements."

SEC. 3. (a) Chapter 35 of title 38 of the United States Code is amended by—

(1) amending section 1761 thereof to read as follows:

"§ 1761. Authority and duties of Administrator

"(a) The Administrator may provide the educational and vocational counseling required under section 1720 of this title, and may provide or require additional counseling if he deems it to be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this chapter.

"(b) Where any provision of this chapter authorizes or requires any function, power, or duty to be exercised by a State, or by any officer or agency thereof, such function, power, or duty shall, with respect to the Republic of the Philippines, be exercised by the Administrator.";

(2) deleting in section 1762, "(a)" and subsection (b) in its entirety;

(3) deleting sections 1726, 1763, 1764, 1765, 1766, 1767, and 1768;

(4) deleting the following heading immediately preceding section 1771, "Subchapter VII—State Approving Agencies", and substituting therefor:

"Chapter 36.—Administration of educational benefits

"Subchapter I—State Approving Agencies

"Sec.
"1770. Scope of approval.
"1771. Designation.
"1772. Approval of courses.
"1773. Cooperation.
"1774. Reimbursement of expenses.
"1775. Approval of accredited courses.
"1776. Approval of nonaccredited courses.
"1777. Notice of approval of courses.
"1778. Disapproval of courses.

"Subchapter II—Miscellaneous Provisions

"1781. Nonduplication of benefits.
"1782. Control by agencies of the United States.
"1783. Conflicting interests.
"1784. Reports by institutions.
"1785. Overpayments to eligible persons or veterans.
"1786. Examination of records.
"1787. False or misleading statements.
"1788. Advisory Committee.

"1789. Institutions listed by Attorney General.
"1790. Use of other Federal agencies.

"Subchapter I—State Approving Agencies";

(5) inserting a new section 1770 to read as follows:

"§ 1770. Scope of approval

"(a) A course approved under and for the purposes of this chapter shall be deemed approved for the purposes of chapters 34 and 35 of this title.

"(b) Any course approved under chapter 33 of this title, prior to February 1, 1965, under subchapter VII of chapter 35 of this title, prior to the date of enactment of this chapter, and not disapproved under section 1686, section 1656 (as in effect prior to February 1, 1965), or section 1778 of this title, shall be deemed approved for the purposes of this chapter.";

(6) striking out in section 1771(a), "this chapter after the date for the expiration of all education and training provided in chapter 33 of this title. Such agency may be the agency designated or created in accordance with section 1641 of this title", and substituting therefor "chapters 34 and 35 of this title";

(7) striking out in sections 1772, 1773, and 1774, each time it appears, the phrase "this chapter" and substituting therefor "chapters 34 and 35";

(8) striking out in sections 1772, 1774, and 1775, each time it appears, the phrase "eligible person" and substituting therefor "eligible person or veteran";

(9) striking out in section 1776 "1653 or";

(10) deleting from the analysis appearing at the head of chapter 35 of such title:

"1726. Institutions listed by the Attorney General."

and

"1763. Control by agencies of the United States.
"1764. Conflicting interests.
"1765. Reports by institutions.
"1766. Overpayments to eligible persons.
"1767. Examination of records.
"1768. False or misleading statements.

"Subchapter VII—State Approving Agencies

"1771. Designation.
"1772. Approval of courses.
"1773. Cooperation.
"1774. Reimbursement of expenses.
"1775. Approval of accredited courses.
"1776. Approval of nonaccredited courses.
"1777. Notice of approval of courses.
"1778. Disapproval of courses."

(11) striking out the term "eligible persons" in sections 1773(a) and 1774 and inserting in lieu thereof "eligible persons or veterans".

(b) Title 38 of the United States Code is further amended by adding immediately following section 1778, the following new subchapter:

"Subchapter II—Miscellaneous Provisions

"§ 1781. Nonduplication of benefits

"No educational assistance allowance or special training allowance shall be paid on behalf of any eligible person or veteran under chapter 34 or 35 of this title for any period during which such person or veteran is enrolled in and pursuing a program of education or course paid for by the United States under any provision of law other than such chapters, where the payment of an allowance would constitute a duplication of benefits paid from the Federal Treasury to the eligible person or veteran or to his parent or guardian in his behalf.

"§ 1782. Control by agencies of the United States

"No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out this chapter, shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any State approving agency, or State educational agency, or any educational institution. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent any department, agency, or officer of the United States from exercising any supervision or control which such department, agency, or officer is authorized by law to exercise over any Federal educational institution or to prevent the furnishing of education under chapter 34 or 35 of this title in any institution over which supervision or control is exercised by such other department, agency, or officer under authority of law.

"§ 1783. Conflicting interests

"(a) Every officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration who has, while such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, any educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible person or veteran was pursuing a program of education or course under chapter 34 or 35 shall be immediately dismissed from his office or employment.

"(b) If the Administrator finds that any person who is an officer or employee of a State approving agency has, while he was such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, an educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible person or veteran was pursuing a program of education or course under chapter 34 or 35 of this title, he shall discontinue making payments under section 1774 of this title to such State approving agency unless such agency shall, without delay, take such steps as may be necessary to terminate the employment of such person and such payments shall not be resumed while such person is an officer or employee of the State approving agency, or State department of veterans' affairs or State department of education.

"(c) A State approving agency shall not approve any course offered by an educational institution operated for profit and, if any such course has been approved, shall disapprove each such course, if it finds that any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration or the State approving agency owns an interest in, or receives any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, such institution.

"(d) The Administrator may, after reasonable notice and public hearings, waive in writing the application of this section in the case of any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration or of a State approving agency, if he finds that no detriment will result to the United States or to eligible persons or veterans by reason of such interest or connection of such officer or employee.

"§ 1784. Reports by institutions

"Educational institutions shall, without delay, report to the Administrator in the form prescribed by him, the enrollment, interruption, and termination of the education of each eligible person or veteran enrolled therein under chapter 34 or 35.

"§ 1785. Overpayments to eligible persons or veterans

"Whenever the Administrator finds that an overpayment has been made to an eligible person or veteran as the result of (1) the willful or negligent failure of an educational institution to report, as required by chapter 34 or 35 of this title and applicable regulations, to the Veterans' Administration excessive absences from a course, or discontinuance or interruption of a course by the eligigible person or veteran, or (2) false certification by an educational institution, the amount of such overpayment shall constitute a liability of such institution, and may be recovered in the same manner as any other debt due the United States. Any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is recovered from the eligible person or veteran. This section shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal liability under this or any other law.

"§ 1786. Examination of records

"The records and accounts of educational institutions pertaining to eligible persons or veterans who received education under chapter 34 or 35 of this title shall be available for examination by duly authorized representatives of the Government.

"§ 1787. False or misleading statements

"Whenever the Administrator finds that an educational institution has willfully submitted a false or misleading claim, or that a person or veteran, with the complicity of an educational institution, has submitted such a claim, he shall make a complete report of the facts of the case to the appropriate State approving agency and, where deemed advisable, to the Attorney General of the United States for appropriate action.

"§ 1788. Advisory committee

"There shall be an advisory committee formed by the Administrator which shall be composed of persons who are eminent in their respective fields of education, labor, and management, and of representatives of the various types of institutions and establishments furnishing vocational rehabilitation under chapter 31 of this title or education to eligible persons or veterans enrolled under chapter 34 or 35 of this title. The Commissioner of Education and the Administrator, Manpower Administration, Department of Labor, shall be ex officio members of the advisory committee. The Administrator shall advise and consult with the committee from time to time with respect to the administration of this chapter and chapters 31, 34, and 35 of this title, and the committee may make such reports and recommendations as it deems desirable to the Administrator and to the Congress.

"§ 1789. Institutions listed by Attorney General

"The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of, or payment of an additional assistance allowance to, any eligible veteran or eligible person under chapter 34 or 35 of this title in any course in an educational institution while it is listed by the Attorney General under section 12 of Executive Order 10450.

"§ 1790. Use of other Federal agencies

"In carrying out his functions under this chapter or chapter 34 or 35 of this title, the Administrator may utilize the facilities and services of any other Federal department or agency. Any such utilization shall be pursuant to proper agreement with the Federal department or agency concerned; and payment to cover the cost thereof shall be made either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in such agreement."

SEC. 4. (a) Chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, is hereby repealed.

(b) Nothing in this Act or any amendment or repeal made by it, shall affect any right or liability (civil or criminal) which matured under chapter 33 of title 38 before the date of enactment of this Act; and all offenses committed, and all penalties and forfeitures incurred, under any provision of law amended or repealed by this Act, may be punished or recovered, as the case may be, in the same manner and with the same effect as if such amendments or repeals had not been made.

(c) The analyses of title 38, United States Code, and of part III thereof, are both amended by (1) striking out:

"33. Education of Korean Conflict Veterans ..... 1601";

(2) inserting in lieu thereof,

"34. Veterans' Educational Assistance ..... 1650";

and (3) inserting immediately after

"35. War Orphans' Educational Assistance ..... 1701"

the following:

"36. Administration of Educational Benefits ..... 1770".

(d) Section 101 of such title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding the following sentence to paragraph (20) thereof: "For the purpose of section 903 and chapters 34 and 35 of this title, such term also includes the Canal Zone."

(e) Section 102(a)(2) of such title 38 is amended by striking out "Except for the purposes of chapter 33 of this title, dependency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Dependency".

(f) Section 102(b) of such title 38 is amended by striking out "(except chapters 19 and 33)", and inserting in lieu thereof, "(except chapter 19)".

(g) Section 111(a) of such title 38 is amended by striking out "33" and inserting in lieu thereof "34".

(h) Section 211(a) of such title 38 is amended by striking out "775, 784, 1661, 1761" and inserting in lieu thereof "775, 784".

(i) Section 903(b) of such title 38 is amended by deleting the last sentence thereof.

(j) Section 1701 of such title 38 is amended (1) by striking out "1013(c)(1) of title 50" in subsection (a)(3)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "511(d) of title 10" (2) by striking out paragraphs (8) and (9) in subsection (a) thereof and redesignating paragraph (10) of such subsection as paragraph (8) and (3) by striking out "and prior to the end of the induction period" in subsections (a)(1) and (d) thereof.

(k) Section 1711(b) of such title 38 is amended by striking out "33" and inserting in lieu thereof "34", and by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "or under chapter 33 of this title as in effect before February 1, 1965".

(l) Section 1731 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (c) thereof and inserting immediately after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

"(c) The Administrator may, pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe, determine enrollment in, pursuit of, and attendance at, any program of education or course by an eligible person for any period for which an educational assistance allowance is paid on behalf of such eligible person under this chapter for pursuing such programs of course.

"(d) No educational assistance allowance shall be paid on behalf of an eligible person enrolled in a course in an educational institution which does not lead to a standard college degree for any period until the Administrator shall have received—

"(1) from the eligible person a certification as to his actual attendance during such period; and

"(2) from the educational institution, a certification, or an endorsement on the eligible person's certificate, that he was enrolled in and pursuing a course of education during such period.

"(e) Educational assistance allowances shall be paid as soon as practicable after the Administrator is assured of the eligible person's enrollment in and pursuit of the program of education for the period for which such allowance is to be paid."

(m) Section 1734(a) of such title 38 is amended by striking out "33" and inserting in lieu thereof "34".

(n) Section 1735 of such title 38 is amended to read as follows: "An eligible person shall receive the benefits of this chapter while enrolled in a course of education offered by an educational institution only if such course (1) is approved in accordance with the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 36 of this title, or (2) is approved for the enrollment of the particular individual under the provisions of section 1737 of this title."

(o) Section 1736 of such title 38 is amended by (1) striking out "(a)", (2) striking out all of subsection (b) thereof, and (3) inserting after the phrase "this chapter", both times it appears, the following: ", or of chapter 36 of this title,".

(p) Section 3013 of such title 38 is amended by striking out "33" and inserting in lieu thereof "34".

GUARANTEED HOME AND FARM LOANS

SEC. 5 (a) Chapter 37 of title 38 of the United States Code is amended by inserting immediately after section 1817 the following new section:

§ 1818. Veterans who serve after January 1955

"(a) Each eligible veteran, as defined in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of section 1652 of this title, shall be eligible for the benefits of this chapter (except sections 1813 and 1815, and business loans under section 1814, of this title), subject to the provisions of this section.

"(b) Entitlement under subsection (a), (1) shall cancel any unused entitlement under other provisions of this chapter derived from service during World War II or the Korean conflict, and (2) shall be reduced by the amount by which entitlement from service during World War II or the Korean conflict has been used to obtain a direct, guaranteed, or insured loan—

"(A) on real property which the veteran owns at the time of application; or

"(B) as to which the Administrator has incurred actual liability or loss, unless in the event of loss or the incurrence and payment of such liability by the Administrator the resulting indebtedness has been paid in full.

"(c)(1) Entitlement to the benefits of this section will expire as follows:

"(A) Ten years from the date of discharge or release from the last period of active duty of the veteran, any part of which occurred after January 31, 1955, plus an additional period equal to one year for each three months of active duty performed by the veteran after such date, execpt that entitlement shall not continue in any case after twenty years from the date of the veterans' discharge or release from his last period of active duty, nor shall entitlement expire in any case prior to the date ten years after the date of enactment of this Act; or

"(B) Twenty years from the date of the veteran's discharge or release for a service-connected disability from a period of active duty, any part of which occurred after January 31, 1955.

"(C) Direct loans authorized by this section shall not be made after January 31, 1975, except pursuant to commitments issued by the Administrator on or before that date.

"(2) If a loan report or application for loan guaranty is received by the Administrator before the date of expiration of the veteran's entitlement, the loan may be guaranteed under this chapter after such date.

"(d) A fee shall be collected from each veteran obtaining a loan guaranteed or made under this section, and no loan shall be guaranteed or made under this section until the fee payable with respect to such loan has been collected and remitted to the Administrator. The amount of the fee shall be established from time to time by the Administrator, but shall in no event exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the total loan amount. The amount of the fee may be included in the loan to the veteran and paid from the proceeds thereof. The Administrator shall deposit all fees collected hereunder in the revolving fund established under the provisions of section 1824 of this title.

"(e) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this section, a veteran deriving entitlement under this section shall not be required to pay the fee prescribed by subsection (d) and such entitlement shall include eligibility for any of the purposes specified in sections 1813 and 1815, and business loans under section 1814 of this title, if (1) the period of his entitlement to the benefits of this chapter based on service during World War II or the Korean conflict has not expired under section 1803(a)(3), and (2) he has not used any of his entitlements derived from such service."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 37 of such title is amended by inserting immediately below

"1817. Release from liability under guaranty."

the following:

"1818. Veterans who serve after January 31, 1955."

(c) Section 1822(a) of such title is amended by striking out "or 1813", and inserting in lieu thereof "1813, or 1818".

(d) Section 1803(c)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out ", with the approval of the Secretary" and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: may from time to time find the loan market demands; except that such rate shall in no event exceed that in effect under the provisions of section 203(b)(5) of the National Housing Act."

(e) Section 1811(d) of such title is amended by striking out "$15,000" each place where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place "$17,500".

(f)(1) Subchapter III of chapter 37 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1826. Withholding of payments, benefits, etc.

"(a) The Administrator shall not, unless he first obtains the consent in writing of an individual, set off against, or otherwise withhold from, such individual any benefits payable to such individual under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration because of liability allegedly arising out of any loan made to, assumed by, or guaranteed or insured on account of, such individual under this chapter.

"(b) No officer, employee, department, or agency of the United States shall set off against, or otherwise withhold from, any veteran or the widow of any veteran any payments (other than benefit payments under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration) which such veteran or widow would otherwise be entitled to receive because of any liability to the Administrator allegedly arising out of any loan made to, assumed by, or guaranteed or insured on account of, such veteran or widow under this chapter, unless (1) there is first received the consent in writing of such veteran or widow, as the case may be, or (2) such liability and the amount thereof was determined by a court of competent jurisdiction in a proceeding to which such veteran or widow was a party."

(b) The analysis of subchapter III of such chapter 37 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1826. Withholding of payments, benefits, etc."

JOB COUNSELING

SEC. 6. (a) The heading of chapter 41 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting:

"Chapter 41—Unemployment benefits for veterans"

and inserting therefor:

"Chapter 41—Job counseling and employment placement service for veterans"

(b) The analyses of title 38, United States Code, and of part III thereof, are amended by deleting:

"41. Unemployment Benefits for Veterans ..... 2001"

and inserting therefor:

"41. Job Counseling and Employment Placement Service for Veterans ..... 2001".

(c) Sections 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 of title 38, United States Code, are amended by inserting the phrase, "or of service after January 31, 1955," immediately after the phrase "veterans of any war", and the phrase "veteran of any war" each time such phrases appear therein.

WARTIME PRESUMPTIONS FOR VETERANS SERVING AFTER JANUARY 31, 1955

SEC. 7. (a) Subchapter IV of chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 337. Wartime presumptions for certain veterans

"For the purposes of this subchapter and subchapter V of this chapter and notwithstanding the provisions of sections 332 and 333 of this subchapter, the provisions of sections 311, 312, and 313 of this chapter shall be applicable in the case of any veteran who served in the active military, naval, or air service after January 31, 1955."

(b) The analysis of such subchapter which appears in such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"337. Wartime presumptions for certain veterans."

MEDICAL CARE

SEC. 8. Section 610(a)(1)(B) and section 610(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by inserting "or of service after January 31, 1955," immediately after "veteran of any war".

DECEASED VETERANS—FLAGS

SEC. 9. Section 901(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "or of Mexican border service" and inserting in lieu thereof, "of Mexican border service, or of service after January 31, 1955".

SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT

SEC. 10. Subsection (1) of section 300 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 530), is amended by striking out "$80" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150".

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

SEC. 11. Section 2 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended (5 U.S.C. 851), is amended by striking out "and" at the end of clause (5) and by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "and (7) those ex-service men and women who have served on active duty (as defined in section 101(21) of title 38, United States Code) at any time in any branch of the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of more than one hundred and eighty consecutive days after January 31, 1955, not including service under the provisions of section 511(d) of title 10, United States Code, pursuant to an enlistment in the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard or as a Reserve for service in the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Air Force Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve, and who have been separated from such Armed Forces under honorable conditions."

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 12. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided, the provisions of this Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment, but no educational assistance allowance shall be payable under chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act, for any period before June 1, 1966, nor for the month of June 1966, unless (1) the eligible veteran commenced the pursuit of the course of education on or after June 1, 1966, or (2) the pursuit of such course continued through June 30, 1966.

(b) The provisions of section 1765(b) of title 38, United States Code, as in effect immediately before the enactment of this Act, shall remain in effect through May 31, 1966.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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. 10]

Andrews, N. Dak.	Flynt	Pepper
Arends	Fuqua	Pickle
Aspinall	Griffin	Powell
Baldwin	Hansen, Idaho	Rogers, Tex.
Berry	Keogh	Rostenkowski
Blatnik	King, Calif.	Roush
Cabell	Kluczynski	Schisler
Cahill	Love	Scott
Cameron	McClory	Sweeney
Craley	Martin, Mass.	Taylor
Daddario	Martin, Nebr.	Thomas
Devine	Matsunaga	Thomson, Wis.
Dowdy	Michel	Tuck
Ellsworth	Mink	Vanik
Farnsley	Murray	Vivian
Feighan	Passman	Willis
	Pelly	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill is the result of 8 years of work.

The so-called Korean bill was discontinued by President Eisenhower, a Republican. After that Mr. Eisenhower opposed this type of legislation. President Kennedy opposed this type of legislation. And President Johnson has opposed this type of legislation.

The first bill introduced in the Congress after that bill was discontinued, was by Congressman AYRES of Ohio. The next bill that was introduced was my bill.

We have worked on this legislation for the past 8 years.

We have a bill today that meets the objections of most people.

The Department of Defense objected to this bill contending that it encouraged men to come out of the service and not to stay in the service.

This bill provides that a man in the service can go to school. This bill provides a day of education for a day of service. This bill encourages a man to enlist for either 3 years or to stay in for 4 years.

I have some assurance that the administration will accept this bill.

I have some assurance that the Defense Department is satisfied with it.

I have some assurance—I have positive assurance that all the veterans' groups are for this bill.

I have about as much assurance as you can get from the other body that if this bill passes today, I move to substitute the bill, the language of H.R. 12410, for S. 9, that the other body would take this bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we come to the House today with a bill that every Member can vote for and be happy with.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which the House is considering today, I am glad to say, was reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on last Thursday. I believe we are presenting the House with a bill that all Members can take pride in and support fully.

The measure is closely patterned after the Korean GI bill of rights, Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress, which I had the honor to sponsor. In addition to education and loan guarantee provisions, it provides medical care and other important benefits for veterans serving on and after January 31, 1955.

Perhaps it would be well to consider some of the background of this legislation.

The concept of Federal assistance for education and training first came into being when President Roosevelt was confronted with the necessity of drafting 18-year-olds. In its final form, the legislation went beyond education and training and included home, farm, and business loans; unemployment compensation; job placement assistance; and mustering-out pay. This five-part package became known as the World War II GI bill, and ultimately involved the expenditure of in excess of $20 billion. It was officially designated the Servicemen's Readjustment Assistance Act of 1944, Public Law 346, 76th Congress, June 22, 1944. The year before, the Congress had enacted the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, Public Law 16, 76th Congress. It was the first major scholarship undertaking by the Federal Government and many serious problems developed early in the program.

Instead of continuing the basic principles of the World War II act the Congress, after an investigation which extended over two Congresses, adopted the concept embodied in Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress of making payments direct to the veteran and letting him use the money paid by the Veterans' Administration for his tuition, books, and subsistence. This program has worked extremely well and very few abuses have been noted. This situation is in sharp contrast to Public Law 346 of the 76th Congress.

In 1956, the war orphans' scholarship program was created—Public Law 634, 8th Congress. This program was patterned directly upon the Korean education and training program, in that all of the major administrative provisions of the two programs were incorporated to insure that a school training a veteran

and a war orphan would not be confronted with two programs with varying procedures and regulations. In 1964, the war orphans' program was expanded by adding the children of 100-percent-disabled veterans to those eligible for this benefit—Public Law 88–361.

The Korean conflict was terminated by Presidential proclamation on January 31, 1955. Public Law 7, 84th Congress was enacted, which permitted veterans with as little as 1 day of service prior to February 1, 1955, to accrue entitlement under the Korean program for the period of their service, up until the time of first discharge. Since most enlistments were for a 3-year period, this meant that entitlement could be accrued considerably past the January 31, 1955, termination date.

The structure of veterans' laws which have developed over the past 20 years has been based on the concept of wartime and peacetime service. War veterans have been given substantially more benefits than peacetime veterans. This system worked very well through World War II. It was after World War II, when we entered the so-called cold war, that problems arose. It has been during this period that we have continued compulsory military service for an extended period of time for the first time in our history. Prior to World War II, we had very few servicemen stationed outside the United States. Today our servicemen are scattered throughout the world, and in many instances are serving under combat or near-combat conditions. During the period of time which is covered by this bill, our Nation has gone through a series of crises associated with Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Taiwan-Matsu, Lebanon, Berlin, Laos, and Vietnam. The perpetual cold war condition, with its crises, compulsory military service, and expanded overseas commitments, makes this bill necessary if our servicemen, during this tense period of history, are to receive equitable treatment.

It should be emphasized that it is not the intention of this legislation to establish a program which completely subsidizes the cost of a veteran's education or training program, as well as his living costs. This legislation is designed as an aid program and it is expected that in many cases the veteran will be required to make a contribution to the cost of his own education and training program. It is believed that the veteran will maintain a greater interest in the use made of the funds provided by this bill, if he is required to make a contribution from his own resources.

Moreover, it is emphasized that the purpose of the committee is not to equalize educational opportunities for the veteran population, but rather to provide assistance which would help a veteran to follow the educational plan that he might have adopted had he never entered the Armed Forces.

This legislation, furthermore, insures that the Nation shall be able to utilize the highest skills and abilities of the veterans who benefit from it. This is especially important since at this time the number of young men available to fill the essential technical and professional posts is the lowest in ratio to our total population which we have had or will have for a decade to come. It is doubly essential that we make fullest use of the skills of the young men who are available.

I would like to direct attention to the language on page 11 of the reported bill, which provides that the Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of a person eligible under the new act in "any course which is to be pursued as part of his regular secondary school education." Concern has been expressed that this language would bar a veteran from enrolling in, and pursuing, specialized or accelerated courses for adults which lead to a high school diploma, or its equivalent.

It does not bar the pursuit of those courses which would permit those who dropped out of high school prior to service from making up this deficiency in courses designed for adults, and, thus, permit them to qualify for college, if they so desire, or otherwise enhance their educational or vocational ambitions.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has advised that he concurs in this statement.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague and for many years the ranking minority member of the Veterans' Committee was the first member of the committee to introduce a bill providing education and training for veterans discharged after January 31, 1955, the end of the Korean conflict. Congressman AYRES introduced his bill in the 84th Congress and has labored for its enactment since that time. He has made a great contribution and I express my appreciation to him. His efforts have been recognized in the Akron Beacon Journal. A copy of their editorial comment is inserted:

NEW HELP FOR GI'S

From President Johnson in the White House to the youngest soldier just inducted into the armed services there is general agreement that a new GI bill of rights should be enacted.

This would extend to today's servicemen and possibly to all who have served since 1955 part or all of the special readjustment benefits given to those who served in World War II and the Korean conflict.

The only disagreement in Congress centers around just how generous the Government should be.

In ascending order of generosity, there are these four propositions:

1. The administration bill, to give educational aid to those who have served in "hot spots" such as Vietnam since October 1, 1963, with less help for those with 2 years or more service not in combat areas. This is estimated to cost $150 million a year.

2. The bill approved Thursday by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, giving educational and vocational education benefits to all veterans of 180 days' service or more who have served since 1955 when the Korean war GI benefits expired. This is estimated to cost $327 million a year at the start.

3. A slightly more generous bill passed last year in the Senate and estimated to have a starting cost of $360 million annually.

4. A Republican-sponsored bill which would be still more generous and would cost at least $425 million a year at the start.

Significantly, Akron's Representative WILLIAM H. AYRES, a Republican who is a longtime member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, goes along with the committee majority.

He points to the inconsistency of most of his fellow Republicans, who had been adamantly against any new GI bill benefits from 1955 to 1964 and who now want to outpromise the administration, the Senate, and the House committee members most familiar with the problem.

Our own view is that something of the proportions of the Senate bill or the House committee bill should be ample.

While it might not be necessary to make it retroactive to 1955, it would be extremely hard to fix an intermediate date which would be equitable. We would hope that benefits would not be handed out as cash to those already discharged from service but would be confined strictly to underwriting appropriate educational and vocational study which they may wish to undertake for a limited number of years in the future.

The GI benefits given after World War II and the Korean war proved to be valuable not only to the beneficiaries but to the Nation as a whole because the earning power of these men was increased so much.

The same should be true if reasonable benefits are given to those who have served since 1955 and are serving today. This is one of the least expensive and most rewarding items in the long list of war and defense costs.

This measure, I am glad to say, meets with the full support of the veterans organizations, and I will offer in the RECORD supporting data for this statement.

Now a word as to the basic provisions provided in this bill:

A program of educational assistance on the basis of a month of training for each month of service, not to exceed 36 calendar months, is provided. The assistance rates for full-time training are $100 for a single veteran, $125 for a veteran with one dependent, and $150 for a veteran with more than one dependent. There are proportionate rates for less than full-time training. Education is generally limited to institutions above and below college level, and must be completed within 8 years from the date of discharge. Individuals in the service whose duty assignments permit may avail themselves of educational assistance while on active duty, but in such instances the Government will pay only the cost of tuition fees and not the full education assistance allowance. The educational provisions are effective June 1, 1966.

Loan guarantee provisions provide that the Veterans' Administration may guarantee as much as $7,500 of a loan made by a private lender for a veteran's home. Direct loans are authorized by the Veterans' Administration where private financing is not available, and the maximum amount of such a loan is increased by this legislation from $15,000 to $17,500. The maximum interest rate payable on any loan under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, would be fixed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from time to time, with the maximum which could be fixed by him being that established under the comparable home loan insurance program administered by the Federal Housing Administration. A

fund is established for the Administrator to offset losses by requiring the veteran to pay 0.5 percent of his loan at closing.

The bill also provides non-service-connected medical care in the Veterans' Administration hospital system for these veterans. It further extends to this same group presumptive service connection for chronic and tropical diseases first manifested within specified periods following discharge, a provision now generally limited to veterans who served during time of war.

The Veterans' Administration is authorized to provide a flag to drape the casket of a veteran of this service at the time of his funeral.

Job counseling and job placement under the Department of Labor is authorized and on the same basis as that given to veterans of prior conflicts.

Preference in Federal employment is provided.

Under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act individuals who are renting homes are protected from eviction, except under leave of a court. Where the monthly rental does not exceed $80, the bill increases this figure to $150 since the cost of living in 1940 was 48.4 when the $80 figure was set, and is now 111.

A comparison of Public Law 550, the bill which we are considering today, and the bill, S. 9, is set forth below:

Comparison of Public Law 82–550 (Korean conflict GI bill of rights) with H.R. 12410 and S. 9

Number, author, and date of introduction	Education					Loan guarantee	Medical care	Wartime rates of compensation	Chronic and tropical disease presumption	Autos for amputees	Preference in Federal employment	Burial benefits	Job counseling
	Time limits	Formula	Rate	On the job	On farm								
Public Law 550, 82d Cong., Korean conflict GI bill of rights (not all of benefits listed were contained in this law).	June 27, 1950, to Jan. 31, 1955.	1½ days of training for each day of service; maximum 36 months.	$110 135 160	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
H.R. 12410, Mr. Teague, Jan. 31, 1966.	Feb. 1, 1955 (permanent program).	Month for month; maximum 36 months.	100 125 150	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No [1]	Yes.
S. 9	Feb. 1, 1955, to July 1, 1967.	As Public Law 550	110 135 160	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.

[1] Flag only.

The approximate cost for the first year is estimated by the Veterans' Administration at $358 million.

Hearings were held on this general subject in the first session on the dates of August 31, September 1, 2, 7, and 15, 1965. Members who introduced legislation of this type in the 2d session of the 89th Congress were given an opportunity to file a statement on their proposals, and these statements are in the process of being printed as a supplement to the original hearings.

FEBRUARY 7, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman,
House Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
Washington, D.C.:

I would like to express my support for H.R. 12410. This much-needed legislation will provide education and training, housing, medical and other benefits for veterans being discharged after January 31, 1955. It is a pleasure to support you in achieving passage of this legislation.

GALE SCHISLER,
Member of Congress, 19th District, Illinois.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
February 4, 1966.

MEMBER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to H.R. 12410, the cold war GI bill, which is scheduled for your consideration and vote on Monday, February 7.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States favors the extension of wartime veterans rights and benefits to all who have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States since January 31, 1955, the official end of the Korean conflict.

H.R. 12410 is more than a GI bill. Besides educational training and home loan assistance, the bill proposes entitlement to VA hospital care, job counseling assistance, veterans preference in Federal employment, wartime presumptions for service-connected disability for chronic and tropical diseases, and other provisions.

Accordingly, H.R. 12410 represents a giant step in the direction of carrying out our national resolution to elevate cold war service in the Armed Forces to wartime status so far as veterans programs are concerned.

Your support and vote in favor of H.R. 12410, therefore, will be deeply appreciated by the 1,300,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Sincerely,

ANDY BORG,
Commander in Chief.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 27, 1966.

Congressman OLIN TEAGUE,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Reports indicate that majority of disabilities to our servicemen in Vietnam are caused by tropical diseases and chronic conditions. Disabled American Veterans believe it imperative that members of the Armed Forces be entitled to the presumption of service connection for tropical diseases and chronic diseases on the same basis as the veterans of World War II and Korean conflict. Respectfully urge the Veterans' Affairs Committee consider this matter at their next executive session.

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director of Legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 7, 1966.

Congressman OLIN TEAGUE,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Disabled American Veterans express deep appreciation to you and the members of your committee for favorably reporting H.R. 12410. The bill not only provides a necessary program of educational assistance to post-Korean veterans but also extends valuable benefits to the service-connected disabled. DAV fully endorses the bill. We urge your continued efforts to secure its passage.

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director of Legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *February 5, 1966.*

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

AMVETS strongly urge the early passage of H.R. 12410 which embraces substantive veterans benefits programs. We feel that the intent of this bill will justify the mandates of our organization and we urge the continued support of you and your colleagues to accomplish this end.

RALPH E. HALL,
AMVETS National Commander.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We understand that H.R. 12410 reported by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee will be taken up in the House on Monday, February 7. While this bill does not completely satisfy the American Legion's proposals as set forth in H.R. 12186 it does, among other things, provide immediate benefits to the servicemen now returning to civilian life.

We are grateful to the committee for its efforts and hope that the House will act promptly so that a readjustment program for our veterans can be enacted without delay.

L. ELDON JAMES,
National Commander, The American Legion.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

You and committee to be commended for favorable action on H.R. 12410. Urge speed in enactment in House and necessary coordination with Senate bill 9. Any deficiencies can be corrected by amendments at this or later sessions of Congress.

H. E. SUMMERS,
Chief, Bureau of Readjustment Education.

Department of Defense

SUMMARY OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL PROCUREMENT FISCAL YEARS 1951-65

	Fiscal year														
	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
Total, Department of Defense	2,100,598	1,207,446	1,113,431	797,496	932,448	880,471	815,835	682,299	649,092	591,244	667,255	981,069	665,523	756,528	701,685
Inductions	586,767	379,485	563,930	265,039	215,188	136,752	179,648	126,556	111,249	90,344	60,293	157,654	74,438	150,723	102,555
1st enlistments	630,488	509,517	342,871	329,120	440,271	371,420	302,878	271,064	309,061	324,119	359,524	384,776	327,694	345,143	318,209
Immediate reenlistments	203,060	182,399	110,647	96,756	177,214	240,312	190,747	173,195	152,947	123,001	190,466	240,312	192,359	206,892	226,117
Other reenlistments	71,307	34,505	42,111	53,658	60,174	57,472	49,489	55,717	44,755	28,945	30,503	25,998	25,846	22,163	20,775
Reserves to active duty [1]	608,976	101,540	53,872	52,923	39,601	74,515	93,073	55,767	31,080	24,835	26,469	172,329	45,186	31,607	34,029
Army	1,084,050	498,881	735,154	456,452	452,451	323,584	370,097	315,478	300,993	259,701	267,098	499,315	270,298	361,449	294,090
Inductions	586,767	295,795	563,930	265,039	215,188	108,502	179,432	126,495	111,170	90,266	60,216	157,517	74,387	150,688	102,497
1st enlistments	153,294	79,944	79,725	93,659	119,778	93,637	68,752	78,269	113,098	102,114	116,129	127,063	111,746	116,202	101,901
Immediate reenlistments	67,837	89,976	60,591	56,076	72,832	77,125	63,076	66,077	53,887	50,604	72,092	88,929	68,664	82,074	76,224
Other reenlistments [2]	22,371	9,433	18,387	25,383	31,898	22,743	19,985	21,495	17,146	13,135	16,230	14,933	14,523	11,360	12,327
Reserves to active duty	253,781	23,733	12,521	16,295	12,755	21,577	38,852	23,142	5,692	3,582	2,431	110,873	978	1,125	1,141
Navy	430,076	266,098	138,091	89,455	172,210	241,363	163,111	160,166	146,019	148,424	163,344	198,413	168,564	169,207	169,810
Inductions						28,250	6	3							
1st enlistments	202,438	171,369	88,050	54,917	121,411	111,993	80,354	89,748	86,442	91,440	94,178	107,414	85,265	95,040	94,301
Immediate reenlistments	62,999	34,786	17,869	16,303	23,711	58,867	48,947	37,546	28,027	27,562	37,782	48,819	44,819	37,153	37,686
Other reenlistments	9,181	2,788	2,159	3,209	4,426	5,600	7,061	8,633	9,758	9,316	8,770	7,108	8,060	7,748	6,329
Reserves to active duty	155,458	57,155	30,013	15,026	22,662	36,653	26,743	24,236	21,792	20,106	22,614	35,072	30,420	29,266	31,494
Marine Corps	153,604	143,583	62,416	106,575	39,503	66,645	76,351	47,755	53,441	50,200	39,769	50,513	41,578	52,058	45,954
Inductions		83,690						14	65	62	65	65	48	35	58
1st enlistments	41,559	39,482	40,771	72,418	27,120	36,896	30,459	26,667	37,389	40,653	30,454	37,151	28,369	39,065	34,310
Immediate reenlistments	11,880	9,502	10,910	11,353	7,830	13,923	18,470	13,409	10,817	7,111	6,833	9,674	10,823	11,035	9,520
Other reenlistments	3,643	998	1,600	1,262	826	919	1,409	1,661	1,889	1,389	1,191	656	702	936	879
Reserves to active duty	96,522	9,911	9,135	21,542	3,727	14,907	26,013	6,004	3,281	985	1,226	2,967	1,636	987	1,187
Air Force	432,868	298,884	177,770	145,014	268,284	248,879	206,276	158,900	148,639	132,919	197,044	232,828	185,083	173,814	191,831
Inductions							210	44	14	16	12	72	3		
1st enlistments	[3] 233,197	[3] 218,722	[3] 134,325	[3] 108,126	171,962	128,894	123,313	76,380	72,132	89,912	118,763	113,148	102,314	94,836	87,697
Immediate reenlistments	60,344	48,135	21,277	13,024	72,841	90,397	60,254	56,163	60,216	37,724	73,759	92,890	68,053	76,630	102,687
Other reenlistments	36,112	21,286	19,965	23,804	23,024	28,210	21,034	23,928	15,962	5,105	4,312	3,301	2,561	2,119	1,240
Reserves to active duty	103,215	10,741	2,203	60	457	1,378	1,465	2,385	315	162	198	23,417	12,152	229	207

[1] Includes National Guard. Includes involuntary calls to active duty.
[2] Includes enlistments category undetermined.
[3] Represents "No prior service" enlistments. Number enlistees with prior service in other branches only not known and included opposite "Other reenlistments" for fiscal years 1951-54.

SUMMARY OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL PROCUREMENT JULY 1964 TO DATE

	July to December 1964	January to June 1965	July 1965	August 1965	September 1965	Estimate October 1965
Total, Department of Defense	350,334	351,351	82,739	85,800	99,348	
Inductions	38,362	64,193	18,861	17,863	24,774	
1st enlistments	166,389	151,820	36,803	45,957	50,245	
Immediate reenlistments	119,559	106,558	20,681	16,888	17,821	
Other reenlistments	10,501	10,274	1,470	1,642	1,543	
Reserves to active duty [1]	15,523	18,506	4,924	3,450	4,965	
Army	141,143	152,947	37,802	36,421	44,357	(2)
Inductions	38,336	64,161	18,852	17,858	24,769	(2)
1st enlistments	54,296	47,605	9,329	11,836	12,557	(2)
Immediate reenlistments	41,482	34,742	8,902	5,828	6,109	(2)
Other reenlistments	6,245	6,082	657	806	585	(2)
Reserves to active duty	784	357	62	93	337	(2)
Navy	86,787	83,023	20,358	20,524	24,291	24,487
Inductions						2,582
1st enlistments	50,699	43,602	12,062	14,302	16,552	16,208
Immediate reenlistments	18,839	18,847	3,150	2,536	3,497	2,790
Other reenlistments	3,313	3,016	535	574	514	411
Reserves to active duty	13,936	17,558	4,611	3,112	3,728	2,496
Marine Corps	24,180	21,774	5,621	6,072	7,765	7,174
Inductions [3]	26	32	9	5	3	2
1st enlistments	17,910	16,400	4,629	5,055	5,988	4,215
Immediate reenlistments	5,142	4,378	790	660	770	638
Other reenlistments	455	424	83	110	110	130
Reserves to active duty	647	540	110	242	894	2,189
Air Force	98,224	93,607	18,958	22,783	22,935	20,142
Inductions [3]					2	
1st enlistments	43,484	44,213	10,783	14,764	15,148	12,486
Immediate reenlistments	54,096	48,591	7,839	7,864	7,445	7,318
Other reenlistments	488	752	195	152	334	338
Reserves to active duty	156	51	141	3	6	

[1] Includes National Guard.
[2] Not available.
[3] Former members of Reserve components who failed to meet prescribed training obligations and were inducted into their parent services for 2-year active duty tours.

Federal educational assistance programs

Program	Description	Eligible	Form and amount	Limitations	Termination date
Title II NDEA loans (fiscal year 1959).	Federal matching (90-10) grants to educational institutions.	Students in institutions of higher education (includes junior colleges); (loans available to 400,000 students in fiscal year 1966).	Undergraduates: Loans up to $1,000 a year and not to exceed $5,000. Graduate students: Loans up to $2,500 a year and not to exceed $7,500 (up to 50 percent of loan forgiven for teachers; up to 100 percent forgiven for teachers who serve in elementary or secondary schools in low-income areas for up to 7 years).	Need including family resources.	Fiscal year 1968.
College work-study (fiscal year 1965).	Federal matching (90-10) grant to educational institutions (fiscal year 1968: 75-25 percent).	Students in educational institutions (includes junior colleges, nursing schools, and vocational schools).	Compensation for no more than 15 hours of work a week at the school or related institution (average $500 a year).	All students but preference to those from low-income families.	Do.
National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965.	Federal Government pays portion of interest on loans made by: 1. State or nonprofit private organization. 2. Federal Government itself.	Students accepted by or enrolled in accredited vocational schools.	Loans of no more than $1,000 a year; unpaid principal not to exceed $2,000.	Students receive interest subsidy only if adjusted family income less than $15,000 a year.	Do.
Higher Education Act of 1965:					
A. Educational opportunity grants.	Federal grants (100 percent) to institutions of higher education. *See item 5, limitations column.	Undergraduates accepted by or enrolled in institutions of higher education.	Grants of $200 to $800 a year. $1,000 after 1st year if in upper half of class. (140,000 grants a year.)	1. Satisfactory progress. 2. Full-time student. 3. Loans for no more than 4 academic years. 4. Financial need—otherwise not be able to attend school. *5. ½ of financial aid must come from other sources.	Do.
B. Low-interest insured loans.	Federal Government pays portion of interest on loans made by: 1. State or nonprofit private organization. 2. Federal Government itself.	Students in institutions of higher education.	Undergraduates: Loans of not more than $1,000 a year; not to exceed $5,000. Graduate students: Loans of not more than $1,500 a year; not to exceed $7,500.	Students receive interest subsidy only if adjusted family income less than $15,000 a year.	Do.
Graduate fellowships:					
A. Title IV of NDEA (fiscal year 1966).	Federal fellowships to educational institutions for individuals plus $2,500 for institution.	Graduate students (preferably those going into teaching).	6,000 fellowships available during fiscal year 1966; 7,500 during fiscal year 1967; 7,500 in fiscal year 1968. Fellowships: 1st year: $2,000. 2d year: $2,200. 3d year: $2,400—plus $400 a year for dependents each year.	OE Advisory Board decides if graduate program at institution is eligible for fellowship program and how many fellowships to give to institution.	Do.
B. Pt. C of title V of Higher Education Act of 1965.	Federal fellowships to individuals.	Persons engaged in or preparing to undertake careers in elementary and secondary education.	4,500 fellowships in fiscal year 1966; 10,000 in fiscal year 1967; 10,000 in fiscal year 1968; also stipends including allowances for subsistence and dependents.	1. Must be full-time student. 2. Cannot be working (except for approved part-time research or teaching).	Do.
Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962:					
1. Institutional	Federal grants to States	Unemployed or underemployed.	Youth (under 21) allowances: $20 per week. Head of household (usually adults): depends on State unemployment insurance.		Fiscal year 1969.
2. On-the-job training	Federal grants to firms	do	Cost of training for 20 weeks (firm pays salary).		Do.
Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963:					
A. Student loans (pt. C)	Federal matching (90-10) to schools.	Medical, dental, osteopathy, pharmacy, podiatry, or optometry students.	Loans up to $2,500 a year (up to 50 percent may be forgiven for service in an area which has a shortage of doctors, osteopaths, optometrists, or dentists).		Do.
B. Scholarships (pt. F of 1965 amendments).	Federal grant to school for percentage of scholarship.	do	Up to $2,500 a year	1. Scholarships given to no more than 1/10 of student's class. 2. Students must be from low-income family.	Do.
Nurses Training Act of 1964	Federal matching grant (90-10) to schools.	Students in nursing schools (all types).	Loans up to $1,000 (up to 50 percent forgiven for full-time employment as a nurse).		Do.

NOTES

Apprenticeship Training Manpower Administration, Department of Labor.—The national apprenticeship law contributes to the national manpower development efforts through the provision of technical assistance in the development of apprenticeship and training programs; it does not make any financial contribution directly to the support of trainees or to the operation of training facilities. There were 170,500 apprentices registered under programs conforming with national standards at the beginning of 1965. The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training which administers this program has a budget of $5,700,000 in fiscal year 1965 and a fiscal year 1966 request of $5,600,000. (Inventory of federally assisted manpower development programs—U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, Division of Manpower Program Planning, Aug. 24, 1965.)

Some apprenticeship training given as a part of the Manpower Development and Training Act program. Maximum of 52 weeks. Money is paid to the sponsor or employer, not to trainee. Not a sizable portion of program—between 3 to 5 percent. Provides for expansion in other occupations and training for special groups.

Manpower Development and Training Act uses Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training as a development arm. Also to service and followup programs. May contact State apprenticeship councils, etc.

Manpower Development and Training Act now has an agreement with Chrysler Corp. for about 1,000 apprenticeship training possibilities. A 52-week program. Have others, Tool and Die Association, for example.

No other registered Federal apprenticeship training assistance programs.

Apprenticeship training under the Manpower Development and Training Act program.—Some apprenticeship training is given as a part of the Manpower Development and Training Act program. It provides for expansion in other occupations and training for special groups. It is estimated that it constitutes between 3 to 5 percent of the program. A maximum of 52 weeks may be provided for a trainee. No payments are made to the trainee. Manpower Development and Training Act uses the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training as a development arm and for followup service. The national apprenticeship law contributes to the national manpower development efforts through the provision of technical assistance in the development of apprenticeship training programs, but does not make any financial contribution directly to the support of trainees or to the operation of training facilities.

Summary of special "opportunity" programs

	President's youth opportunity back-to-school drive (PYOBTSD)	Special programs in which Federal agencies serve as "hosts"				
		Vocational work-study program (VWSP)	Job Corps	Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC)	College work-study program (CWSP)	Work experience program for needy persons
Authority for program	President's youth opportunity back-to-school drive.	Vocational Educational Act of 1963.	Economic Opportunity Act, title I-A.	Economic Opportunity Act, title I-B.	Economic Opportunity Act, title I-C.	Economic Opportunity Act title V.
Objectives of program	To influence youths to complete their education—to provide part-time employment to needy youths.	To provide part-time employment for needy full-time vocational education students.	To provide in rural and urban centers experience and training needed by disadvantaged youths to increase their employability.	To place disadvantaged young men and women in work-experience or training projects to increase employability or enable them to complete their education.	To provide part-time employment to needy college students.	To expand opportunities for work experience or needed training for persons unable to support themselves or their families.
Age range	16 through 21	15 through 20	16 through 21	16 through 21	Not established	Typically adults.
Program administered by	Each Federal agency	Office of Education—HEW	Office of Economic Opportunity.	Department of Labor	Office of Education—HEW	Bureau of Family Services—HEW.
Local implementation	do	State or local boards of education.	Interior and Agriculture Departments and State and local governments.	Various local sponsors	Individual colleges	State and local public welfare agencies.
Are persons serving in Federal agencies Federal employees?	Yes	No	No	No	No	No.
Who pays enrollees?	Each employing Federal agency ($1.25 per hour).	Local educational agency (maximum $45 per month; $350 per academic year).		Non-Federal organization—State and local government or private nonprofit organizations. Generally $1.25 per hour.	College pays up to 90 percent (75 percent after June 30, 1967). Agency may reimburse college for remainder unless college elects to pay full amount.	Welfare agencies. Amount of assistance varies from State to State depending on State standards of need and family size.
References	CSC FPM letters 213-5 and 213-6. VA Circular 00-65-30, dated Oct. 12, 1965.	CSC Bulletin No. 300-4. VA Circular 00-65-24, dated Sept. 9, 1965.	CSC instructions to be issued.	CSC Bulletin Nos. 300-3 and 300-6. VA Circular 00-65-18, dated Aug. 11, 1965.	CSC Bulletin No. 300-5. VA Circular 00-66-3, dated Jan. 10, 1966.	CSC Bulletin No. 300-7. VA circular in process of being released.

Program	References	Who is eligible	Sponsor	How and what paid	Controlling agency	Number hours per week	Remarks
President's youth opportunity back-to-school drive.	FPM letters 213-5 and 213-6. VA Circular 00-65-30.	Needy youths. Age: At least 16 but less than 22. Enrolled in resident secondary school or institution of higher learning.	President's program	Paid by employing agency who fixes salary. VA established salary is $1.25 per hour.	None	Not to exceed 16 hours per week.	Particularly relevant to youths hired under 1965 summer YOC. (1965 program now over.) Must maintain acceptable school standing. Appointments not to extend beyond 1 year; but may be extended for additional 1 year periods if original conditions are still met. Agencies must establish standards to determine if students need earnings.
Summer employment program (May 1, 1966 through Sept. 30, 1966).	FPM Bulletin 316-8	Best qualified candidates available.	None	Paid by employing agency. Regular pay schedules.	Civil Service Commission.	Regular workweek.	Written plans required in Washington area. Nepotism barred.
Neighborhood youth corps enrollees.	FPM Bulletin 300-3. Economic Opportunity Act. AA/P memo July 28, 1965. VA Circular 00-65-18, dated Aug. 11, 1965.	Unemployed young men and women 16 through 21 years of age.	State and local governments and private nonprofit organizations.	Paid by sponsor. Generally $1.25 per hour.	Department of Labor.	In school enrollees: Up to 15 hours per week. Out of school enrollees: Up to 32 hours per week.	To permit enrollees to resume or continue education. Enrollees are not Federal employees. Must not displace Federal workers. To perform useful work. Written agreement with sponsor. Copy to CSC.
President's youth opportunity campaign (1965 campaign over).	FPM letters 213-2, 213-3, 213-4. Associate Deputy Administrator's letter, June 30, 1965.	Boys and girls who need work because of economic or educational disadvantage. Age: 16 through 21.	None	Paid by employing agency or private organization. $1.25 per hour.	None. President directed agencies to employ 1 for every 100 employees.	Regular workweek.	Was a special summer program for 1965. Recruitment through State employment offices. Nepotism barred.
Vocational Education Act, 1963.	FPM Bulletin 300-4. VA Circular 00-65-24, dated Sept. 9, 1965. Public Law 88-210.	Full-time vocational education students. Ages: At least 15 but less than 21.	Local educational agencies. All States have approved plans.	Federal grants to States. Maximum $45 month, $350 academic year. (Special maximum outside local community area.)	HEW. State boards for vocational education.	15 hours maximum.	For needy. Not considered Federal employees. Must not displace Federal workers. Written agreement between agency and local education agency. Two copies of agreement to department. Stations required to keep records of work performed.
Vocational OFC training program for stenos and typists. (Applies only in Washington, D.C., metropolitan area.)	Memo 05-65-29 from AA/P. CS announcement for typists and stenos.	Selected high school seniors. Minimum age: 16.	Cooperative work study program. Fully accredited resident school which has a formal agreement for a vocational office training program.	Paid by employing agency. GS-1 salary for typists. GS-2 salary for stenos. GS-1, $3,507 per annum. GS-2, $3,814 per annum.	None	Minimum of 15 hours.	Must meet all requirements for typist, GS-2 or steno, GS-3 except for the 6 months experience requirement. Not a program for needy. Must continue studies while employed.

Work experience program	Title V. Economic Opportunity Act. FPM Bulletin 300-7.	Persons unable to support themselves or their families. Normally adults in Federal categories of public assistance and other needy persons meeting similar requirements.	Bureau of Family Services, HEW works through State public welfare agencies.	Bureau of Family Services allots funds for projects—preference is given to projects that are a part of a community action program. Financial support for enrollees and their families provided by welfare agency. Amount of assistance varies from State to State depending on State standards of need and family size.	HEW—Commissioner of Welfare. Bureau of Family Services implements program.	Up to 40 hours per week.	Not Federal employees (except for purposes of Federal Tort Claims Act). Aim is to increase employability of enrollees. Projects must be in public interest—work that would not otherwise be performed. Must not displace employed workers.
Work study program for college students.	Title I-C of Economic Opportunity Act. FPM Bulletin 300-5. VA Circular 00-66-3, dated Jan. 10, 1966.	Full-time college students from low-income families. Must be capable of maintaining good school standing. Must be citizens of United States or owe permanent allegiance to United States.	Institutions of higher learning.	Grants made by Office of Education—colleges select students and pay rates (generally not less than $1.25 per hour). Office of Education share not to exceed 90 percent. Host agency pays remainder. (After June 30, 1967, ratio will be 75 to 25 percent.)	Administered by Office of Education, Bureau of Higher Education.	No more than 15 hours week while attending classes—full time during vacations and other periods when classes not in session.	Not Federal employees (except for purposes of Federal Tort Claims Act). Is expected that many students will work for colleges themselves or with private nonprofit community-oriented organizations. Federal agencies should not compete with such organizations but should be ready to support the program. Agency's appropriation must be available for work. Work must either be related to students education objective or will be in public interest and is work which would not otherwise be provided. Must not displace employed workers or impair existing contracts for services. Conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable.
Job Corps	Title I-A, Economic Opportunity Act. CSC instructions to be issued.	Disadvantaged youths in rural and urban centers needing experience and training to increase their employability. Ages 16 through 21.	Interior and Agriculture Departments and State and local governments.	Enrollee allowances established by law.	Office of Economic Opportunity.	No limit	Not Federal employees (except for purposes of Federal Tort Claims Act).

Bills [1] providing education and other benefits for veterans who served on and after Feb. 1, 1955

Number, author, and date of introduction	Education					Loan guarantee	Medical care	Wartime rates of compensation	Chronic and tropical disease presumption	Autos for amputees	Preference in Federal employment	Burial benefits	Job counseling
	Time limits	Formula	Rate	On-the-job	On farm								
H.R. 74: Mr. Fulton of Tennessee, Jan. 4, 1965.	Jan. 31, 1955, to July 1, 1963.	1½ days for each day of service; maximum, 36 months.	$110; $135; $160.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 209: Mr. Teague of Texas, Jan. 4, 1965.	Feb. 1, 1955, induction period.	1 day for each day of service; maximum, 36 months.	$50	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 416: Mrs. Bolton, Jan. 4, 1965.	June 26, 1950, until repealed.	As H.R. 74	As H.R. 74	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 1006: Mr. Gallagher, Jan. 4, 1965.	Combat zones after Jan. 1, 1962, to Presidential proclamation.	do	do	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No.
H.R. 1128: Mr. Multer, Jan. 4, 1965.	As H.R. 209	As H.R. 209	do	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 1504: Mr. Beckworth, Jan. 5, 1965.	As H.R. 416	As H.R. 74	do	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 1554: Mr. Holland, Jan. 5, 1965.	As H.R. 209	As H.R. 209	do	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 1742: Mr. Teague of Texas (by request), Jan. 6, 1965.	do	do	$75	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 2247: Mr. Trimble, Jan. 11, 1965.	Feb. 1, 1955, induction period.	As H.R. 74	As H.R. 74	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes.
H.R. 2364: Mr. Ayres, Jan. 12, 1965.	Feb. 1, 1955, induction period—overseas.	As H.R. 209	$75	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 3223: Mr. Teague of Texas (by request), Jan. 19, 1965.	Korean conflict for 90 days or discharge for service-connected and Jan. 31, 1965, service in armed conflict or issued medal.	As H.R. 74	As H.R. 74	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 3977 (same as H.R. 74): Mr. Shipley, Feb. 1, 1965.													
H.R. 4004: Mr. King of New York, Feb. 1, 1965.	Jan. 31, 1955, to July 1, 1967.	As H.R. 74	As H.R. 74	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 4757: Mr. Conte, Feb. 10, 1965.	Feb. 28, 1961, in Vietnam or adjacent thereto.	As H.R. 209	do	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 5051: Mr. Pepper, Feb. 17, 1965.	Jan. 31, 1955, to July 1, 1967.	As H.R. 74	do	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 5253: Mr. Robison, Feb. 22, 1965.	Jan. 1, 1961, to Presidential proclamation, southeast Asia theater.	do	do	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 5281: Mr. Del Clawson, Feb. 23, 1965.	No	No	No	No	No	Yes [2]	Yes [2]	Yes [2]	([2])	Yes [2]			
H.R. 5413 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Matsunaga, Feb. 24, 1965													
H.R. 5606: Mr. Morse, Mar. 1, 1965.	Jan. 1, 1962, combat area, and Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam.	As H.R. 74	As H.R. 74	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 5678: Mr. Ryan, Mar. 2, 1965.	Jan. 31, 1955, to July 1, 1967.	do	do	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 5888 (same as H.R. 74): Mr. St Germain, Mar. 5, 1965.													
H.R. 5937 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. McGrath, Mar. 8, 1965.													
H.R. 6295 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Baring, Mar. 15, 1965.													
H.R. 6398 (same as H.R. 9306): Mr. McDowell, Mar. 17, 1965.													
H.R. 6908 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Brown of Calif., Mar. 30, 1965.													
H.R. 7034 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Gilligan, Apr. 1, 1965.													
H.R. 7361: Mr. Beckworth, Apr. 12, 1965.	After Korean conflict	As H.R. 74	As H.R. 74	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 7794 (same as H.R. 5606): Mr. Harsha, May 3, 1965.													
H.R. 7910: [3] Mr. Gonzalez, May 5, 1965.													
H.R. 7999 (same as H.R. 5606): Mr. Ashbrook, May 6, 1965.													
H.R. 8375 (same as H.R. 5606): Mr. Sikes, May 24, 1965.													
H.R. 9043: Mr. Adair, June 15, 1965.	Jan. 1, 1964, until termination of combat in Vietnam.	As H.R. 74	As H.R. 74	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 9190 (same as H.R. 9043): Mr. Berry, June 17, 1965.													
H.R. 9287 (same as H.R. 9043): Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, June 21, 1965.													

See footnotes at end of table.

Bills [1] providing education and other benefits for veterans who served on and after Feb. 1, 1955—Continued

Number, author, and date of introduction	Education					Loan guarantee	Medical care	Wartime rates of compensation	Chronic and tropical disease presumption	Autos for amputees	Preference in Federal employment	Burial benefits	Job counseling
	Time limits	Formula	Rate	On-the-job	On farm								
H.R. 9306: Mr. Halpern, June 22, 1965.	Spanish-American War, World War II, Korea, and period of hostilities.	As H.R. 74	As H.R. 74	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.
H.R. 9317 (same as H.R. 74): Mr. Stalbaum, June 22, 1965.													
H.R. 9327 (same as H.R. 9190): Mr. Wyatt, June 22, 1965.													
H.R. 9452 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Feighan, June 24, 1965.													
H.R. 9513 (same as H.R. 9190): Mr. Bray, June 28, 1965.													
H.R. 9632 (same as H.R. 9190): Mr. Reinecke, July 6, 1965.													
H.R. 9697: Mr. Chamberlain, July 8, 1965.	Feb. 1, 1955, induction period overseas service.	As H.R. 209	$75	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 9798: Mr. Saylor, July 13, 1965.	10 or more days during period of hostilities.	As H.R. 74	$130; $160; $190.	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 9799 (same as H.R. 9043): Mr. Saylor, July 13, 1965.													
H.R. 9846 (same as H.R. 5281): Mr. Cleveland, July 14, 1965.													
H.R. 9915 (same as H.R. 9043): Mr. Shriver, July 19, 1965.													
H.R. 10023 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Perkins, July 22, 1965.													
H.R. 10140 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Grabowski, July 28, 1965.													
H.R. 10159 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Carey, July 29, 1965.													
H.R. 10162 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Corman, July 29, 1965.													
H.R. 1081 (same as H.R. 9306): Mr. Grover, July 29, 1965.													
H.R. 10328 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Grider, Aug. 9, 1965.													
H.R. 10333 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Aug. 9, 1965.													
H.R. 10351 (same as H.R. 9043): Mr. Duncan of Tennessee, Aug. 10,1965.													
H.R. 10510: Mr. Olson of Minnesota, Aug. 17, 1965.	Oct. 1, 1961, to July 1, 1967.	As H.R. 74	As H.R. 74	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 10528: [4] Mr. Kornegay, Aug. 18, 1965.													
H.R. 10555 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. McCarthy, Aug. 19, 1965.													
H.R. 10763 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Addabbo, Aug. 31, 1965.													
H.R. 10769: [5] Mr. Secrest, Aug. 31, 1965.													
H.R. 10859 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Morrison, Sept. 2. 1965.													
H.R. 10931 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Macdonald, Sept. 9, 1965.													
H.R. 11066 (same as H.R. 9306): Mr. Perkins, Sept. 14, 1965.													
H.R. 11083 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Halpern, Sept. 15, 1965.													
H.R. 11143 (same as H.R. 9043): Mr. Whalley, Sept. 17, 1965.													
H.R. 11741 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Conyers, Oct. 21, 1965.													
H.R. 11791 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Fraser, Oct. 22, 1965.													
H.R. 11861: Mr. Adair, Jan. 10, 1966.	Feb. 1, 1955, to end of induction period.	1½ times duration of service; maximum, 36 months.	$130; $160; $190.	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes.
H.R. 11862: Mr. Ayres, Jan. 10, 1966.	From Feb. 28, 1961, to end of induction period.	Equal to duration of service; maximum, 36 months.	$130; $160; $190.	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.

See footnotes at end of table.

Bills [1] providing education and other benefits for veterans who served on and after Feb. 1, 1955—Continued

Number, author, and date of introduction	Education					Loan guarantee	Medical care	Wartime rates of compensation	Chronic and tropical disease presumption	Autos for amputees	Preference in Federal employment	Burial benefits	Job counseling
	Time limits	Formula	Rate	On-the-job	On farm								
H.R. 11872 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Clancy, Jan. 10, 1966.													
H.R. 11883 (same as H.R. 5051): Mr. Edmondson, Jan. 10, 1966.													
H.R. 11908 (same as H.R. 9040): Mr. Matsunaga, Jan. 10, 1966.													
H.R. 11910: Mr. Matthews, Jan. 10, 1966.	Feb. 1, 1955, induction period.	As H.R. 74	$130	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.
H.R. 11939 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Zablocki, Jan. 10, 1966.													
H.R. 11970 (same as H.R. 11861): Mr. Horton, Jan. 12, 1966.													
H.R. 11973 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Latta, Jan. 12, 1966.													
H.R. 11974 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. O'Neill, Jan. 12, 1966.													
H.R. 11981 (same as H.R. 11910): Mr. Roberts, Jan. 12, 1966.													
H.R. 11985: Mr. Teague of Texas, Jan. 12, 1966.	Served 2 or more years since Oct. 1, 1963, and received 1 or more of following medals: Vietnam Service, Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, or other medal established by President.	Day of training for day of service for 2 years' service; 36 months.	$800 per year administered by HEW; $130 per month administered by VA.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 11988 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Daniels, Jan. 12, 1966.													
H.R. 11995 (same as H.R. 11862): Mr. Nelsen, Jan. 12, 1966.													
H.R. 12006 (same as H.R. 11910): Mr. Dulski, Jan. 12. 1966.													
H.R. 12038: Mr. Derwinski, Jan. 13, 1966.	Jan. 1, 1962, to date of passage of concurrent resolution by Congress.	As H.R. 209	As H.R. 74	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
H.R. 12039: Mr. Fuqua, Jan. 13, 1966.	Feb. 1, 1955, to end of induction period.	As H.R. 74	do	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 12042 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Harvey of Michigan, Jan. 13, 1966.													
H.R. 12053 (same as H.R. 11861): Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin, Jan. 13, 1966.													
H.R. 12072 (same as H.R. 11861): Mr. Cramer, Jan. 17, 1966.													
H.R. 12075 (same as H.R. 11861): Mr. Gurney, Jan. 17, 1966.													
H.R. 12078 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Kee, Jan. 17, 1966.													
H.R. 12087 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Donohue, Jan. 17, 1966.													
H.R. 12099 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Roybal, Jan. 17, 1966.													
H.R. 12100 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. St. Onge, Jan. 17, 1966.													
H.R. 12116 (same as H.R. 11862): Mr. Bell, Jan. 18, 1966.													
H.R. 12118: [6] Mr. Bray, Jan. 18, 1966.													
H.R. 12120: [6] Mr. Carter, Jan. 18, 1966.													
H.R. 12124: [7] Mr. Dorn, Jan. 18, 1966.													
H.R. 12137 (same as H.R. 9043): Mr. Tunney, Jan. 18, 1966.													
H.R. 12154 (same as H.R. 11985): Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Jan. 19, 1966.													
H.R. 12159 (same as H.R. 9798): Mr. Burton, Jan. 19, 1966.													
H.R. 12161 (same as H.R. 11861): Mr. Duncan of Tennessee, Jan. 19, 1966.													
H.R. 12165 (same as H.R. 209): Mr. Hechler, Jan. 19, 1965.													

See footnotes at end of table.

Bills [1] providing education and other benefits for veterans who served on and after Feb. 1, 1955—Continued

Number, author, and date of introduction	Education					Loan guarantee	Medical care	Wartime rates of compensation	Chronic and tropical disease presumption	Autos for amputees	Preference in Federal employment	Burial benefits	Job counseling
	Time limits	Formula	Rate	On-the-job	On farm								
H.R. 12167 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Machen, Jan. 19, 1966.													
H.R. 12168 (same as H.R. 11861): Mr. Mize, Jan. 19, 1966.													
H.R. 12172 (same as H.R. 11985): Mr. Wolff, Jan. 19, 1966.													
H.R. 12186: Mr. Teague of Texas (by request), Jan. 19, 1966.	On and after Aug. 5, 1964.	As H.R. 74	As H.R. 74	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No.
H.R. 12215: Mr. McDowell, Jan. 20, 1966.	Feb. 1, 1955, induction period.	do	do	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
H.R. 12228: Mr. Sickles, Jan. 20, 1966.	do	do	do	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 12253 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Stafford, Jan. 24, 1966.													
H.R. 12257 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Fascell, Jan. 24, 1966.													
H.R. 12268 (same as H.R. 11985): Mr. Patten, Jan. 24, 1966.													
H.R. 12331 (same as H.R. 11861): Mr. Langen, Jan. 26, 1966.													
H.R. 12333 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. O'Konski, Jan. 26, 1966.													
H.R. 12347 (same as H.R. 209): Mr. Annunzio, Jan. 27, 1966.													
H.R. 12348: Mr. Beckworth, Jan. 27, 1966.	Jan. 31, 1955, to July 1, 1967.	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 12349: Mr. Brademas, Jan. 27, 1966.	Feb. 1, 1955, induction period.	As H. R. 74	$125; $150; $175.	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 12358 (same as H.R. 11861): Mr. Edwards of Alabama, Jan. 26, 1966.													
H.R. 12359 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Farnum, Jan. 27, 1966.													
H.R. 12370 (same as H.R. 209): Mr. Pucinski, Jan. 27, 1966.													
H.R. 12379 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Tenzer, Jan. 27, 1966.													
H.R. 12410: Mr. Teague of Texas, Jan. 31, 1966.	Feb. 1, 1955; indefinitely.	1 month for each month or fraction thereof; maximum, 36 months.	$100; $125; $150.	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes.
H.R. 12414 (same as H.R. 12410): Mr. Brown of California, Jan. 31, 1966.													
H.R. 12415 (same as H.R. 12410): Mr. Dorn, Jan. 31, 1966.													
H.R. 12416 (same as H.R. 12410): Mr. Roncalio, Jan. 31, 1966.													
H.R. 12418 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Broomfield, Feb. 1, 1966.													
H.R. 12419 (same as H.R. 12410): Mr. Casey, Feb. 1, 1966.													
H.R. 12422 (same as H.R. 11861): Mr. Ellsworth, Feb. 1, 1966.													
H.R. 12423: Mr. Halpern, Feb. 1, 1966.	As H.R. 209	As H.R. 209	As H.R. 11861.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 12424 (same as H.R. 3223): Mr. Howard, Feb. 1, 1966.													
H.R. 12431 (same as H.R. 11861): Mr. Saylor, Feb. 1, 1966.													
H.R. 12433: Mr. Adair, Feb. 1, 1966.	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes [8]	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 12468 (same as H.R. 12410): Mr. Duncan, Feb. 2, 1966.													
H.R. 12472: Mr. Fino, Feb. 2, 1966.	No	No	No	No	No	Yes [9]	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.
H.R. 12474 (same as H.R. 12410): Mr. Hanley, Feb. 2 1966.													
H.R. 12479 (same as H.R. 12410): Mr. Kornegay, Feb 2, 1966.													
H.R. 12485 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Minish, Feb. 2, 1966.													

See footnotes at end of table.

Bills [1] providing education and other benefits for veterans who served on and after Feb. 1, 1955—Continued

Number, author, and date of introduction	Education					Loan guarantee	Medical care	Wartime rates of compensation	Chronic and tropical disease presumption	Autos for amputees	Preference in Federal employment	Burial benefits	Job counseling
	Time limits	Formula	Rate	On-the-job	On farm								
H.R. 12496 (same as H.R. 12410): Mr. Rodino, Feb. 2, 1966.													
H.R. 12498 (same as H.R. 11861): Mr. Shriver, Feb. 2, 1966.													
H.R. 12503 (same as H.R. 12410): Mr. Wolff, Feb. 2, 1966.													
H.R. 12523 (same as H.R. 4004): Mr. Bingham, Feb. 3, 1966.													
H.R. 12531 (same as H.R. 12410): Mr. Helstoski, Feb. 3, 1966.													
H.R. 12540 (similar to H.R. 11862): Mr. Roudebush, Feb. 3, 1966.													

[1] Jan. 1, 1965, to Feb. 3, 1966.
[2] Area of hostilities.
[3] Same as H.R. 5051 except it includes widows, and children.
[4] Same as H.R. 209 except rate is $100 per month.
[5] Same as H.R. 4004 except it requires 90 days' service instead of 180 days.
[6] Same as H.R. 11861 except beginning date is Feb. 28, 1966.
[7] Same as H.R. 11910 except job counseling is included.
[8] Service after Jan. 31, 1955.
[9] Vietnam service.

BILLS PROVIDING EDUCATION AND OTHER BENEFITS FOR VETERANS WHO SERVED ON AND AFTER FEBRUARY 1, 1955

BILLS BY AUTHORS

ADAIR: H.R. 9043, 11861, 12433.
ADDABBO: H.R. 10763.
ANDERSON of Illinois: H.R. 12154.
ANNUNZIO: H.R. 12347.
ASHBROOK: H.R. 7977.
AYRES: H.R. 2364, 11862.
BARING: H.R. 6295.
BECKWORTH: H.R. 1504, 7361, 12348.
BELL: H.R. 12116.
BERRY: H.R. 9190
BINGHAM: H.R. 12523.
BOLTON: H.R. 416
BRADEMAS: H.R. 12349.
BRAY: H.R. 9513, 12118.
BROOMFIELD: H.R. 12418.
BROWN of California: H.R. 6908, 12414.
BURTON: H.R. 12159.
CAREY: H.R. 10159.
CARTER: H.R. 12120.
CASEY: H.R. 12419.
CHAMBERLAIN: H.R. 9697.
CLANCY: H.R. 11872.
CLAWSON of Delaware: H.R. 5281.
CLEVELAND: H.R. 9846.
CONTE: H.R. 4757.
CONYERS: H.R. 11741.
CORMAN: H.R. 10162.
CRAMER: H.R. 12072.
DANIELS: H.R. 11988.
DERWINSKI: H.R. 12038.
DONOHUE: H.R. 12087.
DORN: H.R. 12124, 12415.
DULSKI: H.R. 12006.
DUNCAN of Tennessee: H.R. 10351, 12161, 12468.
EDMONDSON: H.R. 11883.
EDWARDS of Alabama: H.R. 12358.
ELLSWORTH: H.R. 12422.
FARNUM: H.R. 12359.
FASCELL: H.R. 12257.
FEIGHAN: H.R. 9452.
FINO: H.R. 12472.
FRASER: H.R. 11791.
FULTON of Pennsylvania: H.R. 9287, 10333.
FULTON of Tennessee: H.R. 74.
FUQUA: H.R. 12039.
GALLAGHER: H.R. 1006.
GILLIGAN: H.R. 7034.
GONZALEZ: H.R. 7910.
GRABOWSKI: H.R. 10140.
GRIDER: H.R. 10328.
GROVER: H.R. 10181.
GURNEY: H.R. 12075.
HALPERN: H.R. 9306, 11083, 12423.
HANLEY: H.R. 12474.
HARSHA: H.R. 7794.
HARVEY: H.R. 12042.
HECHLER: H.R. 12165.
HELSTOSKI: H.R. 12531.
HOLLAND: H.R. 1554.
HOWARD: H.R. 12424.
HORTON: H.R. 11970.
KEE: H.R. 12078.
KING of New York: H.R. 4004.
KORNEGAY: H.R. 10528, 12479.
LANGEN: H.R. 12331.
LATTA: H.R. 11973.
MACDONALD: H.R. 10931.
MACHEN: H.R. 12167.
MATSUNAGA: H.R. 5413.
MATTHEWS: H.R. 11910, 11908.
MCCARTHY: H.R. 10555.
MCDOWELL: H.R. 6398, 12215.
MCGRATH: H.R. 5937.
MINISH: H.R. 12485.
MIZE: H.R. 12168.
MORRISON: H.R. 10859.
MORSE: H.R. 5606.
MULTER: H.R. 1128.
NELSEN: H.R. 11995.
OLSON: H.R. 10501.
O'KONSKI: H.R. 12333.
O'NEILL: H.R. 11974.
PATTEN: H.R. 12268.
PEPPER: H.R. 5051.
PERKINS: H.R. 10023, 11066.
PUCINSKI: H.R. 12370.
REINECKE: H.R. 9632.
ROBERTS: H.R. 11981.
ROBISON: H.R. 5253.
RODINO: H.R. 12496.
RONCALIO: H.R. 12416.
ROUDEBUSH: H.R. 12540.
ROYBAL: H.R. 12099.
RYAN: H.R. 5678.
SAYLOR: H.R. 9798, 9755, 12431.
SECREST: H.R. 10769.
SHIPLEY: H.R. 3977.
SHRIVER: H.R. 9915, 12498.
SICKLES: H.R. 12228.
SIKES: H.R. 8375.
ST GERMAIN: H.R. 5888.
ST. ONGE: H.R. 12100.
STAFFORD: H.R. 12253.
STALBAUM: H.R. 9317.
TEAGUE of Texas: H.R. 209, 1742, 3223, 11985, 12186, 12410.
TENZER: H.R. 12379.
THOMSON of Wisconsin: H.R. 12053.
TRIMBLE: H.R. 2247.
TUNNEY: H.R. 12137.
WHALLEY: H.R. 11143.
WOLFF: H.R. 12172, 12503.
WYATT: H.R. 9327.
ZABLOCKI: H.R. 11939.

BILLS BY NUMBER

H.R. 74: FULTON of Tennessee.
H.R. 209: TEAGUE of Texas.
H.R. 416: BOLTON.
H.R. 1006: GALLAGHER.
H.R. 1128: MULTER.
H.R. 1504: BECKWORTH.
H.R. 1554: HOLLAND.
H.R. 1742: TEAGUE of Texas.
H.R. 2247: TRIMBLE.
H.R. 2364: AYRES.
H.R. 3223: TEAGUE of Texas.
H.R. 3977: SHIPLEY.
H.R. 4004: KING of New York.
H.R. 4757: CONTE.
H.R. 5051: PEPPER.
H.R. 5253: ROBISON.
H.R. 5281: CLAWSON, DEL.
H.R. 5413: MATSUNAGA.
H.R. 5606: MORSE.
H.R. 5678: RYAN.
H.R. 5888: ST GERMAIN.
H.R. 5937: MCGRATH.
H.R. 6295: BARING.
H.R. 6398: MCDOWELL.
H.R. 6908: BROWN of California.
H.R. 7034: GILLIGAN.
H.R. 7361: BECKWORTH.
H.R. 7794: HARSHA.
H.R. 7910: GONZALEZ.
H.R. 7977: ASHBROOK.
H.R. 8375: SIKES.
H.R. 9043: ADAIR.
H.R. 9190: BERRY.
H.R. 9287: FULTON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 9306: HALPERN.
H.R. 9317: STALBAUM.
H.R. 9327: WYATT.
H.R. 9452: FEIGHAN.
H.R. 9513: BRAY.
H.R. 9632: REINECKE.
H.R. 9697: CHAMBERLAIN.
H.R. 9798: SAYLOR.
H.R. 9799: SAYLOR.
H.R. 9846: CLEVELAND.
H.R. 9915: SHRIVER.
H.R. 10023: PERKINS.
H.R. 10140: GRABOWSKI.
H.R. 10159: CAREY.
H.R. 10162: CORMAN.
H.R. 10181: GROVER.
H.R. 10328: GRIDER.
H.R. 10333: FULTON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 10351: DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 10501: OLSON.
H.R. 10528: KORNEGAY.
H.R. 10555: MCCARTHY.
H.R. 10763: ADDABBO.
H.R. 10769: SECREST.

H.R. 10859: MORRISON.
H.R. 10931: MACDONALD.
H.R. 11066: PERKINS.
H.R. 11083: HALPERN.
H.R. 11143: WHALLEY.
H.R. 11741: CONYERS.
H.R. 11791: FRASER.
H.R. 11861: ADAIR.
H.R. 11862: AYERS.
H.R. 11872: CLANEY.
H.R. 11883: EDMONDSON.
H.R. 11908. MATSUNAGA.
H.R. 11910: MATTHEWS.
H.R. 11939: ZABLOCKI.
H.R. 11970: HORTON.
H.R. 11973: LATTA.
H.R. 11974: O'NEILL.
H.R. 11981: ROBERTS.
H.R. 11985: TEAGUE of Texas.
H.R. 11988: DANIELS.
H.R. 11995: NELSEN.
H.R. 12006: DULSKI.
H.R. 12038: DERWINSKI.
H.R. 12039: FUQUA.
H.R. 12042: HARVEY of Michigan.
H.R. 12053: THOMSON of Wisconsin.
H.R. 12072: CRAMER.
H.R. 12075: GURNEY.
H.R. 12078: KEE.
H.R. 12087: DONOHUE.
H.R. 12099: ROYBAL.
H.R. 12100: ST. ONGE.
H.R. 12116: BELL.
H.R. 12118: BRAY.
H.R. 12120: CARTER.
H.R. 12124: DORN.
H.R. 12137: TUNNEY.
H.R. 12154: ANDERSON of Illinois.
H.R. 12159: BURTON.
H.R. 12161: DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 12165: HECHLER.
H.R. 12167: MACHEN.
H.R. 12168: MIZE.
H.R. 12172: WOLFF.
H.R. 12186: TEAGUE of Texas.
H.R. 12215: MCDOWELL.
H.R. 12228: SICKLES.
H.R. 12253: STAFFORD.
H.R. 12257: FASCELL.
H.R. 12268: PATTEN.
H.R. 12331: LANGEN.
H.R. 12333: O'KONSKI.
H.R. 12347: ANNUNZIO.
H.R. 12348: BECKWORTH.
H.R. 12349: BRADEMAS.
H.R. 12358: EDWARDS of Alabama.
H.R. 12359: FARNUM.
H.R. 12370: PUCINSKI.
H.R. 12379: TENZER.
H.R. 12410: TEAGUE of Texas.
H.R. 12414: BROWN of California.
H.R. 12415: DORN.
H.R. 12416: RONCALIO.
H.R. 12418: BROOMFIELD.
H.R. 12419: CASEY.
H.R. 12422: ELLSWORTH.
H.R. 12423: HALPERN.
H.R. 12424: HOWARD.
H.R. 12431: SAYLOR.
H.R. 12433: ADAIR.
H.R. 12468: DUNCAN.
H.R. 12472: FINO.
H.R. 12474: HANLEY.
H.R. 12479: KORNEGAY.
H.R. 12485: MINISH.
H.R. 12496: RODINO.
H.R. 12498: SHRIVER.
H.R. 12503: WOLFF.
H.R. 12523: BINGHAM.
H.R. 12531: HELSTOSKI.
H.R. 12540: ROUDEBUSH.

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

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

Mr. HARSHA. I would like to ask the gentleman as to the reasons why this bill contains a sum for subsistence allowance during education programs and training programs considerably less than what was provided in the Korean bill of rights.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The answer is just exactly what I got through trying to tell the gentleman. We have tried to work out some kind of a bill that would please most people and would become law. It is easy to wave the flag and be in favor of $200 a month and then to get nothing, but we have tried in this bill to work out something that would please the most people to the greatest degree possible and that is the only reason.

Mr. HARSHA. Who objects to paying at least the same amount that the Korean veterans got?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The Eisenhower administration objected to it. The Kennedy administration objected to it. And the Johnson administration objected to it.

Mr. HARSHA. What is the reason for objecting to it?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Because it costs too much money.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the World War II and Korean GI bills covered veterans who served between September 16, 1940, and July 26, 1947—also between June of 1950 and January 31, 1955. Assuming the effective date of this bill is approved as proposed, that will mean that, since 1940, the only group of veterans left ineligible for these benefits are those who served between July 27, 1947, and June of 1950.

I would like to inquire whether the committee considered this fact and what its conclusions were with regard to those men who served during that 3-year period.

Did not the committee feel that this was creating a certain kind of inequity against a relatively small group of veterans?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. In drawing up the bill, I would say that this was considered. So far as the consideration in committee was concerned, it was not considered. The point considered in the committee was whether we would go back to 1955, 1957, or 1963. The decision was made to return to 1955. I would say we made a mistake in 1950 when we wrote the Korean bill in not going back and picking up those men who at that time would have been at an age which so far as acquiring an education is concerned, they would have been able to get some benefit. I will say to the gentleman, I think we made a mistake. But our consideration in the committee was not whether we should go back to that date but whether it should be 1955 or not.

Mr. KUNKEL. Yes, but if they were included then they would have gotten the benefits of the Veterans Preference Act and they would also get certain other advantages, such as home loans and so forth.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Of course, the gentleman is exactly right. A lot of the World War I boys argued that we should go back beyond World War II and pick them up. But somewhere along the line, a decision had to be made. There are a dozen things that could go in this bill that would make it cost more. The question we had was to draw up some kind of bill that would become law.

Mr. KUNKEL. I congratulate the gentleman on the fine job he has done. I think this is an excellent bill.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in commending the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the equitable compromise that they have been able to bring to the floor here today.

Insofar as the amounts are concerned as to what will be paid to the veteran, I think, Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that this was brought out in the committee.

Insofar as the amounts are concerned as to what will be paid the veterans, I think it should be pointed out—and this was brought out in the committee—that the only reason that this bill is of the great importance that it is today is because we are involved in the situation we are in in Vietnam. The Vietnam veterans as such will not be able to use this bill until they get out of the service, and we hope they are all able to use it. Actually, the bill will be of benefit immediately in most cases to veterans who have not seen any combat duty. The moneys they will be getting is more of a bonus than it is a readjustment.

I think most of our veterans who are in school today, and those who are planning to go to school, who did not anticipate any benefits, will be mighty pleased to get the $100 a month.

Our economy is such that if our Viet boys, when they return, need more money and we feel they are entitled to more money, Congress can authorize an additional payment to those veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Certainly the Congress can change the laws if they want to.

I should like to say that since this program was discontinued in 1955, there have been dozens of meetings between the Bureau of the Budget, the VA, and the Defense Department. We have invited veterans' groups to draft a bill; we have invited education groups to draft some kind of a bill that would be a moderate, permanent bill. The bill before us today is the culmination of much work on the part of all concerned.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. I, too, wish to commend the chairman of the committee for bringing this bill to the floor, and all members of the committee for their efforts in formulating this legislation.

I realize that the present bill does not contain the additional benefits that the Korean veterans had insofar as on-the-job training is concerned. It seems to me that, in addition to providing educational benefits for veterans we ought

also to be concerned about training veterans to perform skilled jobs. I realize that such a provision is not in the bill, but I would suggest to the chairman a hope that the committee will try to provide something in the future insofar as this aspect of veterans' retraining is concerned.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am sure the gentleman realizes that under other legislation there is an excellent on-the-job training program for anyone in our country, even though such a provision is not in this bill.

Mr. HORTON. The gentleman, of course, is correct in his references to the Manpower Development and Training Act and the improvements which have been made to extend its benefits. In fact, much of my support of Manpower Development and Training Act has relied on its demonstrated ability to afford needed occupational training.

However, I feel we must be careful not to confuse general Federal programs intended to benefit society as a whole with our obligation to enact legislation that is specifically suited to those "who shall have borne the battle." These are separate situations, and it is my conviction that Congress is summoned to provide separately for them. Also, I feel sure that the advent of Manpower Development and Training Act was not intended to discharge the Federal responsibility for the readjustment of veterans seeking occupational training any more than were the new bills expanding Federal assistance to institutions of higher learning designed to eliminate the need for the very kind of bill we now are considering.

Yet, I also want to express my awareness of the difficulties which doubtless confronted the chairman and members of his committee in bringing the bill along. They, as do I, obviously wanted to enact a measure that would receive final approval.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. This bill would cost between $300 million and $350 million. There are a dozen things that I certainly think veterans are entitled to and which could be added to this bill. Somewhere along the line we had to think about the cost of the bill. That is the reason some of those provisions were not put in there.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending bill, H.R. 12410, to provide educational and other benefits for veterans whose military service occurred after January 31, 1955. I am the sponsor of H.R. 11970, a cold war GI bill which embodies the benefits in the bill now before us. However, my bill also sought additional veterans readjustment assistance, and I shall indicate my belief in the need for these further provisions in commenting on my favorable disposition to H.R. 12410.

I support fully a comprehensive program of cold war GI benefits. But I think it should be made plain that an investment in the futures of Americans who have manned the vigil of the free world against the onslaught of communism is somehow different than an investment in a monument or a spaceship. There may be times when this Nation cannot afford to indulge these programs, but there can never be a time when this Nation is engaged in combat, that it cannot afford to assist its fighting men in attaining a productive life under the very system they have defended with their lives. This kind of investment is a necessity.

Knowing that costs of living and of education have risen markedly since the days of the Korean war—just as the cost of fielding men in uniform has increased—my bill provided for educational benefits that realistically reflect this increase.

Knowing also how effective and successful the Korean benefit bill was in achieving its goal of maximum utilization of the capacities of American young men, I believe the GI bill should provide at least the same degree and breadth of opportunity for education and training. The Korean bill provided that for each day a veteran served, he was eligible to receive 1½ days of training or educational benefits. Since the length of time required to obtain academic or vocational training is not significantly shorter now than it was in 1955—especially considering the multitude of new technical skills that must be digested by our young people today—I do not think it is either wise or economical to shorten the period of training for which benefits may be paid under H.R. 12410.

My bill retains the 1½ days for every day served as a formula. It also provides for monthly benefits that are from $20 to $30 higher than those provided in the Korea bill when the cost of training was not so high. The monthly allowances and days of eligibility in H.R. 12410, in my opinion, do not so well reflect these factors and, in fact, are less than the benefits afforded our veterans more than a decade ago.

Furthermore, we should recognize the importance of the skilled, blue-collar worker to the health of our economy. This factor was recognized under the Korea bill, and as a result thousands of veterans were trained under that bill's provisions for on-farm and on-the-job training programs. My bill retains these essential provisions, but the committee bill eliminates these essential provisions entirely.

The veterans to be covered under this program have given just as faithfully to the well-being of this Nation as did the veterans of past eras. Their sweat, their blood and their time is of equal value.

I also think it should be noted that the rigors of technical society require more of our citizens today than ever before, just as the defense of freemen is today more rigorous and requires more risks of our men in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, while I regret that the bill before us does not match the three provisions I have discussed to the extent that I feel are necessary, I also recognize that under the procedure by which this bill has been brought up in the House there is no opportunity to amend the measure. Thus, even though I would have desired the coverage of nonacademic training programs, lengthened terms of eligibility, and broader benefits paid to veterans enrolled in the approved training programs, I shall vote for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the text of an editorial supporting such legislation which was published in one of the newspapers serving my home community of Rochester, N.Y.:

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat & Chronicle, Dec. 17, 1965]

GIVE VIET TROOPS A GI BILL

It's hard to imagine upon what basis Congress could refuse to pass a GI bill of rights for American fighting men in Vietnam. A similar measure, extending education and providing home-buying benefits to veterans, aided veterans of the Korean war. Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, who fathered that bill, is supporting the pending measure. His experience should help to blunt President Johnson's opposition.

Soon a half million of U.S. troops are expected to be on combat duty in Vietnam; there are plenty of servicemen who will say the Vietnamese conflict is far "dirtier" than the Korean war; and the men who die there are just as dead, the wounded suffer as much, and our fighting men's plans for getting an education are set back as far as they were of Korean veterans. Congress should enact this bill without delay.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. First, I too, wish to commend the chairman and the committee for working out a very difficult problem and, I think, in a very fine way. I happen to think that this is one of the costs that go along with the defense of this country. I am interested in a specific question.

On page 19 of the committee report we have the cost estimate in the table for fiscal 1967. Has this item been budgeted in the budget which the President presented to us in January?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would say to the gentleman that after much discussion back and forth $100 million was placed in the budget for this year. This bill is not budgeted in total amount, but there is $100 million in the bill for a GI bill of rights for education purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. For the fiscal year 1967?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. For fiscal 1967.

Mr. CURTIS. Will there be any impact on the budget that we are presently in, that is, the budget for the fiscal year 1966? That would be up until June 30 of this year.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think there would be practically none. I suggest that the gentleman ask the Budget Bureau about that. I should think that there would be very little.

Mr. CURTIS. I would think so, too.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. I, too, wish to commend the gentleman on the diligence he has used and the patience he has displayed in working out this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman, Representative OLIN TEAGUE, and the members of the House Veterans'

Affairs Committee for its fine work on this needed legislation.

I am but one of many Members of this House who felt the need for this legislation so strongly that we introduced companion bills. Mine, H.R. 12419, is identical to that by the chairman, and I am indeed proud to have placed my name on this legislation.

A few months ago, I had the great privilege to visit with many of our servicemen in Vietnam. The most common question asked of me was whether this Congress would enact a program to permit them to further their education. I told them that in my judgment it would—and I promised that I certainly would do all that I could to help.

The bill before us today is a sound one. It is a program that will not only benefit those young men whose careers were interrupted at a most critical time of their life, but it is a program that will benefit the Nation as a whole. Any money spent to further the education, or the training, of our citizens cannot but help benefit all of us.

It is indeed gratifying to me to see this Congress act to provide a permanent program of education benefits for our servicemen, and to make several changes needed and necessary in the veterans' benefit law. We have, as my colleagues know, enacted broad programs for veterans who served in wartime. This distinction between such service has become meaningless, as my colleagues well know. The bullets were just as deadly in Santo Domingo as they were at Iwo Jima—and the battles in Vietnam are just as deadly as those in Africa and Europe. In this day and age, all civilization is on the battleline and millions of lives can be snuffed out in the time it would take to complete one rollcall of this House. And those young men who serve today must face the reality that at a moment's notice they may be called upon to face the brutal onslaught of an enemy force at any one of scores of far-flung outposts protecting freedom for the United States and the whole Western World.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud to support this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to do likewise. It is my sincere hope that every member of our Armed Forces avails himself of the opportunity this bill creates to further his education, and to help him over the rough spots of readjusting to civilian life upon his discharge from service. I am indeed grateful for the small part I have had in helping make this program a reality.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, this is probably one of the most important bills that the House will receive this session. I support this legislation and I wish to commend my chairman, for bringing the bill out. I am sorry that we had to leave out some of the provisions that I had in my original bill (H.R. 11981), but it was necessary in order to get a bill that we could get approved. I wish to commend my chairman and the rest of my colleagues on the committee for their fine work.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is long overdue. I think it makes permanent what we can hold out to servicemen as some of the benefits that they are entitled to.

I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a summary of the bill H.R. 12410.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The summary is as follows:

SUMMARY OF H.R. 12410

EDUCATION

Provides a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving in the Armed Forces, discharged after January 31, 1955. College level and below college level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools is provided. Part-time training is permitted. Eligibility accrues at the rate of 1 month of training for 1 month of service, not to exceed 36 months. A minimum of 180 days' service is required to establish eligibility unless the individual is discharged for a service-connected disability. Persons serving on active duty for training do not accrue eligibility. The education and training allowance set by the bill for full-time training is $100 per month for a single veteran, $125 a month for a veteran with one dependent, and $150 for a veteran with more than one dependent. Proportionate rates are paid for three-quarters and half-time training. Fees and tuition are paid for less than half-time training. Education must be completed within 8 years from the date of discharge or 8 years from the effective date of the act. Training is provided for active duty members of the Armed Forces who have served at least 2 years, a portion of which occurred after January 31, 1955. These active-duty members may receive payments for fees and tuition. The administrative provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, for Korean conflict veterans, and the war orphans' training program are applicable to this new program. Schools will be approved by the State approval agencies of the various States, and these agencies will be responsible for extending supervision to approved schools.

GUARANTEED AND DIRECT HOME LOANS

The Veteran's Administration home loan guarantee program is extended to this new group of veterans discharged after January 31, 1955. The guaranteed loan by a private lender of $7,500 is continued. Direct loans for housing in rural areas and small towns, established as direct-loan areas, will be available to this group. The maximum amount of the direct loan is increased from $15,000 to $17,500. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is given authority to regulate the interest rate, consistent with the ceiling established for the Federal Housing Administration. A fund is established for the Administrator to offset losses, by requiring the veteran to pay 0.05 percent of his loan at closing.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED MEDICAL CARE

At the present time, veterans serving after January 31, 1955, are eligible for medical care in Veterans' Administration facilities only for service-connected disabilities. This group is made eligible for non-service-connected medical care on the same basis as veterans of earlier wars. Eligibility for non-service-connected medical care is based on availability of a bed and the signing of an oath of inability to pay, as is required of veterans of earlier wars entering for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCE IN FEDERAL SERVICE

Preference in employment in Federal service is extended to this group being discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as is currently applicable to war veterans. Persons serving on duty for training purposes do not accrue veterans' preference rights.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

War veterans are now covered by certain presumptions of service connection for a long list of chronic and tropical diseases. Peacetime veterans do not enjoy these presumptions of service connection. The wartime presumptions are extended to the group being discharged after January 31, 1955.

A flag is provided to drape the casket of war veterans. This provision is extended to this group serving after January 31, 1955.

War veterans are provided job counseling and job placement assistance by the Department of Labor. This new group is placed on the same basis for this assistance as veterans of earlier wars.

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act is amended to increase protection for individuals who are renting homes when they are called to service. The amount of rental covered is increased from $80 monthly to $150 monthly.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that most of us welcome an opportunity to vote for a measure to provide a permanent system of benefits for those who serve in the Armed Forces. The passage of this measure will end a controversy of long standing. It will eliminate the question of whether or not benefits are due to peacetime veterans. Actually, under today's world conditions, there are no peacetime veterans. Since World War II our men have been called upon to serve in every part of the world subject there to the dangers and the problems which accompany military service. In some areas of the world military service can be pleasant. But, it is not a serviceman's choice to say where he will serve. His duty station may be one which exposes him not only to hazards of battle but of hazards of health and climate. Always there is the problem of family separation, a matter of great moment with Americans.

Now many numbers of our forces are committed to combat action in the Far East. Others are confronted with danger daily in the Dominican Republic and on tomorrow there may be added trouble in any part of the world.

For these reasons it is important that there be permanent legislation. The House bill, as written, will encourage military service by providing an additional needed incentive to serve in uniform. The new bill must clear a House Senate conference, where it is hoped the House version will prevail. The measure when completed will pay college or vocational school expenses and guarantee loans for the purchase of homes, farms,

and businesses for veterans with more than 180 days' active service since January 1, 1955, when the Korean GI bill expired. Six-month trainees and those with only National Guard and Reserve service will not be covered under the bill. Eligible veterans will have 8 years, henceforth, in which to take advantage of the provisions of the act.

The Korean and World War II measures contributed greatly in excess of their cost to a forward-moving America. It resulted in new opportunities for many veterans to enjoy an education, to enter a business and to have a home. A permanent veterans' bill will do no less in the years ahead. And, it is justly deserved recognition for brave men who serve their country wherever they are needed, whenever they are called upon. In every sense, it constitutes a sound investment in the future of America.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before the House. This measure represents the culmination of many months of intensive study by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and its staff. More than 100 measures, including 1 passed by the other body, have been carefully considered by our committee. Witnesses representing the Federal Government, State governments, veterans' organizations, educational associations, campus student groups, and others presented views that were carefully analyzed by the committee. Witnesses for the administration first opposed all pending proposals and then just recently suggested an extremely limited benefit program. In this atmosphere of varied opinion, the committee drafted the bill before you today. It is more generous than that advocated by the administration and yet more limited than some of the proposals considered by the committee.

This bill offers to servicemen of more than 6 months active duty since January 31, 1955, a program of educational benefits; home loan guarantee; job counseling and placement services; nonservice-connected hospital and domiciliary care; veterans preference in Federal employment; flags for the caskets of deceased veterans; presumptions of service connection for certain disabilities similar to those afforded to veterans of war service and more protection under the the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940.

The principal benefit offered by this measure is, of course, education. It will provide a maximum of 36 months of education of service personnel who have served more than 6 months since January 31, 1955. Education time is earned at the rate of 1 day of education for each day of military service. The monthly educational allowance for veterans pursuing full-time institutional training is $100 monthly for single veterans; $125 for those with one dependent and $150 for those with two or more dependents. Proportionate rates are established for part-time training.

Unlike the World War II and Korean conflict GI bills, the program authorized by this legislation permits active duty servicemen with more than 2 years of service to take advantage of the educational benefits. The legislation also authorizes a permanent veterans education program rather than one geared to the termination of the draft or the end of the Vietnam conflict.

Although this is a good bill, Mr. Speaker, and one which I urge my colleagues to support, candor compels me to state that I am not entirely satisfied with the monthly educational allowances set forth in the bill. I believe we have an obligation to provide at least the same allowances as were made available under the Korean GI bill. Despite the increasing cost of education, the monthly allowances in this bill are $10 less per month than those of the Korean GI bill. Unfortunately, our efforts to obtain the higher rates were defeated by a close margin in committee.

I am pleased, however, that we are able to present a bill that will inform the young men fighting in Vietnam and all other servicemen that the Nation appreciates their sacrifice. The educational program offered by this measure will not only facilitate the return to civilian life of young men uprooted by war, but will increase the educational level of our Nation as well. The results of the World War II and the Korean GI bills lend added evidence to the fact that our Nation was enriched with more engineers, scientists, teachers, doctors, and other professions than ever before. The programs paid for themselves in increased tax revenue from the higher incomes of recipients of the two GI bills. I believe we can expect similar results from the bill before us today.

I repeat that it is good legislation and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12410.

This legislation extends benefits which were provided to those who served their country in the armed services during World War II and the Korean war. Certain changes are made in the benefits, but the important aspect of this legislation is that it provides a type of benefit which will do the individual and the country the most good.

I can think of no other type of Federal program that is a greater investment in the future than that which provides educational benefits that will assist individuals to be a truly productive part of our society.

This is not a Federal handout. It does not represent more Federal control over education.

This bill provides educational benefits to individuals who have earned them through serving their Nation in time of need. While it does not provide benefits in dollar amounts which I suggested in legislation which I introduced, I believe this measure is adequate, justifiable, and equitable.

Also, in my judgment, this cold war GI bill meets the test of top priority legislation which we can afford to consider during these critical times.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, normally at this stage of a session, and particularly on Mondays, we do not have any major legislation coming before us. With this in mind I made a firm commitment several weeks ago to be present for an important meeting in my district. Quite unexpectedly and suddenly the bill before the House was programed for consideration today.

The bill (H.R. 12410) was introduced last Monday, January 31, was reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with amendments on Thursday, February 3, and was programed the same day for consideration today, February 7.

I am not complaining about the speed with which this suddenly comes before us. On the contrary, I know that the committee has had a GI bill of rights measure of this character under consideration for a long time, but the administration has been adamantly opposed to the program.

I am truly delighted that the committee has acted so expeditiously and that this measure now comes before us as one of the first major bills to be considered at this session. My regret is that my long-standing previous commitment precludes my being present to vote for the bill. There is no doubt that it will pass overwhelmingly. Were there any doubt whatsoever in that respect I would be here for this vote, even if I had to charter a private plane to get me to Illinois, notwithstanding the weather uncertainties, to fill my commitment back home.

This bill in substance extends to our young men whose lives are disrupted by military service the rights and readjustment benefits that we granted to our World War II and Korean war veterans. We certainly can do no less for the Vietnam veterans. It is not a question as to whether they actually serve in Vietnam or in a combat area. The fact is that when they put on the uniform their normal civilian pursuits are disrupted, and they are prepared to go anywhere their country requires. They are prepared to risk their lives whenever and wherever they are called upon to do so.

As we well know, every young man has a military obligation which he must discharge in one way or another, either in one of the reserve training programs or enlistment or induction. As we also all too well know, the draft calls have been increasing and deferments decreasing. Married men and college men are now finding previous deferments cancelled.

Single or married, in college or just about to enter, whatever one's status, compulsory military service results in one losing his status in civilian life. It is time lost in a career. The period of readjustment following the service is usually difficult and sometimes long.

What is particularly important, and commends this bill to be, is that it pro-

vides for educational assistance, be it in college or in job training, that these young men will have a better chance to continue on where they left off with their education for their chosen career or to begin a new one. The lads who take advantage of his program will be the ones who want an education.

I am sure this measure will be adopted. I regret I cannot be here to vote for it, even though my vote is not needed to make a two-third majority for passage. But I do wish the RECORD to show my interest in the adoption of this program which, from my point of view, is long overdue.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I vigorously support legislation to provide for the education, training, and other benefits for veterans of military service since January 31, 1955. Such legislation is widely known as a peacetime or cold war bill. Today we really are not at peace, and the war is certainly not cold. American GIs' are manning posts of hardship throughout the world and are making the supreme sacrifice in combat. These conditions have prevailed for many years.

Certainly, the youths who today risk their lives to preserve our way of life are entitled to no less than was given to those of prior service. Surely, America is just as able to support such a program as it was the GI bill for World War II veterans. I think it can be clearly established that over the years, the GI's who benefitted from the original bill have more than replenished the coffers of the U.S. Treasury. Through improved skills and better education, they were able to obtain more rewarding jobs and to enter professions which made it possible for them to earn substantially greater returns than would have been possible, and to pay much greater taxes as a result.

This will be true of the present pending proposals, including H.R. 12053 which I have introduced. I join my colleagues of this second session of the 89th Congress in supporting this legislation and to urge terms as favorable to present veterans as that provided their predecessors.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I join in vigorous support of the so-called peacetime or cold war GI bill. This legislation will enhance the benefits of service in the Armed Forces of the United States and provide a broad program of educational and other benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955.

If our Government is able to embark on an international health program, and to undertake an International Education Act, it is my conviction that it is only reasonable that we first make available educational and other opportunities to the veterans who have been serving our country in posts of peril and hardship throughout the world.

I wholeheartedly favor this legislation.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this bill and hope it passes by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support this very important bill. I am glad to know that this Congress is finally recognizing our great national obligation to those of our young men who have served through the gruelling battles of the cold war.

For my part, I am sorry that it took the awakening popular feeling over Vietnam to make this legislation a reality. This bill deserved passage last year—or even before. Our soldiers have earned this assistance by their service, and that service alone. This bill should not have had to depend on the administration's slow surrender to public opinion.

I want to make very clear the fact that the cold war GI bill we pass here today is a product of this Congress. The administration bill that limped down from the White House was a penny-ante bill. The bill that this Congress will pass is a tribute to our veterans, not a grudging concession to national opinion. The administration's bill was a reluctant concession, stripped to the utmost possible extent.

The people of the United States have spoken out in support of this bill. They have asked this Congress to help the soldiers that have helped America. They have declared their feeling that the cost of this bill is part of the cost of cold war national defense. The people of this country know that this bill is not a luxury—they know it is not an unearned subsidy of an undeserving few.

That is why I am sorry that the administration has been so reluctant to support this tribute to our fighting men. The administration will spend billions on wild-eyed world-saving attempts to eradicate hunger and improve education throughout the world, but the administration has begrudged the money we are going to vote today to spend on benefits for our fighting men.

I think that this is a sorry state of affairs. We owe our cold war fighting men more than a reluctant, economy-size grubstake. Indeed, we owe our cold war warriors much more than we are giving them. I noted in the President's message last Wednesday that he proposed an international war on malaria. I also noticed that he did not bother to mention malaria in Vietnam—where it is often more of a menace to our troops than bullets. This is wrong.

So I say again that this cold war bill is the product of this Congress, and I am proud to support it. I have only one small note of criticism. This bill provides for monthly payments to cold war GI's which are smaller than the payments made to Korean war veterans. This is not right. There should be equality, or perhaps in view of the post-1953 inflation, cold war GI benefits should even be a little higher. I hope that somehow we will get the level of these payments increased—if not today, real soon.

Even if this higher payment level would call for more money in this and coming years, I firmly believe that this type of expenditure is a great investment. A full-fledged program of this type may even pay for itself in the long run. By increasing the earning power of thousands—hundreds of thousands of young men—the Government is enlarging its future tax base. The expenditures of today—if adequate to their task—will produce the revenues of tomorrow. If we are pennywise and pound foolish, we will not only have violated our responsibilities to our veterans, but we will have sabotaged the long-range commonsense of our program.

I hope that everyone here today will support this bill. I hope that improvements will be made, but the bill is a good bill, and I will vote for it.

I am also happy to note that the national veterans organizations are behind this legislation.

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

Mr. FINO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to evidence my support of H.R. 12410, which actually is a cold war GI bill of rights. I think the mood of the House on this legislation is clearly demonstrated by noting that something over 110 bills have been submitted by the Members to provide such benefits to our soldiers, sailors, and marines who have fought in the various little dirty wars since January 31, 1955. I am pleased to say that I was the author of one such bill.

It is a good bill; however, there are things that I would change if it were possible to do so. Since no amendment can be offered, this is impossible. I think that the committee has done about as good a job as is possible with the amount of money that the administration has approved for this legislation. There are several things I would have liked to see changed. I would personally prefer that 1½ days education benefit be allowed for each day's service, instead of the 1 day for each day's service as this bill provides. Also I think that the training allowance should have been more generous. This bill provides $100 per month for single veterans, $125 per month for married veterans and $150 for veterans with two or more dependents. I think that these amounts are inadequate. I

will not comment on many other features that the bill contains. Those two points that I mentioned are the matters with which, let us say, that I take most exception to. But I realize that as a practical matter that this bill will provide many badly needed veteran benefits and therefore I intend to support it. I certainly hope that this legislation receives an overwhelming vote of approval.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I will support the bill before us today not because it is a perfect bill but because it offers my only opportunity to support readjustment benefits for veterans of current service.

We find ourselves in the strange position of praising and applauding a bill that falls woefully short of providing even the same educational benefits that were available to World War II and Korean conflict veterans. Yet we commend ourselves because, by contrast, this bill is so much more generous than has been recommended by the present administration.

The Veterans' Administration has budgeted $100 million for the next fiscal year for educational benefits for veterans of current service. The bill before us today has a price tag of about $327 million for the first year. It has been suggested that we risk a Presidential veto if we increase this cost. Yet the bill does not provide for on-the-farm training, on-the-job training, or apprentice training, as did the other bills we have had following World War II and the Korean conflict. The bill does not pay a monthly allowance that is as generous as those we paid World War II and Korean veterans even though the administration freely admits that all costs of education, books, tuition, and subsistence have increased greatly over the past 10 years. Ironically, last year the Congress concluded that educational costs had increased sufficiently to warrant an increase from $110 to $130 a month to be paid to dependents of deceased and totally disabled servicemen attending school under the war orphans program. This bill does not even use the same formula for determining educational time as did the previous GI bills. Under this bill, instead of a month and a half for a month's service, you get only one month for each month's service. Instead of a veteran being able to get a full 4-year college education from his 2-year enlistment, he will now only get 2⅔ years of schooling.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these provisions have not been left out of the bill because they lack merit, but because their inclusion would increase the cost and subject it to a possible Presidential veto.

Let us look for a moment to some of the things which we are doing now for high school dropouts and other selected segments of our society.

We propose to spend $355 million to train 45,000 persons in the Job Corps. This figure averages out to $7,889 a year for one trainee. Contrast that with $100 a month which we are going to pay to a man who has been out on the firing line defending this country.

Mr. Speaker, under the work experiment and training program, the so-called happy pappy program, we will expend a total of $160 million this year to provide benefits of up to $250 a month for unemployed fathers.

Just the other day there appeared in the local press a quote as to what they are doing to earn this sum:

> We are busting rocks and digging ditches and cutting trees, and that is about it. We are building a few swinging bridges. I have been in this program a year and have not learned a thing.

Yet we are afraid to give to these men who are out defending our lives and our country any more than $100 a month, under the threat of a Presidential veto.

Mr. Speaker, the question which comes to my mind is whether the Congress passes legislation and the executive administers it, or whether we pass bills which only meet with the approval of the Executive.

While this committee was considering this legislation proposing to give $100 a month to our veterans, the Executive on February 2 sent to the Congress a message in which he asked for educational benefits for foreigners to be included in next year's budget, a total of $524 million.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, it is a disgrace that on the one hand we propose to spend $524 million for educating foreigners and only $327 million on the other hand to pay our GI's who are defending this country.

Finally, I commend the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for not accepting the administration's plan to provide benefits for only veterans who have served since October 1, 1963.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am proud to voice my support for H.R. 12410, the cold war GI bill of rights. I have long been a sponsor and an active advocate for legislation to provide our peacetime veterans with readjustment assistance, and I believe that H.R. 12410, which was unanimously approved by our committee, deserves the support of the entire House. While its provisions may not go as far as my own bill, H.R. 12423, or provide the comprehensive program as many of us would like, I feel that this measure probably stands a better chance of administration acceptance at this time than would a more comprehensive program. But we should not let our concern and our efforts end with the enactment of this legislation. Its shortcomings must be considered and I hope we will have early opportunity to meet them. I would like to heartily commend our distinguished chairman for his painstaking efforts and dedicated work to develop this legislation which is one of the most important issues to come before this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not a benefit bill designed to reward those who serve their country. For service to one's country bears its own reward in the knowledge and satisfaction that one has contributed to our security. Rather, I conceive this as an "investment" bill—an investment in the human and economic resources of our Nation. Statistics prove that the benefits extended to our veterans redound to the Government many times over. In the past 20 years, veterans who were trained and educated under the earlier Readjustment Act, have contributed a billion dollars a year in additional taxes, which more than offset the cost of that program. Moreover, the increased skills and intellectual attainment which those programs made possible, have enriched our culture and advanced our economy. I believe that we can continue to anticipate such salutary effects from the future programs embodied in this bill.

The two key provisions of the bill are those which provide educational and home loan assistance. Under the former, veterans would be able to receive 1 month of education or training for each month of active duty, to a maximum of 36 months. Monthly payments would vary according to whether the veteran was pursuing his education on a full- or part-time basis, and on the number of dependents. Unfortunately, the maximum educational assistance is set at $150 per month, which is less than that which is obtained under the Korean war GI bill. In view of the increases in the cost of living—and particularly in tuition costs—over the last 10 years, I think this maximum is somewhat unrealistic. Our distinguished colleague, the able gentleman from Indiana, ROSS ADAIR, studied this issue in depth, and concluded that more realistic allowances were clearly in order. I wholeheartedly agree with him. His bill, as well as my own, propose educational allowances ranging to $190 per month for veterans with two or more dependents, who are pursuing a full time curriculum. I firmly believe that we have an obligation to go all out for the young Americans who have risked their lives and diverted their careers in defense of their Nation, and I feel that more liberal allowances were warranted.

The home loan provision in H.R. 12410 is an excellent program, which will help our returning GI's by providing direct and guaranteed loans. The maximum guarantee remains at $7,500, but the direct loans, for housing in rural areas and small towns, is increased to $17,500. In addition to facilitating the readjustment of veterans whose family plans may have been dislocated by military service, this provision will undoubtedly stimulate the construction of new homes and thus provide jobs for thousands of workers in this basic industry. Moreover, it provides a necessary supplement to the veterans assistance program we enacted last year as part of the Housing and Urban Development Act.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of speaking to our servicemen from

Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the jungles of Vietnam, and I know firsthand that no legislation we enact this year will be more to them than the legislation we are considering today. Many of these men want to enhance the skills they have learned in the service, from meteorology to aircraft mechanics. Others want to begin or continue their educational pursuits, and still others hope to establish a home. The readjustment programs embodied in this bill are designed to make these hopes a reality.

One disquieting feature of this bill is the absence of a provision for small business loans. This opportunity was given to the World War II and Korean veterans and it provided new vistas of opportunity for thousands of young Americans and in turn paid dividends to our economy many times over. Many of the veterans and GI's to whom I have spoken, have indicated their deep interest in establishing themselves in the business world. Some had completed their education before entering the military and others were simply more disposed to embark upon opportunities in business. In fairness to these individuals, I included a provision for small business loan guarantees in my bill, and sought to amend the committee bill accordingly. While my amendment fell one vote short of committee adoption, I believe that sufficient support has been evidenced for this worthy program to warrant pursuing this further by separate legislation. I might mention that the small business programs under the prior Readjustment Act for World War II and Korean veterans processed 225,000 loans and had a remarkable record of success.

Mr. Speaker, in all, I think that the bill before us is a good bill, and one which commands our support. I believe that the miscellaneous provisions, such as those according veterans preference in Federal employment and providing increased medical care for tropical diseases, are well conceived, and reflect the high quality of work which the committee devoted to this effort. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am proud to have played a part in the shaping of this legislation and honored indeed to commend it to the House for passage.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member of the Congress who gets up on this floor today and criticizes this bill would document the bills that they have introduced and the efforts they have made to get a bill through the House during the past few years.

Mr. Speaker, may I say further to my colleagues, the Member of the other body who has done more than all other Senators to get a bill is on the floor of the House today, Senator YARBOROUGH, and he is my best assurance that this bill will be accepted in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, may I commend our distinguished and illustrious chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], for his dynamic leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor. I thank the chairman for permitting me to join him in introducing this legislation. The chairman has labored long and hard to bring to the House this bill which is justice to the veterans and fair to the American taxpayer. For almost 16 years it has been my honor to sit next to Chairman TEAGUE on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and I know of the chairman's full devotion and dedication to our servicemen who are serving the cause of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans organizations united splendidly in support of this legislation. I commend the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, Amvets, and the Veterans of World War I for their cooperation. These great organizations are to be commended for their dedicated representation of the veterans of America and our servicemen abroad.

This is a reasonable bill. It will do the job, and I believe it will receive the overwhelming endorsement of the Congress. Returning only a few days ago from Vietnam, I can report to you that this legislation would be a tremendous boost to the morale of our fighting men. The servicemen throughout the world were greatly encouraged last year by the group insurance passed by this Congress and by the general pay raise.

Everywhere I go people ask—What can be done to help our servicemen who are fighting for the cause of freedom? Mr. Speaker, the passage of the bill will help these servicemen.

In Vietnam our men are gallantly opposing Communist aggression. They are fighting a jungle war in the mud and quagmires of this faraway land. It is a ruthless aggression of terror, torture, and a war against civilization. Our men are faced with monsoons, tropical diseases, and jungle rot. I can report to you that they are performing gallantly. They left the shores of America as young boys. They will return as men. This legislation will enable these men to readjust and face the future with confidence and assurance. Education and training, which this bill will provide, will assure them of job opportunity and the ability to compete with their fellow Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the American people can afford the cost of this bill. Our Nation is passing through a period of unprecedented prosperity. Our national income is at an all-time high collectively and per capita. It is increasing almost daily. Surely, Mr. Speaker, in a time like this we can afford to encourage our servicemen who are in uniform at the time of stark, ruthless Communist aggression. Not only are our men fighting desperately with the enemy in the jungles of Vietnam, but they are standing guard in Santo Domingo, on the road to Berlin, at the radar stations near the North Pole, and throughout the world. These men are in war no less than those of us who fought in Europe, in the Pacific, in the air and in the sea during World War II. Our men today are fighting the Communist aggressor with the same sacrifice and devotion to duty as our men in the Korean conflict.

Those of you who served our country in uniform will agree with me that military service does interrupt the hopes, aspirations, plans, and dreams of our young men and women. Military service often calls for a change of direction and a readjustment period, often very difficult and trying. This bill, with its educational benefits, will provide our returning servicemen with the encouragement and incentive to not only readjust but to continue their education.

No one will question today the great benefits of the GI bill and the educational benefits to the veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

This bill is necessary. It is fair and it is timely. The American people are ready for this legislation. They overwhelmingly favor it. Our veterans organizations are supporting it. Our men and officers in service recommend it.

In summary, this bill will provide:

Education: Provides a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving in the Armed Forces, discharged after January 31, 1955. College level and below-college level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools is provided. Part-time training is permitted. Eligibility accrues at the rate of 1 month of training for 1 month of service, not to exceed 36 months. A minimum of 180 days service is required to establish eligibility unless the individual is discharged for a service-connected disability. Persons serving on active duty for training do not accrue eligibility. The education and training allowance set by the bill for full-time training is $100 per month for a single veteran, $125 a month for a veteran with one dependent, and $150 for a veteran with more than one dependent. Proportionate rates are paid for three-fourths and half-time training. Fees and tuition are paid for less than half-time training. Education must be completed within 8 years from the date of discharge or 8 years from the effective date of the act. Training is provided for active duty members of the Armed Forces who have served at least 2 years, a portion of which occurred after January 31, 1955. These active duty members may receive payments for fees and tuition. The administrative provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, for Korean conflict veterans, and the war orphans' training program are applicable to this new program. Schools will be approved by the State approval agencies of the various States, and these agencies will be responsible for extending supervision to approved schools.

Guaranteed and direct home loans: The Veterans' Administration home loan guarantee program is extended to this new group of veterans discharged after January 31, 1955. The guaranteed loan by a private lender of $7,500 is continued. Direct loans for housing in rural areas and small towns, established as direct loan areas, will be available to this group. The maximum amount of the direct loan is increased from $15,000 to $17,500. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is given authority to regulate the interest

rate, consistent with the ceiling established for the Federal Housing Administration. A fund is established for the Administrator to offset losses, by requiring the veterans to pay 0.05 percent of his loan at closing.

Non-service-connected medical care: At the present time, veterans serving after January 31, 1955, are eligible for medical care in Veterans' Administration facilities only for service-connected disabilities. This group is made eligible for non-service-connected medical care on the same basis as veterans of earlier wars. Eligibility for non-service-connected medical care is based on availability of a bed and the signing of an oath of inability to pay, as is required of veterans of earlier wars entering for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities.

Employment preference in Federal service: Preference in employment in Federal service is extended to this group being discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as is currently applicable to war veterans. Persons serving on duty for training purposes do not accrue veterans' preference rights.

Miscellaneous provisions: War veterans are now covered by certain presumptions of service connection for a long list of chronic and tropical diseases. Peacetime veterans do not enjoy these presumptions of service connection. The wartime presumptions are extended to the group being discharged after January 31, 1955.

A flag is provided to drape the casket of war veterans. This provision is extended to this group serving after January 31, 1955.

War veterans are provided job counseling and job placement assistance by the Department of Labor. This new group is placed on the same basis for this assistance as veterans of earlier wars.

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act is amended to increase protection for individuals who are renting homes when they are called to service. The amount of rental covered is increased from $80 monthly to $150 monthly.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST].

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, this bill recognizes what all of us and what the American people have known, that since the beginning of the Korean war we have been in a continuous global war against communism everywhere. It is impossible to say when it will end. This bill starts with 1955 and it is open-ended until this conflict is resolved.

The benefits of the bill have been discussed. There is a training program. While the on-the-job-training and farm training has been left out, there is available under this bill vocational training of any and every kind available to any veteran and any veteran has the right to go to any agricultural school in the United States of America or to go back to his high school if he has not finished high school and take an agricultural course. These do not make up the full programs that were in the original bill but it does offer as much opportunity for this training as the veteran wants to take advantage of. This bill was considered for a long time by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Many of us have introduced bills. I introduced one last year, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] introduced the first one back in 1955, immediately after the President had declared the Korean bill to be ineffective.

This bill has the unanimous support of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and of every single individual on the committee. It has the support, I am sure, of every veterans' organization in the United States.

It does not perhaps please every individual in every particular, but it is overall an excellent bill and one that should pass this House today.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12410, the peacetime veterans benefit bill. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and a member of the Subcommittee on Education, I wish to inform my colleagues that exhaustive hearings were held in connection with this legislation. Appearing before our committee were representatives of most of the educational associations, all veterans' organizations, and many others, all in support of a GI bill for post-Korean veterans. Although the bill falls short of many things some of us desire, such as on-the-farm and job training, it does contain many benefits for the veterans. It is hard for many of us to understand why we can offer job training to boys in the Job Corps camps, and not to veterans who possess value. The benefits of the GI bill for the post World War II and Korean war veteran demonstrated the great enhancement not only to the individual in terms of income and self-fulfillment but also in terms of additional income to assist our national economy.

During recent months we have seen great emphasis placed upon training young men, many of whom are military rejectees, in Job Corps camps at a cost running as high as $8,000 each year per man. During the past few years we have also seen the rejection of the qualified soldier. Often he has completed his stint of duty and is awaiting an opportunity to reenter into civilian life as a qualified and productive citizen.

Is it socially just or fair to have two classes of young people: the economically advantaged, many of whom avoid the draft by attending college—and the economically disadvantaged who are drafted by the selective service board or by economic circumstances?

It has been said that the applicant for these educational allowances will be one in four of the cold war GIs. The chances are his qualifications will have resulted in him gaining some promotion within the enlisted ranks in the services and this means he will have acquired a sense of responsibility which makes it probable he will complete the courses of study he sets out upon.

Surely, at a time when massive economic dependence is a real threat to our society, it is in the urgent national interest to encourage the independence and productivity of this special group of young men whom we are discussing. The threat of long-term unemployment hung less heavily over the World War II veteran and the Korean war veteran than it does over young men leaving the armed services today. The World War II and Korean war veteran faced the problem of frictional unemployment. The cold war veteran faces the same problem.

Some say we cannot afford this GI bill. There are several ways of estimating whether these costs can be afforded. In the first case, if these young persons are not trained and educated to acquire the necessary skills to compete in today's labor market they will become dependent as a cost or drag on the economy.

In the second case, we must compare the costs of a cold war GI bill with the general costs of defense. With defense costs running at over $50 billion a year, the costs of the cold war GI bill, even with the liberalizing amendments is only one-half of 1 percent of defense costs.

If we can afford the costs of selecting the most able and fit youth to serve the Nation, we can surely afford the costs of training them to take a useful place in civilian life. It is an interesting exercise to compare costs of this bill with profits of business. With corporate profits after taxes running at over $44 billion a year, the cold war GI bill cost represents a little less than 1 percent of present-day profits. While many such profits are being made directly or indirectly out of defense industry, no profits at all would be possible if the security of the country were endangered through lack of dependable and adequate Armed Forces. The question, therefore, is simply one of whether the Nation has the right to take young men involuntarily—or involuntarily, under economic pressure—into the armed services so that they lose two or more vital years of education and training and then discharge them into civilian life which has changed owing to the high speed of the technological revolution through which we are passing, without any adequate readjustment training or education. Adjustment is made for other persons involved in other aspects of defense. A scientist was hired by the Aerospace Corp., a nonprofit corporation engaged in defense work, recently and the Government paid some $3,500 for the costs of trucking his yacht from Massachusetts to California. I am not here to complain about the Government subsidizing the trucking industry for $3,500, but I question whether the adjustment rights of the scientist are any more important than the adjustment rights of the veterans.

The Veterans' Administration argues that World War II and the Korean war "sharply disrupted career planning." Some argue that "special Government aid" was needed after World War II and the Korean war to "ease the transition for wartime service back to civilian life." Some now boldly state that service today has "a much less disruptive effect upon the veteran's educational plans and his career." How they arrive at that conclusion I do not know. We are living today in the middle of a sweeping techno-

logical revolution which did not exist at the end of World War II and which was only partly in existence at the end of the Korean war. A young person with a limited education who loses 2 or 3 years of educational time in the service is a sitting duck for a life of unemployability today. This was not the case 15 years ago. Neither was it the case 20 years ago. The fact that some persons served in a declared war and other persons are serving in an undeclared war does not much differentiate their cases. In both cases time spent on military service is time lost for the individual insofar as his lifetime career is concerned.

We feel that the bill before the committee is a necessary measure for the following reasons: Military service is inequitably distributed and falls largely on the sons of working-class people. Young working-class boys entering military service generally gain no transferable civilian skills during their period of military duty. Young veterans emerge into a civilian society in a state of technological, economical, and social revolution. The general development of this revolution demands a higher degree of education and skills for regular employment than the young veterans possess. These young veterans have lost from 2 to 3 years of their most educable years in military service. The handicaps of young veterans in the labor market are emphasized by their dramatic unemployment rate of about 50 percent. This bill will encourage young veterans to equip themselves to live as Americans should—free, independent, productive, and self-supporting.

I reject the suggestion that cold war GI benefits be restricted to those young men serving in areas of hostilities. Manning the PX in Saigon is less dangerous than being a parachute instructor in Fort Benning, Ga. It is a matter of luck where a man's service time is spent. Throughout his service he can be sent anywhere.

It is in the interest of fair play to both the cold war GI and the national economy that this bill be passed. Many veterans are standing idle and confused at this time of dwindling job opportunities. This bill offers a lifeline to the more energetic of these young people. If they grasp it, they can save themselves from lives of economic dependency. That is in the interest of us all.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I believe that it will give a major lift to the spirit of our men in Vietnam. They have asked about it from Danang to the Mekong Delta. Their morale is magnificent, and this is one way in which we can help and show we care.

Today our servicemen are scattered throughout the world, and in many instances are serving under combat or near-combat conditions. During the period of time which is covered by this bill, our Nation has gone through a series of crises associated with Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Taiwan-Matsu, Lebanon, Berlin, Laos, and Vietnam.

Regardless of where members of the Armed Forces have served, their educational or career plans have in many cases been interrupted in order to fulfill their military obligations. The provisions on education in this bill, in the main, are sound. They will assist a veteran in following the educational plan he might have adopted had he never entered the Armed Forces.

The bill would provide for a month of training for each month of service, not to exceed 36 calendar months—which is the equivalent of 4 academic years. The assistance rates per month for full-time training are $100 for a single veteran, $125 for a veteran with one dependent, and $150 for a veteran with more than one dependent. There are proportionate rates for less than full-time training. Education is generally limited to institutions of higher learning, and must be completed within 8 years from the date of discharge.

All veterans are eligible who served on active duty for a period of more than 180 days, any part of which occurred after January 31, 1955, and who were released under conditions other than dishonorable.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the House will act favorably on this important legislation.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12410, the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966. A great many Members of this body have been the direct beneficiaries of World War II and Korean conflict GI bills and know firsthand the value of such legislation.

While H.R. 12410 is not completely satisfactory in the eyes of many, the Veterans' Affairs Committee is to be commended for making this measure a priority item in this, the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

I have carefully reviewed H.R. 12410 and am satisfied it has been designed to insure that our Nation will be able to utilize the highest skills and abilities of veterans who will benefit from this legislation. The Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 provides a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving in the Armed Forces, discharged after January 31, 1955. It is a flexible program, as it provides college level and below college level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools. Eligibility accrues at the rate of 1 month of training for 1 month of service with a limit of 36 months, and the bill also provides a person serving on active duty for training does not accrue eligibility. In my opinion, the allowances provided are generally adequate, as are the program limitations. As I understand the measure, a full-time student with no dependents will receive $100 per month, $125 per month with one dependent, and $150 per month with two or more dependents. Less than full-time students will, of course, receive smaller benefits. There are other provisions which have been more fully discussed, but, in essence, the educational benefits appear to be reasonable in most instances and, in my opinion, long overdue.

In addition to the education benefits, H.R. 12410 also extends benefits of both the guaranteed and the direct home loan programs to veterans discharged after January 31 of 1955. It provides non-service-connected medical care to veterans serving after January 31, 1955. Eligibility for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities, very properly in my opinion, is based on availability of a bed in a Veterans' Administration hospital and the signing of a statement of inability to pay for treatment elsewhere.

This legislation extends preference in employment in Federal service to the group of veterans discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as is currently applicable to war veterans. It provides job counseling and job placement assistance; a presumption of service connection of certain chronic and tropical diseases; protection for individuals who are renting homes when called to service; and permits the Veterans' Administration to furnish burial flags for draping the caskets of deceased veterans with service after January 31, 1955, as is now provided war veterans.

Mr. Speaker, many times this body has met and concerned itself with matters of grave importance to this great Nation and others. Of no less importance is the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966.

There are some who have resisted this measure in the name of economy. It is indeed difficult to reconcile this view with the recent record of spending. The express purpose of the legislation is to enhance and make more attractive service in the Armed Forces of the United States and, in addition, to provide assistance to those who serve in the Armed Forces in attaining the vocational and educational status they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country. Not all those who serve are exposed to the dangers of combat, but the choice is never theirs. All those who serve do, in effect, give a portion of their lives to the service of their country for the benefit of all Americans. If billions can be spent on Great Society programs, a little can be expended to assist those who have kept and are keeping our society free. This bill is a start in the right direction and should be passed forthwith.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I strongly endorse this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my distinguished colleagues in this body in praise of the speedy and thorough action by the Veterans' Affairs Committee in reporting out an excellent piece of legislation, H.R. 12410, the peacetime veterans benefits bill.

I am pleased and proud to support this bill and I am confident it will be enacted into law at an early date.

At a time when our military involvement in Vietnam is escalating at an alarming rate, when our debate over this situation in other chambers is becoming almost as heated as the fighting itself, one hardly needs to be reminded that the fight is being waged by courageous young Americans, few of whom are old enough to vote but who seem to have a better grasp of the issues involved than many of us.

The Vietnam war continues to uproot more and more of our young men, to interrupt their lives and send them to a mysterious and faraway place to fight a frustrating and exhausting war. If there were no other reason to pass this bill here today, it would be reason enough to give them a break when they return.

Speaking for myself, I was, and continue to be, sincerely grateful for the break I had through the World War II GI bill. I do not exaggerate when I say, that were it not for the World War II bill that helped me get through Boston College Law School, I would probably not be here today.

I daresay many of my distinguished colleagues could say the same thing.

But there are other, equally compelling reasons for us to support this bill now before us.

Cost has sometimes been used as a reason for opposing this legislation. It is pointed out by the committee, I believe, that the educational benefits in H.R. 12410 will run to something like $327 million in fiscal 1967. Nevertheless, I think we can justly concede that the profits in terms of increased revenues from the increased earning power of those men who benefit from an educational opportunity they might otherwise be denied, more than justifies the investment.

There has been virtual universal agreement on one aspect of GI education programs. And that is that veterans, returning from active duty to their college campus and classrooms, are among the most sincere, the most mature, and the most receptive students in the world. College professors are in general agreement that veterans' academic grades and accomplishments, in general, rank among the highest.

There is no question of their being able to take advantage of the opportunity thus offered.

We are presently investing billions in various aid-to-education programs. As a result of legislation passed last year, we have authorized over a quarter of a billion dollars for aid to higher education. We spend millions on preschool education programs. We will spend millions on public and secondary schools. We have even authorized an aid program for private and parochial schools.

There is no question of our recognition of the fact that education is the key to the future and to our continuing national welfare.

While there are still risks in some of the million-dollar aid programs, some gambles that we must take, there seems virtually no risk involved in a renewal of veterans benefits under a new GI bill.

A renewal of the VA insured home loan program is also justified. The record of these programs over the years has been equally good. Moreover, because of the pressures they exert on interest rates, they have had a favorable impact on inflationary tendencies in the economy. Certainly, the home building industry owes much of its recent boom to the VA loan programs.

I might personally regret that H.R. 12410 lacks a business loan feature, as I had proposed in my own bill. But I am prepared to concede that existing Federal loan programs, especially the small business loan program administered by SBA, can offset the lack of a VA plan. Unfortunately the SBA loan program appears to have lost some of its responsiveness in recent months. But that is a problem, perhaps, for the Small Business Committee, of which I am pleased to be a member.

I am pleased to note that this bill also preserves a veterans preference requirement on Federal employment and a GI job counseling and guidance service. I think these programs, too, have more than justified their worth since World War II.

I support this bill here today and it is my hope that it can be enacted into law at the earliest possible time.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I rise in support of this legislation. I feel it is the very least we can do. I certainly agree that it should stimulate the morale of our fighting forces in Vietnam.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of legislation to extend the benefits of the GI bill of rights, having introduced H.R. 11973, I would like to say that I support H.R. 12410 as a compromise measure and urge its passage. The young men being called into service are just as deserving and are making the same sacrifice as the young men who were called into service during the Korean conflict and World War II. Therefore, they should have the same privileges under the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act and be entitled to the same benefits as were extended to our Korean and World War II veterans. H.R. 12410 differs slightly from H.R. 11973, but it provides for the following:

Education: Provides a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving in the Armed Forces, discharged after January 31, 1955. College-level and below-college-level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools is provided. Eligibility accrues at the rate of 1 month of training for 1 month of service, not to exceed 36 months.

Guaranteed and direct home loans: Benefits of both the guaranteed and the direct home loan programs are extended to veterans discharged after January 31, 1955. The guarantee of a loan by a private lender in the amount of $7,500 is extended to this group and, in areas established as direct loan areas where guaranteed financing has not generally been available, a maximum direct loan of $17,500 is authorized. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to regulate interest rates, consistent with the ceiling established for Department of Housing and Urban Affairs.

Non-service-connected medical care: At the present time, veterans serving after January 31, 1955, are eligible for medical care in Veterans' Administration facilities only for service-connected disabilities. This group is made eligible under the provisions of this bill for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities on the same basis as war veterans.

Preference in Federal employment: Preference in employment in Federal service is extended to the group of veterans discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as is currently applicable to war veterans.

Burial flags: The bill will permit the Veterans' Administration to furnish a flag for draping the casket of deceased veterans of service after January 31, 1955, as is now provided war veterans.

Job counseling and job placement assistance: Places veterans discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as veterans of earlier conflicts for assistance through the Department of Labor in job placement and counseling.

Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief: Amends the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act by increasing protection for individuals who are renting homes when called to service from $80 monthly rental to $150 monthly rental.

I cannot urge too strongly to pass this legislation by an overwhelming vote in order to show our fighting men in Vietnam that we are supporting them all the way.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY].

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

Mr. KORNEGAY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the bill introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and reported by his committee has my wholehearted support. In fact, I introduced a bill very similar to this one on the first day of this session.

I had the privilege of visiting Vietnam in November, and can testify with complete conviction to the fact that our fighting men there have fully earned and should receive the educational, medical, and other benefits contained in this bill.

These men are in Vietnam because our country needs them there, and they are doing a magnificent job. The American fighting man will continue to do a magnificent job—in Vietnam, in Berlin, in the Caribbean, or wherever he is needed.

Every young man who served with the Armed Forces during the cold war period this bill covers, faced the real possibility of being sent into combat. And, unfortunate as it may be, every young man who serves in the foreseeable future faces the same possibility.

We have here an opportunity to express our gratitude to these men by helping them return to civilian life better

equipped to provide a good, full life for themselves and their families. And, at the same time, the whole Nation will benefit—as it has benefited from the World War II and Korean GI bills—from the group of educated, productive young Americans which will be the result of this bill's passage. This bill is a great investment in our country's future, and it will pay tremendous benefits.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, the attempt of a few to make political capital out of the fact that the present administration has supported a more modest measure than the one before us. The fact remains that the last Republican administration, also in office during the cold war period, would not support any measure along these lines. That is the record. There is little credit for the GOP in that record.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge passage of this bill.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, because we are a democratic Nation and because we honor our commitments to fellow nations we are engaged in bitter conflict against the forces of aggression. Because we value freedom above life itself and because attacks upon freedom anywhere in the world are attacks upon our own, we have been forced to take steps to strengthen our defenses and to insure our military readiness. We have had to step up drastically our draft and may have Reserve calls. We have had to interrupt the pursuits of many of our young men and put them at the disposal of their country.

Despite these overriding conditions we find the compulsory draft most distasteful. It is contrary to our national temperament. We do not like to pick or choose among our citizens some who must bear the civic duty of defending their country while others further their education, training, or careers at their expense. We sense the injustice of a plan whereby some Americans must forfeit 2 to 4 years of their lives insuring the freedom of all and return to civilian life greatly behind those who did not serve.

And yet the compulsory draft is necessary. The exigencies of these trying times are such that we must have a large and strong Armed Forces ready at a moment's notice to send wherever we may need them. The draft is the most effective way of supplementing the number of men who volunteer.

But the personal sacrifices which the men who serve in our Armed Forces make whether they enlist or are drafted are enormous. What is eminently more unjust than the compulsory draft, therefore, is our failure to help these men make the difficult transition back to civilian life.

The obligation to serve and defend one's country does not warrant a reward. It necessarily accompanies what President Kennedy once called the burden and glory of freedom. I do not consider readjustment assistance, however, as being in any sense a reward. It is in one respect restitution to those young men and women who bear a disproportionate share of the burden of freedom. It is an attempt to restore to them precious opportunities lost through service. The cold war GI bill will help the veterans to regain these lost opportunities. An education allowance of $100 a month for a single veteran and $150 a month for a veteran with more than one dependent will enable post-Korean veterans to obtain college level and below college level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools. Guaranteed and direct home loans will assist the cold war veterans in purchasing homes and resettling their families. Job placement assistance and preference in Federal employment will help the veterans become self-supporting members of the civilian work force.

We are all aware, Mr. Speaker, that in today's world it is imperative that every American obtain as much education and training as he is capable of receiving. The demands of the labor market for better educated and trained workers are only one reason. The requirements of citizenship in a 20th century democracy are another. We in the 89th Congress realize the importance of education and we have demonstrated again and again our commitment. We have passed numerous measures designed to improve the quality of education and to increase educational opportunity at all levels. We would be grossly inconsistent, therefore, if we failed to pass the cold war GI bill. We have already passed the Elementary and Secondary Education and the Higher Education Acts of 1965, aimed at raising the general level of our grade, high schools and colleges, and to make them available to all students. We also enacted the special Head Start and Job Corps programs to assist disadvantaged and deprived youth. Will we continue any longer to penalize the men who defend us and insure our safety? Will equal educational opportunity extend to all Americans except the cold war veterans?

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson once said:

> The classroom—not the trench—is the frontier of freedom.

Therefore we must not deny any part of our citizenry access to the classroom. We must not deny those who defend our democracy from participating fully in it. The cold war GI bill will open to the post-Korean veteran educational doors which might otherwise remain closed. It will help him to help himself and to make positive contributions to the progress of the country. We have only to look at the results of the World War II and the Korean GI bills to see how the veterans can enrich our Nation. The thousands of teachers, engineers, doctors, nurses, electricians, and mechanics who received their education and training under the previous bills, left quite an impressive academic record. Not only did they raise the educational level of the country but they also stiffened the fiber of our colleges and vocational schools. They became responsible homeowners and taxpayers. It is even estimated that the better educated, higher earning veterans through their higher taxes will pay back the entire cost of the program twice and possibly three times in the course of a lifetime. We can expect similar results when our post-Korean veterans leave the battlefield and reenter the classroom. We owe them at least the same chance. I am proud to cosponsor the bill that will give them that chance.

The cold war GI bill like the World War II and Korean GI bills makes no distinction between those servicemen who serve in actual areas of combat and those who serve here at home. The purpose of the bill, after all, is not to reward the serviceman because he risked life and limb but to give him a reasonable chance of regaining the education and job opportunities he lost through service. The provisions of the bill are certainly not extravagant and in all likelihood the post-Korean veteran too will more than pay for the cost of the program. Although the cold war GI bill will probably be a profitable investment, it is more than simply a case of spending money to make money. It is an investment in the people and the future of this country and it is certainly in the American tradition of self-help. There is no handout and no unemployment compensation involved just the possibility of becoming educated citizens, trained workers, and homeowners. The initiative and the hard work are still left up to the veterans. Without readjustment assistance, however, they have little hope. The cold war GI bill will salvage valuable skills and talents which we as a nation can ill-afford to lose. It will help post-Korean veterans overcome readjustment obstacles greater in many ways than those facing World War II and Korean War veterans. Education and training are indispensable to today's work force. A much higher level of both is required today than in 1945 or 1955. In addition, the cost of education like the cost of living in general has skyrocketed since the end of World War II and the Korean war. In view of these conditions the need of the cold war GI for assistance exceeds that of his predecessors. One thing is certain, the need for veteran readjustment assistance is acute. We cannot any longer as Americans deny them that help.

Mr. Speaker, the cold war GI bill is outstanding in both its urgency and its justice. It is a bill which I strongly support, which my constituents strongly support, and which the whole American people strongly support. I now encourage my distinguished colleagues to take swift and positive action under this overwhelming mandate. We must enact the cold war GI bill.

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

Mr. KORNEGAY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill will benefit thousands of West Virginians, and I support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. Speaker, one of the finest investments this Nation ever made was the World War II and Korean GI bill of rights. It enabled millions of Americans to obtain an education and thereby strengthened the Nation. Under the

World War II GI bill, 122,460 West Virginians who had served in the Armed Forces received educational assistance; and 37,445 Korean conflict veterans from West Virginia received such aid. I am informed by the West Virginia Department of Veterans' Affairs that 103,201 West Virginians who have served in various branches of the armed services since 1955 will now be eligible under the terms of the new bill. The guaranteed and direct home loan features of this bill, as well as other provisions will prove very helpful, and I am proud to have introduced a companion bill along these lines.

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

Mr. KORNEGAY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill and urge its enactment. Although I originally sponsored a bill granting more liberal benefits to our cold war veterans, I am happy to cast my vote for H.R. 12410.

This type of legislation is both compassionate and practical. From the human standpoint, we must remember that any young man called into service stands just as ready to enter combat as any other. At any moment, in any place in the world, conflict could break out that would require our young men to risk their lives for freedom. Although presently our troops are engaged in Vietnam, they could have been in Lebanon in 1958, or Berlin in 1961, or Cuba in 1962. It was only by the barest chance that the men in the armed services at that time are not combat veterans today. Because of their willingness to serve, they deserve the same consideration as those who are risking their lives in Vietnam or who did so over a decade ago in Korea.

Practically speaking, this legislation is one of the best investments, with the highest rate of return of any single item in the current or past budget.

Investment in the human resource pays limitless dividends. Aside from the billions of dollars paid back into the economy because of the training of veterans under the provisions of this and previous GI bills, we cannot even estimate the influence that the educated man or woman has upon his or her children in terms of aspiration, values and awareness of national needs.

I have thousands of students attending college in my district at a large State university and several community colleges. Since I am only a dime away from those young people I am well aware of the problems that they face trying to finish their education with limited financial means. Far too often the ones struggling the hardest are veterans of the Armed Forces. They were willing to serve their country when it called upon them. I hope that this Congress will reciprocate by passing this bill now that they are in need.

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

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

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of this bill, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, few people will recall what the initials "GI" stand for, since they were first heard in the American idiom 25 years ago. Those of us who can recall the oversized—or worse still, the undersized—shoes, moth-eaten horse blankets—wrap leggins and olive drab longjohns cut by the Klan costumer, cannot forget that these letters stood for "General issue."

General issue meant that somewhere, hidden away in the loft of the War Department, a descendant of Rumpelstiltskin drew a mental picture of the average American male.

This average American male was put together like a patchwork quilt. The Army clothing specialist took the feet of a Kentucky backwoodsman, the shoulders of a Texan, the thighs of an Oregon tree-topper, the calves of a Tennessee ridgerunner, one arm from a North Carolina cottonpicker and the other from a south Brooklyn straphanger. He put them together and added a waist band modeled on the Lincoln Highway and this became the general issue of clothing which was handed to freshmen recruits of the class of 1940. This class was truly average because it was both underage and overage.

The motivation of this calculated misfitting was a bit of pure military psychological genius:

The enlistee who put on his Army uniform for the first time looked into the mirror and could not wait to get to the front where he could dig a foxhole and get out of sight to cover his shame.

The Army, however, was not without compassion. It, too, recognized that general issue left the soldier far short of being one of the world's 10 best-dressed men, or for that matter, even a competitor in a Watusi-Burundi fashion contest.

It demonstrated this compassion by covering the whole collection of sags, stretches, seams and scratches with a magnificent great coat. This great coat, complete with brass buttons that turned green on the 17th of March 1918, was belted in the back midway between the shoulders and the hem for a very definite purpose. Since its collar covered the man's head and its hem reached to his heels, by noting the belt in the back and the middle row of buttons in the front, you could determine: (a) where the middle of the man was and (b) which end to feed. It also served a very practical purpose: In the event the man tripped on the hem in front, his buddy could grab the belt in the back to save him from falling down.

Looking back at the $21-a-month Vanity Fair costume of 1940 and the exquisite models of today with green berets, shiny boots and tinted fabrics from pale blue to lustrous suntan, one can surely say that Mr. McNamara must be doing something right.

I think today we in the House are doing something right.

We are not only recalling what the Nation's GI needed 20 years ago when we reported the first GI bill, we are recalling that many of us are in the Congress today because of the benefits of the GI bill. I realize this may not be the best reason for reinstating its benefits in the minds of some.

However, no one can deny that the GI bill of 1946 was the most magnificent, effective, the most fair and equal measure ever propounded by any legislative body in the history of man.

It made sense then and it makes sense today.

It makes sense as an adjustment to make up today to the soldiers, sailors, and airmen of our Nation some measure of the time and opportunities they lost while serving in the Armed Forces. It makes sense because everyone who enrolls in a program under this bill will emerge a better educated, better living and better taxpaying American.

It makes sense because it requires no complicated bureaucratic administration or direction. It simply puts the money where the man is so that he can enroll in a school or college of his choice. I am gratified as one who acknowledges his debt to the GI bill to be one of the sponsors of the bill before us today.

This is truly a general issue bill. The issue, however, is not between those who support and those who oppose it, because there can be no sensible opposition to this bill. Rather, the general issue is that those who serve us in war and times of national need will not be deprived of the benefits they rightly deserve in order to attend to their own needs in years to come.

The clothing did not fit in 1940, but this bill fits the frame, the posture and strength of our day. I strongly advocate its immediate passage as a memorial to those who will not be on hand to share in its benefits and as a meaningful commitment to those who will return and have a right to expect our grateful appreciation and support.

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

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12410, the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 and urge its passage.

H.R. 12410 provides a permanent program of educational and training assistance for individuals serving in the Armed Forces, discharged after January 31, 1955. The bill also extends the Veterans' Administration home loan guarantee program, provides non-service-connected medical care to post-Korean veterans on the same basis as veterans of earlier wars, and establishes a number of miscellaneous provisions. This legislation contains the better aspects of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

The American people recognize that universal military service must be a national policy. The shape of the international world which developed after World War II forced the United States to maintain a strong military posture, and the Korean war was a manifestation of the new international scene. It was recognized then, and we are about to reaffirm this recognition, that this Nation ought to provide some means for the young men and women who served in the Armed Forces to help them readjust to civilian life. While it is true that the need for this assistance never really disappeared,

the assistance itself has; and we are now in a position to restore it on a permanent basis. The Congress can now reaffirm for the young men and women who served, and even now serve in military service during the cold war, that national principle that we are ready and willing to assist them in the task of assuming the responsibilities of civilian life just as we have done all we can to assist them with the responsibilities of military service.

Americans are not by nature or inclination a warlike people, and the need for universal military service must always be viewed by Americans as a burdensome but necessary responsibility. When it is necessary for the Nation to ask for this responsibility, and a we take pride in the response of our youth, it would be wrong not to take steps to assist in a concrete way the readjustment to productive and happy civilian life.

I believe that the House should move swiftly and firmly to ratify this excellent and responsible bill, knowing that H.R. 12410 has received the endorsement of our great national veterans organizations, among them, the American Legion, the American Veterans of World War II, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Jewish War Veterans, knowing that it is the product of years of study and effort on the part of our committee, and knowing that now is the time.

Mr. Speaker, past experience under the World War II and the Korean GI bills of rights indicates clearly that the benefits to the Nation as a whole by far outweigh the cost of the program. In my own district, thousands of veterans and their families benefited from the previous legislation because of the opportunity to secure education and training. The entire community has benefited from the increased earning power of the veteran. In this tradition, all communities will continue, now under the new program, to reap the benefits.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill and to make a brief observation. It has been referred to as a peacetime GI bill. It has been referred to as a cold war GI bill, but I am constrained to remind the House that since January 31, 1955, this country has been engaged from time to time in situations that were hot, and that, in fact, were not cold. I think, of course, today of Vietnam. I think back to Laos and to the Cuban crisis. I call attention to the struggle in the Dominican Republic and the Lebanese expedition. Taiwan, Quemoy, and Matsu, are well documented in the record books. There was a Berlin crisis, where the flower of American youth looked death and destruction in the face.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the last 10 years American servicemen have from time to time, in a series of crises, been subjected to grave danger and, of course, we all know the sad fact that many have paid a high price in these times in the service of our country.

I point these facts out in order to show that all has not been sweetness and light and that our military men are not and have not been simply barracks soldiers. They deserve the consideration of the benefits which we offer in this bill and which should flow from a grateful nation.

I urge that every Member of the House indicate his appreciation to our servicemen and servicewomen by voting for this piece of meritorious legislation.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 12410 which would bring about the long overdue educational benefits to our servicemen. I introduced legislation similar to this bill we are passing today on May 6, 1965. My H.R. 7977 would go further than the legislation we are considering today and I think that most of us would like to see these benefits extended to our men who are fighting so gallantly for our country. Nevertheless, this appears to be the best we can do today and I give this bill my strong support.

I want to say a word about a phrase that is heard once in a while regarding these benefits. Some refer to these as fringe benefits for our servicemen. Nothing could be further from the case. These are rightful benefits which should universally accompany the service of men and women for our country. Everyone knows that the serviceman's pay is very low. I consider these as a rightful claim they have on their country for the years they have spent in our Armed Forces. No better investment can be made in the future of our country or the future of these youths than the enactment of this legislation.

It is my earnest hope that we will consider some of the portions of this bill which have been cut out so the cold war GI bill will be as comprehensive and as helpful as the benefits which World War II servicemen received. We should do no less and I will continue to work for these improved benefits.

Once again we see the strange process of the Bureau of the Budget which shortchanges veterans while adding on the fat in bureaucratic agencies which are administering already wasteful programs. I will show the President 100 places he can trim some fat from his gigantic, record-breaking budget rather than shortchange our veteran. Veteran benefits are already low and I hate to see us perpetuate this second-class citizenship for the general veterans class.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion, and in support of the legislation, the new permanent version of the GI bill of rights as recommended by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

This is legislation which I feel is long overdue. In fact I have myself introduced similar legislation in previous years. But I confess I had almost lost hope that we could ever look for its enactment, not only because of opposition at the other end of the avenue, but also because of opposition here within this House as well. I am glad that the increased fighting in Vietnam has now changed all that, and I am prepared to give full support to the version of the bill as reported out of the committee.

Certainly many of us may feel that the sums provided in this bill ought to be larger. But we do have to face up to the fiscal realities of the situation. And we are making, I feel, a very important and significant start in the program outlined here.

Few pieces of legislation were ever more important or more universally hailed than the original GI bill that followed World War II. It made possible an orderly readjustment to civilian life for those men who had had their lives and careers interrupted by military service. It also gave higher education a tremendous boost, one that is still being felt, and one that has helped these institutions be better prepared to handle the greatly increased educational demands of our current crop of young college-age men and women.

Surely this Nation ought to do no less for those who have served or are serving their country in uniform during these days of technical peace, which are actually days of half war and half peace, a situation we have long referred to as the cold war. These men and women are not serving their country exactly on a voluntary basis. The draft is calling many of them, either directly or indirectly, to the colors. Their education, and their chance to get themselves safely embarked on a civilian career, have been interrupted by military service. And this disruption has come not merely to those who find themselves stationed in the hotspots of the cold war: Berlin, Lebanon, the Dominican Republic, and now Vietnam. It has come just as well to all the others, too. They also serve who carry out military assignments elsewhere than on the frontlines. That is why I support the decision of the committee, Mr. Speaker, not to limit this legislation just to those who, perhaps by mere chance, happened to be assigned to combat situations.

I congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] for his leadership in this legislation. I hope his motion will be overwhelmingly supported by this House.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, since first arriving in Congress in 1961, I have introduced and vigorously fought for a cold war GI bill that would enable the multitude of men who have greatly contributed toward the security of this Nation during these troubled times to receive, in the form of educational and other opportunities, recognition and recompense for their unselfish efforts in behalf of this great Nation.

Therefore, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues of this 89th Congress in voting unanimously for H.R. 12410.

Great sacrifice, devotion and diligence have been called for from those who have been placed in military service by the demands of a world striving for peace amidst a sea of turmoil. Their lives and careers have been disrupted by these demands leaving them, in many instances, at a distinct disadvantage educationally, professionally, and financially.

It is the purpose of this bill that this inequity be largely removed by providing our veterans of this very heated cold war with an opportunity to regain an equitable footing through educational

and other assistance provided by a grateful government.

This legislation is not only a worthy expression of gratitude and a means of assistance to our veterans but, moreover, it is an investment in the economy and future of our country—a proven investment that has provided great dividends in the past.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in considering the present bill, H.R. 12410, the House is following reliable precedents and accepting a responsibility we should be proud to undertake. I am confident the House will approve, by an overwhelming margin, this bill to provide educational and other readjustment benefits for those men and women who serve their country in a time of national peril.

We have only to look at the records of the GI bill of rights programs enacted, first, for World War II veterans and, subsequently, for veterans of the Korean war to appreciate the significance of what we are doing today. Despite some imperfections in the World War II program—which were corrected in the Korean war program and in the present bill—millions of young Americans were enabled to overcome the disruptions of wartime and get a new start in life, with more education and training, better housing, help in finding a job or establishing a business.

The entire country benefitted. Postwar adjustment problems were reduced to a minimum. The civilian economy picked up immediate strength. Personal opportunities were enlarged. And the Nation received large numbers of well-educated and highly trained young people who have since become an indispensable bulwark during the stresses and strains of the cold war.

It is this experience, Mr. Speaker, which I think accounts for the absence of any discernible opposition to the purposes of the present legislation. Though there have been differences of approach, the committee bill impresses me as an effective and equitable compromise. It recognizes the country's debt to those who have assumed the risks of military service at a time when the cold war can become hot at almost any point on the globe. It provides the assistance and incentive returning veterans will need to make successful readjustments to civilian life. And it invests in the future of our country in a way that is guaranteed to pay huge dividends.

In yesterday's Newark Sunday News, Mr. Speaker, additional arguments are advanced in support of the present bill. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to include the editorial and bring its persuasive reasonableness to the attention of our colleagues.

FOR COLD WAR GIs

At last heeding the precedents established by the GI bill of rights for veterans of World War II and Korea, Congress is moving toward passage of a similar benefit system for those technically known as cold war veterans.

Some Congressman and previous administrations had opposed the bill for the latest generation of U.S. fighting men. Their argument: Peacetime service under cold war conditions did not warrant the vast expenditure of money that would be necessary. Now, the thinking has changed because no one, despite the lack of a formal declaration of war, can regard Vietnam, or even the Dominican police action, as anything but hot.

Another argument in support of the current measure can be found in statistics the Veterans' Administration published in 1956, when the World War II bill expired. A survey showed that the average income of veterans who trained under the bill increased 51 percent in 6 years, while that of nonveterans in the same age group had increased 19 percent.

But perhaps most significant is the meaning the cold war bill would have for American fighting men in the field. Too often, and without justice, today's servicemen have been depicted as the dropouts, the undereducated and the unskilled waging someone else's war. The passage of the new GI bill would help refute such a description, and prove those back home do care and understand the sacrifices being made.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of a measure to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who have served since the Korean war, I enthusiastically support H.R. 12410, the cold war GI bill. I am very glad that this extremely important subject has come up in the House early in this session for this legislation deserves to be immediately and favorably acted upon.

It is unfortunate, however, that this bill comes before us under a procedure which bars any amendments. It does not seem equitable to give the more recent veterans less than the Korean veterans received, particularly in view of the increased cost of living. I am hopeful that at some stage of the legislative process it will be possible to increase the monthly allowances to at least the level received under the Korean war GI bill.

Our experience with readjustment benefit programs for veterans of the Second World War and the Korean war has clearly indicated the value of such a program. Through GI benefits, millions of ex-servicemen have been aided in trying to make up for the years lost from civilian life and have been able to establish themselves in useful, productive occupations with a resultant beneficial effect on our economy.

The same problems of readjustment and economic dislocation that veterans faced 11 years ago are faced today by thousands of young men returning from service in the Armed Forces. These young men have been forced to disrupt their lives and careers to serve their country throughout the world. After completing their service, these men face not only the serious problem of adapting back to civilian life, but also find themselves far behind those in their age group who were able to pursue their schooling and their careers.

The cold war GI bill gives us an opportunity to balance this situation by affording the veteran who has sacrificed several years of his life a chance to catch up with his nonveteran counterparts whose lives were not disrupted by military service.

The two previous GI bills have unquestionably proved to be a wise and just investment. Support of the legislation before us today would certainly be appreciated by all the countless thousands of men who have served our country in the past decade and by those of us who wish to return to them in some small measure the opportunities they missed while in the service of our Nation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for reporting out this bill, H.R. 12410, known as the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966.

This legislation provides educational assistance for all veterans serving in the Armed Forces and discharged after January 31, 1955. This will give the veteran college level training and training in trade or vocational or technical schools. Part-time training is permitted.

This legislation will be outstanding recognition by our Government for the patriotic service rendered by our veterans during these critical times. Sacrifices must be made to protect ourselves and future generations against the powerful onslaught of the international conspiracy for global enslavement engineered by the leaders of world communism.

The vast majority of veterans who benefit by this bill have made a sacrifice by serving their country at a period of years when most of them could take advantage of training and educational advancement in civilian life. This legislation not only provides for educational opportunities but also for guaranteed and direct home loans non-service-connected medical care, preference in Federal employment, job counseling and job placement assistance, soldiers' and sailors' civil relief, and other numerous favorable readjustments on legislation pertaining to World War II and Korean veterans.

I was one of the 182 World War I veterans who served in the 78th Congress. I attended caucuses during February and March in 1943 with about 80 World War I congressional World War I veterans and the original GI bill of rights for veterans was formulated by our group. Before that session of Congress adjourned, the GI bill of rights for the World War II veterans was enacted into law.

The World War I veterans of that day were a dedicated group who had come through the experience of Government neglect when they returned after their discharge from their service in World War I. There was no such thing as a bill of rights for World War I veterans during those difficult years when they were discharged to reenter civilian life after discharge in 1919 and 1920.

I have supported all practical legislation for the benefit of the returning veterans from World War II, Korea, and this legislation which will be a great help and aid to the cold war veterans of the last 10 years, including the boys who served in the Vietnam crisis.

I do hope the Veterans' Affairs Committee will, in this session of Congress, give some special attention to thousands of World War I veterans who, today, are trying to meet the high cost of living on inadequate pensions; many as low as $78 per month. The legislation enacted in past Congresses has not been much aid to the World War I veterans and in a great number of cases the recent veterans' legislation has resulted in a reduction of Government aid to the service-

men of 40-odd years ago. Their ranks and numbers today are few and the least our Government should do is to adequately take care of the few remaining from 1917 to 1920.

I hope that this bill will receive a unanimous vote of the House of Representatives and also of the other body and signed by the President without any amendments.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, we consider today an act for veterans' educational assistance which is a most important and significant piece of legislation. I am pleased to rise in support of this legislation.

While I do note that the bill reported upon favorably by the House Veterans' Committee—H.R. 12410—differs in some regards from the bill I introduced; and while I would like to have seen a GI bill contain provisions equal to those provided for the Korean veterans, the bill we consider today is nevertheless a substantial improvement over the original recommendations made by the administration, and does provide important aid to all veterans serving from February 1, 1955, into the indefinite future.

The main consideration today is to assure our servicemen and veterans that they will have the opportunity to pursue their education and receive other aid in readjustment to civilian life. This bill provides that assurance and, therefore, has my wholehearted support.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in rising in support of this bill to provide education and training benefits for the veterans of this country.

As the report of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs makes clear, this legislation is not intended to be a blank check or to completely subsidize the cost of a veteran's education. It is a carefully drawn measure which is based on the sound principle that the veteran, in many cases, will more effectively utilize the aid available to him if he is required to make a contribution from his own resources.

It is based further on the equally sound principle that the veteran has made sacrifices for his country and that it is both fitting and proper to provide the assistance that will enable him to begin or complete the educational dreams and plans that were interrupted by his service in the Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, education and training assistance for the veterans of this country dates back to 1944. The history of this legislation, particularly that of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, makes very clear that it has met with marked success.

This is a practical and warranted investment in our most important resource, our people, and I urge that it be approved and implemented without delay.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 12410. This cold war GI bill sponsored by my colleague, Congressman OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, is an excellent piece of legislation.

On July 28, 1965, I introduced a cold war GI bill. A number of other Members introduced similar bills. It seems to me that this in itself is an ample demonstration that the Members of this House feel the necessity of this legislation as a matter of conscience. Now we are united behind H.R. 12410 because the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has done an admirable job on bringing together the various points of view that were involved in the numerous bills.

The original World War II GI bill of rights expired in 1955. Lesser benefits were voted for the veterans of the Korean conflict, and these expired in 1965. I believe that all men and women who have served in the Armed Forces in this "twilight zone" called the cold war in which there is neither peace nor war, but often combat, deserve the same consideration we extended to other veterans.

The enactment of a new GI bill has a double advantage. It gives us the opportunity to repay our young men and women for their sacrifice. Secondly, the original GI bill has already proved a wise investment. From it have come thousands of better educated, better trained, more highly skilled citizens who have greatly enriched the mainstream of American life. Incidentally, they also have a greater capacity to earn money and consequently, they pay more taxes.

I, myself, like dozens of other Members of this House, enjoyed the benefits of the original GI bill of rights. Following my service in World War II I completed my education and professional training as a lawyer under the GI bill. For many of us here in the House today, the educational opportunities we received opened the paths that eventually led to our public service as Members of Congress.

It seems to me only fair that those men and women have kept secure the periphery of the free world during the cold war are entitled to the gratitude of the Republic.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I support this measure, although as a matter of principle, I regret that it came up under suspension, thus prohibiting amendments which might have made it a better bill.

I join other Members who have expressed their concern over the opposition of the executive branch to certain provisions of this measure. I believe it to be completely inconsistent for the administration to oppose this bill while doling out millions of dollars in dubious spending schemes. We could easily achieve the economies necessary to meet objections to this measure by cutting the fat out of the foreign aid program, eliminating fraud and mismanagement of the poverty program, and scaling down the misuse of funds in our agricultural programs.

Our country remains the world's greatest power because of the high caliber of our servicemen. This is especially so in wartime situations when we are proudly served by our civilian armies, the men who serve during a period of crisis, then return to permanent peaceful pursuits. It is to meet their needs that we process this bill this afternoon.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the cold war GI bill.

I returned recently from an extensive tour of U.S. operations in Vietnam. In talking with hundreds of our servicemen, I found that a concern uppermost in their minds was the opportunities they would find waiting them upon their return to civilian life. The Congress has a solemn obligation to broaden and strengthen those opportunities and I believe that the pending legislation is a sound measure which can help fulfill that obligation.

The cold war GI bill will meet the problem of giving the veteran an equal chance in our competitive society. It provides for assistance in obtaining educational objectives through monthly allowances. Home and farm loan assistance will also be included.

In a nation whose concepts of government are such that compulsory military service is considered a temporary emergency measure, this bill provides just compensation for those whom we call to service. In addition, it strengthens the educational and economic fiber of our country, and by so doing, contributes to the betterment of all our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this well-justified and badly needed legislation has my wholehearted support.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support H.R. 12410, the new GI bill of rights. It is the least we can do for veterans of military service in this seemingly permanent period of international conflict.

Moreover, this is legislation which I have urged for a long time. I am sorry only that it does not go as far as the benefit programs which we granted to veterans of World War II and Korea. Rising prices have pushed up the cost of education since those days and I believe this bill should have reflected that fact.

Nevertheless, this bill has the merit of being a permanent program applying to those whose service occurred or will occur after January 31, 1955, when eligibility under the old program expired. This is fairer than the more limited program approved last year by the Senate which, I hope, will not approve the House version.

This bill will provide educational and job training benefit allowances for veterans and, in addition, will furnish certain medical benefits, a home loan guarantee program and preference for employment in the Federal civil service.

Last year, seeking to get a new GI bill going, I introduced H.R. 9846 limited to veterans during periods of hostilities. I readily grant the justice of a general bill such as H.R. 12410, however, to assist all persons whose lives are disrupted by the requirements of our Nation's obligation to oppose Communist aggression whether or not they have been ordered to serve during periods of hostilities.

A general bill is particularly warranted because there is some evidence that some well-endowed young men have used a protracted pursuit of education as a means of totally avoiding military service.

I am, therefore, supporting this measure wholeheartedly, although I feel we should have done more in some respects. Certainly, we can do no less.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 to our Nation is so

great that it is deserving of nothing less than our unanimous support. What more proof do we need than the successful results of the World War II and Korean GI bills which enabled millions of returning veterans to complete or further their education after military service? When we consider the numbers of lawyers, teachers, doctors, scientists, technicians, and others whose skills and professional abilities are made possible through the benefits of the GI bills, it appears manifest that the extension of those benefits to those in military service since 1955 will contribute even further to the enrichment of our national life.

With our system of selective induction, it seems eminently fair to me that those who are called upon to sacrifice months and years from the pursuit of their chosen careers, while serving for small pay in the Armed Forces, should be given that extra incentive to push forward with their education when leaving the service. By extending this opportunity through the provisions of new veterans readjustment legislation, we insure that these young people who are called to serve will not be forgotten in our society where rapid social and technological change demand even greater specialization for the individual who wishes to play a significant role in this society. The boost given to our veterans by H.R. 12410 will bear witness to our desire that their service to their country is not to be considered negligible.

The many other fine provisions of this legislation, such as home loan assistance, VA hospital care, job counseling assistance, and service-connected disability coverage, all deserve our unstinting support. This is good legislation, Mr. Speaker, both in the national interest and in the interest of fairplay for a select group who are called upon to give much for the rest of us. I am proud to be able to stand fully behind H.R. 12410, a significant new bill that will contribute much to American society.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD the text of a letter to the Veterans' Committee from Mr. Alfred Laureta, director of the department of labor and industrial relations for the State of Hawaii. Mr. Laureta states:

We fully support the legislation which is being considered to provide veterans education and training benefits similar to those granted veterans of the Korean conflict and World War II.

Inasmuch as the approval authority for apprenticeship and other on-the-job training under Public Laws 346, 679, and 550 was assigned to our apprenticeship division, we were able to observe firsthand the high returns this investment paid to our returning veterans and the resulting benefits contributing to the general welfare of our State. Many of the veterans who received on-the-job training under the GI bills are now serving on our joint apprenticeship committees and have assumed other responsible roles in their respective fields.

We respectfully urge that proposed legislation to give assistance to veterans readjusting to civilian life make provision for those who will utilize apprenticeship or other job training to gain occupational skills.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in bringing to the floor of the House for early action H.R. 12410. I strongly support the enactment of this bill to grant educational and other benefits to the young men and women who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States since January 31, 1955.

The experience of our country with the World War II and Korean conflict GI bills has proven the need for this legislation. The veterans who received educational benefits and on-the-job training under the World War II and Korean conflict GI bills have contributed immeasurably to a better America through the education they received and the skills they acquired.

Those who have served in our Armed Forces since January 31, 1955, deserve the benefits set forth in H.R. 12410. The assistance they will receive under this bill will enable all of them to be better prepared and more productive citizens of tomorrow. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 12410.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee for their foresight and efforts to bring this legislation to the floor. The current hostilities in Vietnam only underline and emphasize the need for a law of this type.

I first introduced a cold war veterans bill in 1961 and I am proud to say that I have supported all efforts to have a bill of this nature brought before the Congress since that time.

Ever since the cutoff point of the GI bill of rights in 1955, American servicemen have remained ready to defend America at any point on the globe. Admittedly some have been called to face more imminent danger, but every soldier, sailor, airman, marine, and coastguardsman has been under the constant pressure of expected hazardous service. The chances are greater than ever that a serviceman will be called to serve in a combat area, perhaps to give his life, defending the American way of life.

I think it only just that a country as great, rich, and powerful as ours adequately compensate a man for this service. There is to my mind no greater reward than that of offering education. The cost of providing these educational benefits is small when compared to the advantages to the Nation and to the veteran himself. Without education and training in today's world, little is to be gained. But given a solid education the vistas become unlimited.

We should not only provide the opportunity for this reward, but we should insure that every man eligible is informed of the availability and urged to take part. I was amazed to learn that over one-half of all veterans eligible for educational benefits after World War II and the Korean war never took advantage of the tremendous opportunities presented. The provisions of this law should be made eminently clear to servicemen not only during the term of service, but also after discharge and during the 8 years of eligibility.

I might interject here that I have also offered a bill to allow veterans to transfer educational entitlement to their children. I strongly feel that this provision would be in line with our emphasis on providing today's youth with the education and training so necessary to compete and succeed in today's world. Many veterans for various reasons forgo participation and I think it would be wise and with great foresight to greatly improve the futures of our children by allowing this transfer of educational benefits.

I have limited my emphasis to the education and training aspects of this bill. We must also keep well in mind the home loan assistance, VA hospital care, job counseling assistance, preference in Federal employment and other equally worthwhile and necessary provisions.

I urge speedy enactment of H.R. 12410 and I hope for a quick and complete implementation of the programs once passed.

I would like to include at this point an editorial from the Newark Sunday News of February 6 concerning H.R. 12410:

FOR COLD WAR GI'S

At last heeding the precedents established by the GI bill of rights for veterans of World War II and Korea, Congress is moving toward passage of a similar benefit system for those technically known as cold war veterans.

Some Congressmen and previous administrations had opposed the bill for the latest generation of U.S. fighting men. Their argument: Peacetime service under cold war conditions did not warrant the vast expenditure of money that would be necessary. Now, the thinking has changed because no one, despite the lack of a formal declaration of war, can regard Vietnam, or even the Dominican police action, as anything but hot.

Another argument in support of the current measure can be found in statistics the Veterans' Administration published in 1956, when the World War II bill expired. A survey showed that the average income of veterans who trained under the bill increased 51 percent in 6 years, while that of nonveterans in the same age group increased 19 percent.

But perhaps most significant is the meaning the cold war bill would have for American fighting men in the field. Too often, and without justice, today's servicemen have been depicted as the dropouts, the undereducated and the unskilled waging someone else's wars. The passage of the new GI bill would help refute such a description, and prove those back home do care and understand the sacrifices being made.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my enthusiastic support for this long-needed program of assistance for our dedicated and selfless veterans who have given so much to the cause of freedom. As a veteran of 4½ years' service during World War II, I understand fully the hardships which face our young men in our troubled world. I believe this program will contribute much to the strength of our Nation by encouraging our veterans to return to school and to receive the technical and educational training so important to the Nation and to the personal success of the individual.

I certainly am grateful to those lawmakers who established the program for World War II veterans because without the assistance which I received, I would not have been able to receive my higher education. In view of this, it is most gratifying for me to participate in today's actions so that our present-day veterans will receive the recognition

which those of us who served in World War II and in Korea were accorded.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my approval and support of H.R. 12410.

The merits of the original GI bill of rights, more accurately known as the Servicemen's Readjustment Assistance Act of 1944, have never been seriously questioned. I believe it fair to say that of all the major bills enacted within approximately the past two decades, this bill, and its companion bills prescribing various readjustment benefits for veterans, have been the most popular.

However, those of our servicemen whose service fell within that period extending from February 1, 1955, to the present date, received no readjustment benefits. This situation has been corrected by the present bill, in the event it should be enacted into law.

The present bill, however, as good as it is, does not, in my opinion, go far enough. The so-called Korean GI bill provided for school assistance to GI's at a rate of $110 for those without dependents, $135 for those with one dependent, and $160 for those with two or more dependents. The present bill provides relief at the rate of $100 for recipients without dependents, $125 for those with one dependent, and $150 for those with two or more dependents.

Moreover, the Korean bill furnished school assistance for 1½ months for every month of military service, whereas the present bill furnishes such assistance on the basis of 1 month of school assistance for 1 month of service.

I cannot agree that the veteran of the brutal Vietnam conflict is less entitled to readjustment benefits than the veteran of the Korean, or any other conflict.

I therefore go on record as favoring an even stronger bill than the one which, hopefully, we shall soon enact. I support this bill, however, on the principle that three-fourths of a loaf is better than none.

I think it appropriate at this time, Mr. Speaker, to say a word about how our servicemen are conducting themselves in Vietnam at the present time. I spent a week there, last December. I talked to hundreds of our servicemen, and to their officers, and to the native Vietnamese who are in touch with them.

I can say, without a moment's hesitation that this Nation has never had in the field a finer, more intelligent, well-behaved, harder hitting soldier than it now has in Vietnam. This is the almost universal concensus of those who know them best.

The GI in Vietnam is one of our most effective ambassadors of good will. In general he knows why he is there, and what is to be done. In general, he does not complain. Significantly, those who are weeping loudest over the plight of our soldiers in Vietnam are not the soldiers themselves. They accept their historic role, and play it with fortitude. Let all Americans take note of their heroic behavior.

It is possible that Utah will benefit more than any other State from this cold war GI bill.

Since Utah has a higher percentage than any other State of its young people finishing high school, it seems probable that a higher percentage of its young veterans will take advantage of these benefits.

I note with pride that 49,000 Utah servicemen took advantage of the educational benefits offered under the World War II GI bill, and that 21,000 Utahans used similar benefits under the Korean war GI bill.

According to the 1960 census, my State showed the highest percentage in the Nation of high school graduates among residents 25 years and older, with 56 percent. It ranked second only to Colorado in the proportion of adults with college degrees, with 10.2 percent.

As of last fall, college enrollment in Utah reached 56,334, or 5.6 percent of the total population.

I can think of no other program in this generation that has done as much as the GI bills to raise the overall standards of our country. The unprecedented prosperity we enjoy, including the historic boom we are in right now, are fed in large measure by talents trained under this program.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker I rise in strong support of H.R. 12410, the bill providing assistance to servicemen involved in the defense of of our country. Last year alone, 1,365 servicemen were killed in action in Vietnam, and over 5,500 were wounded.

The point I wish to make is this: during the same time that these men were risking their lives against an invisible jungle enemy, at home our Government was using the taxpayers' money to coddle school dropouts, lawbreakers, beatniks, and other undesirables to participate in the so-called Great Society's Job Corp. They were paid, in most cases, more money than our servicemen on the battlefront. Our Government has paid travel expenses for Job Corp members to take extended Christmas vacations, when servicemen had to get home the best way they could—if they were allowed to go home at all.

I think the time has come, Mr. Speaker, when we should recognize this fact—whether we are fighting a worldwide nuclear war or one of these so-called limited police actions such as we have been involved in in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, the risk to the individual in battle is just as great either way. This fact has not been recognized since Korea, and I feel the passage of H.R. 12410 is the least that we should do to show our appreciation to these gallant men.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the passage of H.R. 12410, the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, demonstrates the continuing concern of the Congress to provide benefits for those who serve in the Armed Forces.

At a time when the youth of our Nation are actively engaged in combat and increased draft calls disrupt the lives and educations of more and more young men, it is our responsibility to provide the benefits which were provided by the GI bill in 1944 and the Korean GI bill in 1952.

H.R. 12410 is not as comprehensive as the earlier GI bills, but without it, we would have this need totally unmet. As a product of the former GI bill myself, I support this measure, although I feel we could have done more, because it is a matter of justice that we provide a continuity of benefits for those who serve in the Armed Forces.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12410 which provides for education and other benefits for veterans who served our Nation during the hot and cold war period after January 31, 1955, the earlier cutoff date for similar benefits.

I was one of those who introduced similar legislation earlier this year and called for early hearings by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as well as early passage in the House of Representatives. I tried to make the point that particularly in view of the warlike situation that so many of our boys experienced and continue to experience in such areas like South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic that such legislation is timely and Congress should immediately proceed to the task of making a part of our statutes another GI bill of rights.

Congress has traditionally rewarded our servicemen for their service and sacrifice during time of national peril. Certainly, by passing this new GI bill, Congress will be keeping face with our servicemen who once more came to our Nation's need during the hot and cold war period outlined in the legislative proposal before the House today. By this very act we on the home front can personally proclaim our deep and everlasting appreciation.

As a World War II veteran myself, I came to appreciate a similar expression of thanks by an earlier Congress which took similar action in affording GI bill benefits to those returning from the battlefronts of World War II. No one will argue the wisdom of such an earlier enactment. Our Nation has benefited immeasurably in terms of increased contributions both intellectually and materially, from the sharpened mental processes of former GI's who took advantage of the educational opportunities that Congress voted. The Nation benefited and our GI's benefited. It was not merely a one-way street of proffering to returning GI's some tangible expression of appreciation for their war-endured hardships and sacrifices.

I think we can safely say that the vast majority of those veterans who accepted with gratitude the benefits that Congress bestowed upon them in public appreciation for their service, have been and continue to be responsible for the unprecedented economic and technological growth in the United States.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think the GI bill of rights is one of the finest human investments that we in the Congress can make while at the same time going on record with our servicemen that we are deeply indebted to them. I enthusiastically support passage of this bill.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and I hope my colleagues will give their wholehearted support likewise.

At long last it seems as if action will be taken to provide veterans benefits for

those servicemen who have served in Vietnam and other combat areas since the Korean war.

The sacrifices of these men who heroically carry the battle for freedom into the jungles and plains of Vietnam on behalf of all of their fellow Americans, entitle them to share in the same benefits accorded the veterans of World War II and Korea.

Although I will support it, my one objection to the bill is that it does not go far enough. However, half a loaf is better than none, and, in view of the great difficulty those of us who are interested in the welfare of the veteran have had to get even this bill before the Congress, I have no alternative but to support it.

The present bill does not provide the same benefits as those provided veterans of the Korean war. For example, the monthly payments to those veterans getting education benefits under the present bill are less than those payable under the Korean GI bill.

I am at a total loss to understand how this can be justified when the Vietnam war is every bit as vicious and ugly as the Korean war. In addition, the costs of living have increased considerably since the Korean war era and it seems to me that by all logic the Vietnam veterans should have at least as much as the Korean veterans.

This bill is not yet enacted into law and it would seem to me that somewhere along the line of its legislative progress there might very well be an occasion for us to increase these amounts. I strongly recommend that this be done.

This administration can spend over $500 million for an educational program to educate the rest of the world, yet it shirks its responsibility to its own veterans. It gives away aid and financial assistance to even Communist nations. Yet I am told the Johnson administration will veto this bill if we increase the subsistence payments in it.

It is utterly amazing to me why this administration thinks more of our foreign friends than it does of its own sons. I hope that this Congress has the good judgment to increase the subsistence payments of the educational program at least equivalent to the amount that was paid to the Korean veterans.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I arise in support of this bill to extend educational and loan benefits to the military veterans of this cold war struggle in which we are engaged.

Surely there could be no logical defense for denying to those now serving in Vietnam the same benefits which have been granted by a grateful Nation to American servicemen of World War II and Korea.

I believe it can be demonstrated, moreover, that the educational benefits granted on so broad a scale following those two conflicts have added so measurably to the Nation's pool of skilled manpower that they have made truly major contributions in the growth of our national product. On this basis, they have been good investments for the country.

Surely it is clear that the educational and business loan benefits of the original GI bill of rights even have enhanced the Treasury of the United States in taxes. On this basis alone, I believe it is a defensible thesis that they have paid for themselves.

Many, many thousands of young Americans, returning from these wars, have found it possible by means of these provisions to equip and qualify themselves for greatly improved standards of income. The skills they have developed through the educational training certainly have enhanced their earning power, and on the basis of this greatly increased earning power, they have over the years paid far more taxes to the Government itself than they could have done if these benefits had been denied to them.

Additionally, the thousands of successful business relationships undertaken by young American veterans through the business loan features of this program have enabled them to add enormously to the productivity of the American economy. Home ownership, so stabilizing a factor for any society, has received great stimulus from these loans.

For the first time in our history, the past decade has thrust upon us the continuing necessity, year after year, to call up young Americans at a crucial stage in the development of their careers and to require their services for the common defense.

Having thus harshly interrupted their training and development for the peacetime pursuits of their individual careers, the Nation surely owes to these young men the duty to assist in smoothing the transition back into the civilian life of our country.

For these reasons, I feel sure that an overwhelming majority of the Members of the House will support this legislation.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that my able, distinguished friend from Texas, Chairman TEAGUE, and his committee, have reported this bill, H.R. 12410, to the House. It represents a good start on enhancing benefits of peacetime service in the armed services, and further extending the benefits of higher education, and I think it is another valuable incentive for service, and also a fitting recognition of that service when honestly and faithfully performed.

Legislation of this type providing for education and training for peacetime service has been under consideration here for many years and supplements some other very fine basic GI programs in behalf of our faithful veterans. The benefits provided by this bill constitute a supplement rather than full payment of educational costs, and of course, this is much better than anything that peacetime veterans have enjoyed in the past.

The committee has very frankly declared that the legislation is designed as an aid program and it is expected in many cases that the veteran will be required to make a contribution toward his own educational program.

It should enable many veterans to develop their skills and abilities and train themselves for careers in various fields and for future life.

The program of educational assistance is limited to a month of training for each month of service, not to exceed 36 calendar months.

The assistance rates for full-time training are $100 for a single veteran, $125 for a veteran with one dependent, and $150 for a veteran with more than one dependent with proportionate rates for less than full-time training.

Education is generally limited to institutions of higher learning, and must be completed within 8 years from the date of discharge.

Individuals may avail themselves of educational assistance while on active duty, but in such instances, the Government will pay only the cost of tuition fees, and not the full education assistance allowance. The education provisions are effective June 1, 1966.

The home loan guarantee provisions of the bill are patterned closely after similar benefits to the veterans of the Korean conflict.

The bill also provides non-service-connected medical care in a VA hospital system for peacetime veterans, and further extends to this same group presumptive service connection for chronic and tropical diseases first manifested within specified periods following discharge, a provision now generally limited to veterans who served in the time of war.

Job counseling and job placement under the Department of Labor is authorized on the same basis as that given to veterans of prior conflicts and preference in Federal employment is provided.

Under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, individuals who are renting homes are protected from eviction, except under leave of a court.

While I should have much preferred to see other more sweeping legislation in this field, I recognize the difficulties inherent in attempting to pass such legislation at this time and welcome the opportunity to support this bill.

At the same time, I would like to express the hope that, from time to time, the bill can be amended to bring it more fully in accord with the needs and entitlements of our peacetime veterans, and to give them opportunities and benefits which I think they deserve from the Nation they have served so faithfully and well.

I do not think there is any occasion for preening our feathers because we have extended to peacetime veterans, many of whom have served the Nation with distinction, valor, and sacrifice, some measurably lesser benefits than we have provided for the residents of certain foreign nations under our various international relief programs.

Nevertheless, we should all be able to join in hailing this step forward at this time as constructive and promising, and hope that it will eventuate in the not too distant future in a finalized, perfected version of this bill that will really do the job that the American people want to see done for those young sons of ours who have served our Nation with great credit, efficiency, and honor, many of them with great sacrifice to themselves and their families.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is high time we get down to the business of passing a GI bill for our fighting men. They

have been the forgotten men of the so-called Great Society. With more and more men being sent to Vietnam, and prospects of a long, long commitment there, we have got to act now.

The enactment of this cold war GI bill—H.R. 12410—will provide readjustment benefits designed to help our veterans make an easy and successful transition back to civilian life without a requirement that he be disabled or destitute. Since 1955 we have called upon our young men who have entered the armed services to make personal sacrifices that are associated with such service and yet we have denied them the readjustment aids they need so desperately to help them catch up with those of their contemporaries who have not likewise been asked to serve, but who instead continue the more lucrative pursuits of civilian life.

This bill will help to make up for education, business, and other opportunities lost during service. It is patterned after the readjustment benefits shared by those of us who are veterans of World War II and the Korean war.

H.R. 12410 establishes direct and guaranteed loans for homes and farms. It provides for a fee not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of the total loan amount to be charged on loan guarantees. All veterans since 1955 could receive full treatment for ailments not resulting from military service. Presently all veterans receive free treatment for service-incurred ailments only if they cannot otherwise afford the care and only if there is room in VA hospitals. It is quite a liberal approach.

This bill establishes a permanent program of grants for educational and vocational training for veterans serving 180 days or more after January 31, 1955. It authorizes the Veterans' Administration to make maximum payments to those enrolled in full-time education programs of $100 a month if single and $125 to $150 a month if there are dependents. It entitles a veteran to a month of education or training for each month or fraction thereof spent in service up to a limit of 36 months. This bill recognizes the importance of preparing our service men returning from war to take their places in civilian life.

On the other hand, the administration's bill—H.R. 11985—did not take a readjustment approach but rather a "hazard pay" approach. It would have divided the responsibility for the administration of the bill between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and provide benefits only to a fraction of those who served valiantly.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars on January 18, pointed out so well that only 6,000 veterans would be eligible for full college benefits under the administration bill, and that it would not include any job, farm, or apprenticeship training. Neither would it provide for VA farm or home loans.

In short, the administration's proposal was a skimpy one and completely inadequate. I am glad the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in its wisdom has seen fit to report a bill which I can support although I still would have preferred the Adair bill in its entirety.

Mr. Speaker, I hope passage of this bill will bring about a quick conference with the Senate so the differences can be resolved with a minimum of delay, and our returning fighting men's urgent needs can be met.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, our courageous servicemen in the Vietnam war deserve a prompt enactment of a bill providing for education and housing benefits in the tradition of our past, but primarily because of the important service that they are rendering the country and the world in these troubled times. The country can never adequately express gratitude for service such as they render in danger and in peril of their lives and the survival of freedom in our day. I am very happy to support legislation of this kind and hope that it will be made law at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House today, the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, should be approved.

During the period covered by the new bill, our Nation has been involved in a series of crises associated with Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Taiwan-Matsu, Lebanon, Berlin, and Laos, as well as Vietnam. Compulsory military service has been extended with no end currently in view. Under such conditions, with continuing crises and expanded overseas commitments, this bill is necessary to assure equitable treatment for veterans of service since Korea as well as men now on active duty.

Passage of H.R. 12410 provides a permanent program of educational assistance for veterans to include college-level and below-college-level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools. It also includes guaranteed and direct home loans, medical care to veterans with provisions for presumption of service connection of certain chronic and tropical diseases, veterans preference in Federal employment, and job counseling and job placement assistance.

In reporting this bill to the House, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs emphasized that a major purpose of the legislation is to provide assistance to the veteran which would help him to follow the educational plan that he might have adopted had he never entered the Armed Forces. This surely is a minimum provision in view of the steadily increasing number of our young men in service who are engaged in combat duty in Vietnam in which so many have already given their lives in defense of freedom.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12410, the peacetime veterans benefits bill.

At the outset I want to commend distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], and the members of the committee for their expeditious handling of needed legislation to provide readjustment and educational assistance to our young men returning from military service.

Although the proposal reported from the committee is somewhat different from the cold war GI proposal I introduced, H.R. 11939, the committee bill, is indeed an adequate answer to the problem of providing aid to our American fighting men who are engaged in fierce and hazardous combat in the swamps and jungles of Vietnam.

During the recess it was my privilege, as chairman of the congressional study mission to the Far East, to visit Vietnam and to see the dedication of our troops to the cause of halting Communist aggression.

It also was my privilege to visit with our boys in Korea, who are holding the cease-fire line in a sensitive and potentially dangerous area of the world. There, too, one could not help but be impressed with the quality of character exhibited by our troops.

In Vietnam and Korea, as in the Dominican Republic, and hundreds of other posts throughout the world, our American fighting men are giving much in order to insure the preservation of our freedoms.

It is indeed fitting that we at home express our gratitude to these men—as we have in the past to the veterans of World War II and the Korean war. There can be no better way to assist these men and women obtain educational benefits and other assistance upon their return to civilian life.

Those who served in the Armed Forces shoulder a disproportionate burden of citizenship. Often while they are serving the country, others of their age are preparing for occupational or professional careers.

It is clear that no person, no matter how ambitious or how talented he may be, can progress at a normal rate in our rapidly changing society and economy when threats to peace call him away to military duty for long periods of time.

Our society is setting a breathtaking pace because of rapid technological advancement. Today's skill is tomorrow's surplus and obsolescent ability. We should assist our former servicemen in adjusting to these conditions.

The enactment of this proposal not only will be an act of justice toward those who are sacrificing civil gain to military duty, it will also benefit our country in many other ways.

None of us needs be reminded of the effects on our society of the World War II GI bill. Veterans who availed themselves of the programs have raised their educational and income levels, with resultant benefits to our Nation.

John S. Gleason, Jr., former Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, has estimated that the GI bill, which cost approximately $14.5 billion, continues to pay for itself at a rate of close to $1 billion per year.

This return comes from additional tax paid by better educated, higher paid former servicemen. There is every reason to expect that the program of readjustment assistance proposed for cold war veterans would have a similar impact.

Mr. Speaker, the need for education assistance for our cold war veterans is clear and compelling. I know that the members of this body will recognize this

fact and will overwhelmingly approve H.R. 12410.

It is my further hope that conference action can be taken swifty in order that the bill may be enacted into law at the earliest possible opportunity. There can be no better way for the Congress to demonstrate its support of and admiration for our fighting men in Vietnam than by approval of a new GI bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise in support of H.R. 12410, the legislation before us today which will provide a comprehensive program of education and training for veterans of Vietnam and the Communist challenge in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Taiwan-Matsu, Lebanon, Berlin, and Laos.

This legislation is absolutely necessary, Mr. Speaker, if our servicemen are to be treated fairly with those who have not had to interrupt or lose their educational opportunities and careers by reason of active military service.

Helping the serviceman returning from war to take his place in civilian life is as essential to the national interest as was the task of preparing him for military duty. This legislation insures that our Nation will be able to utilize the highest skills and abilities of the veterans who benefit from it. This is extremely important today when the number of young men available to fill the technical and professional vacancies is at the lowest ratio to our population in our Nation's history.

In addition to educational assistance this legislation provides that the Veterans' Administration may guarantee loans made by private lenders for a veteran's home. Direct loans up to $17,500 are authorized by the Veterans' Administration where private financing is not available.

Medical care for non-service-connected illnesses will also be provided by the VA hospitals for these veterans.

Job counseling and placement is authorized the same as for veterans of prior wars, and they will receive a preference in Federal Employment.

The same economics problems are faced today by the thousands of cold war servicemen. They have been compelled to disrupt their lives and careers to serve in the protection of freedom throughout the world.

This legislation will balance the inequities of this situation and give these deserving young men an opportunity to catch up with their nonveteran friends.

I am pleased to add my support for this proposed legislation and I sincerely urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as one who has sponsored and advocated similar legislation, I most earnestly hope that the House will resoundingly approve this bill before us, H.R. 12410, the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966.

As you are aware, this measure extends wartime veterans' benefits and rights to all those who have honorably served in the Armed Forces of this country since January 31, 1955, the official end of the Korean conflict.

Through the enactment of this bill, veterans and military personnel of this so-called cold war period will be granted, besides educational training and home loan assistance, job counseling aid, entitlement to hospital care, wartime presumptions for service-connected disability from chronic and tropical diseases, and certain other benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the statistics and facts in the record of the operations of the original GI bill and the Korean conflict strikingly reveal that they were perhaps the wisest investments for our national security, production and progress, ever made by our Government in our entire history. On this score alone, this bill stands eminently worthy of approval.

However, may I also suggest here, and especially in the light of recent military developments, that the most practical way we can attempt to insure the maintenance of an essential, high morale among those individuals, and their families who are now in military service and who may be called to future military service, is to demonstrate our substantial concern for the welfare of those who so ably served in the past in the defense of this Nation. Although this measure before us may not contain the full educational and dependency allowances that most of us might desire, and although it may contain greater restrictions than most of us might wish, it is still a substantial step in a just direction and, under the procedural circumstances here, it is the best bill currently obtainable.

Mr. Speaker, the basic reason for enactment of any veterans' benefit bill is the traditional belief and commitment of our people that those who have lost irretrievable time from their normal lives and made stern sacrifices while serving in our Armed Forces preeminently merit educational and other assistance to enable them to try to make up the lost time and overcome their sacrifices when they return to civilian life. Let us, this afternoon, sustain this belief and honor our commitment.

Mr. Speaker, on all counts this legislative proposal is unquestionably good for all Americans and I urge its overwhelming adoption.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12410, the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966. This bill, referred to as the GI bill of rights and in the last session as the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, will extend education and other benefits to our veterans who have served in the Armed Forces since January 31, 1955.

This is more than a GI bill. In addition to the educational training and home loan assistance, it proposes entitlement to veterans' hospital care, job counseling assistance, veterans' preference in Federal employment, and wartime presumptions for service-connected disability for chronic and tropical diseases.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily support the educational opportunities this bill extends to our veterans, and I believe it will encourage more young people to serve their country. It provides a permanent program of educational assistance for those discharged from the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955. College-level and below college-level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools is provided, and part-time training is permitted.

I am also pleased that the bill extends benefits of both guaranteed and direct home loan programs to veterans who served after the January 31, 1955, date.

At present, veterans serving after January 31, 1955, are eligible for medical care in VA facilities only for service-connected disabilities. This bill will give non-service-connected medical care on the same basis as war veterans, with eligibility based on the availability of a bed and inability to pay for treatment elsewhere, as is now required of veterans of earlier conflicts.

I am pleased the new bill also extends preference in Federal employment to veterans discharged after January 31, 1955. Veterans discharged after this date are also placed on the same basis as veterans of earlier conflicts on job counseling and job placement assistance. The presumption of service connection of numerous chronic and tropical diseases, now given to war veterans, is extended to veterans with service after January 31, 1955.

While we recognize it is the duty of every citizen to serve his country, the veteran has every right to expect his country to assist him in readjusting to civilian life and regaining some of what he has lost as a result of his service to his country. The GI bill of World War II and the Korean conflict did not distinguish between those exposed to combat and those who served without seeing combat, but extended benefits indiscriminately to those who served. Our peacetime veterans and veterans of the Vietnam conflict should also be given these benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I support the provisions of H.R. 12410 and I call on my colleagues in the House to vote for this bill. It represents a step in the right direction in carrying out our obligation and our resolution to see that our veterans are not forgotten citizens.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, as a longtime advocate of readjustment benefits for our cold war veterans, I am delighted that this legislation has finally come before the House of Representatives. Recognition of the vital role that our post-Korean servicemen have played in the defense of freedom is long overdue. Our Nation is indebted to the men and women who have served in our Armed Forces since January 31, 1955, no less than to our gallant World War II and Korean troops. The tragic war in Vietnam, the conflict in the Dominican Republic, the Cuban missile crisis, the Berlin call-up emphasizes the burden that our leadership of the free world has imposed upon our young men during the past 10 years. In every part of the globe, in hot wars and cold wars, Americans are carrying out essential missions at great personal sacrifice. Their lives have been disrupted, their service is arduous, their futures are uncertain. Surely, they are entitled to assistance in finding their place

in the society they have helped to protect and defend.

The men and women who benefited from the World War II and Korean GI bills became more productive members of society and thus enriched our national life. Eight million veterans of World War II were trained under the GI bill.

A total of 2,200,000 went to college; 3.5 million went to other schools; 1.4 million underwent on-the-job training; three-quarters of a million were trained on farms.

To quote the Veterans' Administration:

> Today we are a far stronger Nation because of the infusion of skilled and professional manpower gained through the GI bill: 450,000 engineers; 180,000 doctors, dentists, nurses; 360,000 schoolteachers; 150,000 scientists; 107,000 lawyers; 243,000 accountants; 36,000 clergymen of all faiths; 17,000 writers and journalists; 711,000 mechanics; 383,000 construction workers; 288,000 metalworkers; 138,000 electricians; 83,000 policemen and firemen; 61,000 printers and typesetters; and 700,000 who trained for business and executive careers.

The experience after Korea was still better: 3 million took advantage of the educational benefits, of whom over half attended college.

The programs proved a sound investment for the individual and for the Nation. In the words of the Bradley Commission:

> The veterans' education program was a major contribution to the national welfare, and the country would be weaker educationally, economically, and in terms of national defense if educators, veterans' organizations, the President, and the Congress had not seen fit to embark upon this new and momentous educational enterprise.

The Commission's words are equally applicable to the post-Korean war veterans who are confronted with an even more difficult problem in equipping themselves for today's new and complex technology. It should be stressed that the majority of our cold war veterans were drafted or enlisted because they largely lacked the financial ability to attend college. Thus, when they return to civilian life they are handicapped in qualifying for gainful employment because their military service prevented their acquiring training and skills for a specific occupation. The bill before us today will help to rectify this inequity by giving these young men the opportunities enjoyed by veterans eligible for the prior GI programs and by their more fortunate contemporaries whose education was not interrupted by military service.

In this connection, I am most disappointed that this bill does not provide on-the-job training as contained in the bill, S. 9, passed by the Senate last July. As a sponsor of a companion measure to S. 9, I feel that the on-the-job training and the more generous educational benefits contained therein are wholly justified.

In December I had the privilege of meeting and observing hundreds of our military personnel in Spain, Holland, Germany, and England. I was tremendously impressed with their quiet pride in their mission, their sense of duty, their acceptance of the hardships of service, their understanding of our Nation's responsibilities in this nuclear age. These men and all the others who serve around the globe guard our freedom as truly as did the GI's of World War II and the Korean war. Let them know that their fellow citizens are proud of and grateful to them and are anxious to help them during their adjustment to civilian life. Let the Americans fighting in the jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam, their comrades stationed throughout the world know that their fellow citizens realize that they have been called upon to bear a disproportionate share of the duties of citizenship.

I regard it as a great privilege to vote for this measure which I am confident will prove as outstandingly successful as the earlier programs. I urge passage of H.R. 12410.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to have the opportunity today to go on record in support of H.R. 12410, which is improperly called the cold war GI bill. Years ago the word cold may have been an appropriate description but today it is neither realistic, or very fair to use it to describe the action in southeast Asia.

H.R. 12410 is more than just an ordinary GI bill because, besides educational training and homeowner assistance, the bill proposes entitlement to VA hospital care, job counseling and assistance, veterans' preference in Federal employment, wartime presumptions for service-connected disability for chronic and tropical diseases, and other provisions.

Accordingly, H.R. 12410 represents a giant step in the direction of carrying out our national resolution to elevate cold war service in the Armed Forces to wartime status, so far as veterans' programs are concerned.

The bill provides allowance to be paid as educational assistance with eligibility at the rate of 1 month of training for 1 month of service, not to exceed 36 months.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we were disappointed that the allowances are so low and are not as high as was in the Korean Act of 1952, or Public Law 550. But, as has been said many times, this is a start in the right direction and the Congress can change or adjust these rates later on to be more realistically geared to increases in cost of living. The members of the committee are to be commended for including the guaranteed loan provision for homes to $7,500 and direct loan authorization to $17,500. For the first time, non-service-connection medical care is provided for the post-Korean veterans. The Veterans Preference Act is extended to cover this group of veterans as well as job counseling and job placement, and certain provisions of the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act.

The bill does not contain everything that would be preferred but I am convinced it is the best bill that can be enacted at this time. Some of us ask why is it that on our side of the Congress every bill concerning veteran benefits must be considered under suspension of the rule where there is no time for adequate time for debate. I recall in particular the complaint that many of us received from World War I veterans back in the 86th Congress, regarding Public Law 86-211. There is a natural resentment against a procedure which bars amendments but in this it may have served a good purpose to prevent the present strong sentiment engendered by the Vietnam conflict from enlarging the bill to a size that might not be acceptable to the administration. Thus a fair conclusion is, it is better to have a bill that can become law and be made more acceptable in the future than to pass a measure that will be opposed so bitterly by the Bureau of the Budget that it may be returned to us with a veto.

Today we are at the end of a long trail that commenced back in the 86th Congress when S. 1138 was passed by the Senate, and followed in each Congress, by S. 349 in the 87th, S. 5 in the 88th, and now S. 9 in the 89th Congress.

As we considered H.R. 12410 today it was observed the senior Senator from Texas, who has for so long dedicated himself to the passage of a bill of this type, was on the floor of the House and I know that he must have rejoiced to see that for the first time in 8 years the House was about to concur in some of the provisions contained in Senate-passed measures of the past four Congresses.

For a considerable length of time and for quite substantial reasons there have been those who were lukewarm to the so-called GI bill. They pointed out that draft obligation was for a prescribed period, and there were lenient policies for those actively pursuing education. Mobilization and demobilization were more orderly and in the past few years our burgeoning economy could readily absorb the returning veterans. But the escalation of the hostilities in Vietnam within the last 2 years has changed all this. Everyone who goes in the service today is faced with an obligation for potential service in combat zones and planning becomes less and less predictable and practical because of the rapidly changing situation.

It should be a generally accepted fact that no person no matter how ambitious, industrious or talented he may be can progress at a normal rate in our rapidly expanded economy when a series of threats to world peace calls him away to military duty for long periods of time. Overlooked is the fact that the enactment of a cold war GI bill would not only constitute an act of justice for the persons sacrificing civil gains for military duty but would also be in the best interests of the Nation.

Our great country has twice expressed concern for those who are taken for compulsory military service because this draft is incompatible with our national tradition and is not lightly imposed upon our citizenry. Only war, or the imminent threat of war, creates the conditions which justify the draft. In the past we have expressed our concern for draftees twice: First, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—Public Law 346, 78th Congress—and second, the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952—Public Law 550, 82d Congress. These were popularly known as the World War II GI bill and the Korean GI bill.

There is no question about the value of these programs. Such has been proved. On the 20th anniversary of the World War II bill, the VA stated that the "educational level of the Nation had been raised." This bill gave rise to the adult education courses that are carried on in all higher educational institutions today. John S. Gleason, then VA Administrator, in the summer of 1964, in an article in George Washington University magazine, said:

> The GI bill of World War II which cost $14.5 billion has seen that cost more than recouped. It pays for itself close to $1 billion a year in higher earning veterans. This return comes from additional income tax paid by these better educated men.

The need for new legislation today is clear, compelling, and urgent. Most of the military in uniform today would never have voluntarily entered military service because in civilian life they were pursuing their individual goals. The sequence of events is that following the compulsory draft they serve on active duty for a specified time and then perform additional service in the active reserve before they enter the ranks of the standby reserves. Once they are drafted their total military obligation generally extends over a period of 6 years. They are not truly out of service until this whole obligation has been discharged.

Until now these young men have been denied the readjustment aid so vitally needed to help them catch up with those of their contemporaries who were not asked to serve but who continued their more lucrative and comfortable pursuits of civilian life.

The action to redress the inequities of this situation is long overdue. Those in service now are looking for valuable opportunities ranging from educational advantages to worthwhile job possibilities and potentially profitable business ventures. We are in an era of prosperity, yet the military pay does not begin to compare with wages in civilian life or profits from even a small business. Unlike those who were discharged from World War II, the present day cold war veteran if he does not possess some skill or has a professional or semiprofessional status is in pretty bad shape. Actually, with the progress of automation machines are taking over the unskilled jobs. A discharged draftee needs some skill or technical training if he is to be certain of a job. The need for this legislation will continue so long as there is a continued existence of the compulsory draft law which calls a selected group of men away from their private life on behalf of the entire Nation. The compulsory draft law affects our youth adversely just as soon as they come of draft age, actually whether they are drafted into the service or not. Employers are not willing to invest time and money into training men with unsatified military obligations. It has been shown again and again that such unsatisfied obligation may be a complete bar to gainful employment.

Events in the past 2 years have increased markedly the need for a readjustment program. Some would prefer the limitation of these benefits be passed on only to those who have, as in the words of Lincoln, "borne the battle." It is true that some have performed in areas where there have not been great hazards but if we look back we will find over the past years there have been many "hot spots". There was Lebanon in 1958, and also in that same year, Quemoy-Matsu; then from 1961 to 1963, the Berlin crisis occurred and in 1962 and 1963, the Cuban crisis. Many were on duty in the Congo in 1960, and a lot of our military personnel saw duty in Laos in 1961 and 1962, and during the Dominican Republic episode in 1965, which is still fresh in our minds, as, of course, are the years 1964 and 1965 and 1966 in Vietnam. Certainly a lot of our soldiers who have earned the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, who have gone as advisers, observers, or instructors have engaged in an area of hostility and should be eligible for the benefits provided in the bill. This is the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, an organization of 1,309,000 that supports this philosophy.

We believe that a grateful Nation should extend benefits to these post-Korean-conflict GI's. We would, of course, prefer a formula that would provide for the entitlement to maximum benefits for those actually subjected to the hazards of war. But it is equally true that idealistic benefits should accrue to those who have served in an area of hostility.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that justice may be long delayed, but that it is seldom forever denied. By the passage of H.R. 12410 today equity and justice will be done to those post-Korean GI's who have served their country, but until now have been denied veteran benefits.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12410, a bill to enhance the benefits of service in the Armed Forces of the United States and to further extend the benefits of higher education by providing a broad program of educational benefits for veterans who were in the service after January 31, 1955, and other members of the Armed Forces.

This bill provides a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving in the Armed Forces, discharged after January 31, 1955. College-level and below-college-level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools is provided. Part-time training is permitted. Eligibility accrues at the rate of 1 month of training for 1 month of service, not to exceed 36 months. The education and training allowances provided are as follows:

Type of program	No dependents	1 dependent	2 or more dependents
Institutional:			
Full time	$100	$125	$150
Three-quarter time	75	95	115
Half time	50	65	75
Cooperative	80	100	120

Fees and tuition are paid for less than half-time training, and administrative provisions of the GI bill for veterans of the Korean conflict and the war orphans' training program are applicable to this proposed program. Schools will be approved by State approval agencies of the various States, and these agencies will be responsible for extending supervision to approved schools. This legislation also provides for guaranteed and direct home loans to veterans discharged after January 31, 1955. The guarantee of a loan by a private lender in the amount of $7,500 is extended to this group and, in areas established as direct loan areas where guaranteed financing has not generally been available, a maximum direct loan of $17,500 is authorized. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to regulate interest rates, consistent with the ceiling established for Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. A fund is established for the Administrator to offset losses under this program, by requiring the veteran to pay 0.05 percent of his loan at closing.

Under the provisions of this bill, this group is also made eligible for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities on the same basis as war veterans. Preference in employment in Federal service is extended to the group of veterans discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as is currently applicable to war veterans. The presumption of service connection of numerous chronic and tropical diseases is also extended to these veterans, as well as job counseling and job placement assistance and an increased protection for individuals who are renting homes when called to service by amending the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.

While I am not completely satisfied with the legislation, I believe it is a step in the right direction. I would favor much broader and more liberal terms being written into the bill, however, from statements made today by members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, it is quite apparent that this bill can be passed and those of us who are interested in having a bill enacted at this time, will have to forgo our wishes for broader legislation.

I wish to commend the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the entire membership of this committee for their excellent workmanship on this legislation. I have received a great deal of mail from residents of my district backing this legislation and I trust that this bill will receive unanimous support in the call of the roll on this matter today.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as a longtime sponsor of legislation to provide a GI bill for our peacetime veterans, I am glad that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has brought this bill to the House floor. Passage of this legislation could well be one of the most significant achievements of this Congress.

I have long felt that so long as we continue to draft young men into the service they should be provided educational benefits upon their discharge—as was done for those who served in World War II and Korea. Since 1955—when the Korean conflict officially ended, along with the GI bill—our servicemen have faced such crucial periods as the Middle

East crisis, the Berlin situation, the Cuban missile crisis, and now Vietnam.

Our servicemen who have fought in Vietnam, are now fighting now, or will fight there, are facing the same hazards as did their brothers-in-arms who served in World War II and Korea. The sacrifices of these men, who heroically carry the battle for freedom into the jungles and plains of Vietnam, entitles them to share in the same benefits accorded the veterans of World War II and Korea. I hope this bill will be passed by the House and promptly enacted into law.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have waited 9 years to vote for the bill before the House, and I am deeply proud now to have this opportunity to speak for it and to help in its passage. I cannot think of any better investment we could make in the future of this Nation than by the improvement and encouragement of its most precious resource—the dedicated brainpower of its people.

We are performing economic miracles in this country today—in production, distribution, and in economic reform. In science we are making the miraculous almost routine. In all fields of human endeavor, American brains and skill and dedication are achieving goals undreamed of just a generation ago. If one were to search deep into the factors behind this remarkable series of achievements, I believe that no single factor would stand out in importance above the GI bills of World War II and the Korean war, which provided us with millions of men and women trained to do great things through the advanced education made possible by this type of legislation.

Where would we have developed the necessary professionals such as doctors, dentists, astronauts, writers, thinkers, physicists, engineers—or the skilled craftsmen and technicians who learned their work in trade schools and on-the-job training—if it had not been for the two GI bills? How poor our country would be today without those skills.

LEGISLATION SERVES DUAL OBJECTIVES

Mr. Speaker, since the days when the previous law was expiring, I have supported reenactment of a GI bill program. I congratulate those who have been instrumental in bringing this bill before the House today. I think passage of this legislation will not only provide deserved benefits for veterans who have earned them many times over by their sacrifices, but will also go a long way toward resolving some of the most troublesome problems today in connection with the draft.

Going into the service will no longer continue to mean, for many, the end of formal education, but, as it did before, will mean instead a new opportunity for a great deal more education. There will be renewed incentives to enlistment, with the knowledge that enlistment will bring not only the satisfaction of serving one's country in a most important and even crucial manner but also the satisfaction of knowing that such service will later mean greater opportunities for advancement and thus a better future after return to civilian life. Congress is acting with great wisdom, I feel, in passing this bill.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12410, to enhance the benefits of service in the Armed Forces and further extend the benefits of higher education by providing a broad program of educational benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955.

This legislation extends the benefits of a higher education to qualified and deserving young persons who might not otherwise be able to afford such an education, provides vocational readjustment and restores lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose careers have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty after January 31, 1955, and aids such persons in attaining the vocational and educational status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country.

Also, the legislation insures that the Nation shall be able to utilize the highest skills and abilities of the veterans who benefit from it. This is especially important since at this time the number of young men available to fill the essential technical and professional posts is the lowest in ratio to our total population which we have had or will have for a decade to come. I think it is doubly essential that we make fullest use of the skills of the young men who are available.

Mr. Speaker, the program of educational assistance is on the basis of a month of training for each month of service, not to exceed 36 calendar months. The bill provides assistance rates for full-time training of $100 for a single veteran, $125 for a veteran with one dependent, and $150 for a veteran with more than one dependent. There are proportionate rates for less than full-time training. Education is generally limited to institutions of higher learning, and must be completed within 8 years from the date of discharge. Individuals in the service whose duty assignments permit may avail themselves of educational assistance while on active duty, but in such instances the Government will pay only the cost of tuition fees and not the full education assistance allowance. The educational provisions are effective June 1, 1966.

The educational assistance and home loan guarantee provisions of the reported bill are patterned closely after Public Law 550, 82d Congress—the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952—which gave these benefits to veterans of the Korean conflict. Loan guarantee provisions provide that the Veterans' Administration may guarantee as much as $7,500 of a loan made by a private lender for a veteran's home. Direct loans are authorized by the Veterans' Administration where private financing is not available, and the maximum amount of such a loan is increased by this legislation from $15,000 to $17,500.

This bill also provides non-service-connected medical care in the VA hospital system for these veterans. It further extends to this same group presumptive service connection for chronic and tropical diseases first manifested within specified periods following discharge, a provision now generally limited to veterans who served during time of war. The VA is authorized to provide a flag to drape the casket of a veteran of this service at the time of his funeral.

The legislation also authorizes job counseling and job placement under the Department of Labor and on the same basis as that given to veterans of prior conflicts. Preference in Federal employment is provided.

Mr. Speaker, the escalation of hostilities in Vietnam makes it more imperative than ever that this legislation be enacted into law immediately. The readjustment needs of our service men and women have grown with the rigors and hazards of their service. Planning for the future by our veterans grows less and less practicable with the rapidly changing Vietnam crises. For these reasons, I wholeheartedly urge my colleagues to unanimously pass this bill today.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to lend my support to passage of H.R. 12410, the peacetime GI bill of rights. I share the view of many of my colleagues that those young men who have been asked to devote years of their lives to the defense of the free world merit their Nation's assistance in completing their education and in making economic adjustments.

I am pleased to support this measure not only because it constitutes a well-merited compensation to the veterans but also because it is another step in the effort to expand the ranks of youngsters who will secure further training, both academically and in those technical fields where there will be employment opportunities in the future.

I have introduced legislation which is close to what we are adopting today. One difference between the measure I introduced and H.R. 12410 concerns the chances for integration of the education assistance with the Manpower Development and Training Act program. Under my proposal, it is explicitly provided that a veteran could elect to participate in a Manpower Development and Training Act training course and still get the subsistence benefits under the GI bill. As written, H.R. 12410 could be construed to require the returning veteran to enroll either in an academic institution or in a technical school in order to secure subsistence benefits. I hope that the bill which is finally enacted will permit veterans to participate in the Manpower Development and Training Act programs with no loss of benefits. Such participation would strengthen both the Manpower Development and Training Act and the GI bill. In many instances, it would permit the veteran to get the type of specialized vocational training to enable him to secure permanent employment in a reasonably short time.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud President Johnson for including this proposal in his state of the Union message and the committee for its prompt action.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am happy and proud to speak today in support of a measure which I believe to be of compelling importance, H.R. 12410, the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act. The United States has

always been a Nation which has paid its debts. But there is something we owe to over 3 million young ex-servicemen. By 1970 this figure will rise to about 6 million. We owe these young men a chance to return to civilian life as useful, self-supporting members of society. In return for the disproportionate share of service which they have rendered to their country, we owe them some amount of assistance in the readjustment they have to make.

This bill is in keeping with our American tradition of individual initiative. It is not a dole or a handout. Rather it provides men who have left active duty between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967, with the opportunity to develop their abilities and skills through education and training, and to buy their own homes or farms with direct and guaranteed loans.

These cold war veterans need a GI bill for the same reason our World War II and Korean war veterans needed GI bills. For over 2 years 40 percent of draft-eligible men are diverted from the normal and more lucrative activities of continuing their education or pursuing their careers. When they have completed their active service they find that they must compete with the almost 60 percent of their contemporaries who did not serve. They have lost much more than 2 years of their lives. They have lost education and career opportunities which perhaps can never be fully replaced.

The draft law has an adverse effect on our young men even before they are drafted or volunteer. A favorable draft status now seems to be a job qualification. Businesses and industries are not willing to invest in employees whose futures are so uncertain. Even when they have left active service these men are still not free to devote their full attention to civilian life. They have a reserve obligation yet to fulfill. For a total of 6 years servicemen are the victims of unfair competition.

I am not questioning the need for a compulsory draft law because I do believe that at present it is necessary. Rather my point is that we must consider the effects on the draft and subsequent military service upon our young men. We must then take the action which justice demands. We assist World War II and Korean veterans to readjust to civilian life. In Texas under the Hazelwood Act we extended even more educational assistance to veterans with no further eligibility under the World War II and Korean bills. We should not do less for the cold war veterans. Not all of the post-Korean veterans risked their lives in combat as did their predecessors, but all were prepared to do so if the situation demanded it. A few years ago, Dr. H. Evert Pope, in regard to cold war veterans, said:

> We have made the same requirements of many young men to serve in the Armed Forces. These men are making the same sacrifice—losing their jobs, breaking up homes, and postponing their educations, just as those who served in World War II and the Korean conflict.

The purpose of H.R. 12410 is simply to restore to post-Korean veterans some of the opportunities they lost by reason of their military service. I believe H.R. 12410 provisions for educational and training assistance and for direct and guarantee loans are just compensation. I believe that they are compensation long overdue.

There is one point, however, which I think this bill and other proposals for readjustment assistance overlook. Our concern is not just for the cold war veterans. The purpose of readjustment legislation is not only to rehabilitate the ex-serviceman, but his whole family. Surely they suffer from his loss of time and his lack of education and training as much as he. As a result of this lack they are just as far down the economic ladder as he is. Therefore it seems to me only fair that even if non-service-connected death or disability prevent the veteran from utilizing the educational and training opportunities of this legislation, his wife, as the new breadwinner of the family, should be able to utilize them.

H.R. 7910, the cold war GI bill I introduced last year, makes such provision. Section 1910 of the bill extends educational benefits to surviving widows or wives of cold war veterans who did not use or complete the available education or training by virtue of non-service-connected death or disability. In the event that there is no surviving widow or wife, each child of the veteran is entitled to use or complete the total amount of education or training the veteran would have used or completed. H.R. 7910 is further evidence of our national commitment to education. It is not aid to education. It is aid to citizens, but it is a kind of aid which recognizes the importance of education in today's society.

Unfortunately, neither the present bill, H.R. 12410, nor the one passed last year by the Senate, S. 9, contain benefits for the wife, surviving widow, or children of the veteran. I hope that in the near future serious consideration will be given to this aspect of my bill, H.R. 7910.

If any further justification for H.R. 12410 is necessary a look at its probable effects will be sufficient. You are all aware I am sure that the World War II GI bill has been an unqualified success. Not only did it enable millions of ex-GI's to raise their education level and embark upon higher paying careers, but it supplied the labor market with skills which would have otherwise been wasted. Not only did it enable millions of ex-GI's to buy their own homes but it produced one of the greatest construction booms in our history. Not only did it change the lives of some 10 million ex-servicemen and their families, but it drastically altered the whole structure of our society.

The World War II GI bill cost the Federal Government $14.5 billion. It has more than paid for itself. It adds almost a billion dollars annually to the Treasury in the form of taxes paid by our higher educated veterans. Even the most cautious businessman would praise such a wise investment.

A bill to educate veterans of the cold war would be equally worthwhile. Today with such great technological progress and the advance of automation, problems facing the uneducated and the unskilled are critical. Men without skills are men without jobs. By providing necessary education and training opportunities for post-Korean veterans we can help to produce some of the professional and skilled workers which our economy and national defense require. We can reduce unemployment. But most important we can help these veterans to help themselves. President Kennedy, when speaking to a group of servicemen, once quoted this old poem:

> God and the soldier, all men adore,
> In time of danger, and not before.
> When the danger is passed and all things righted,
> God is forgotten and the soldier slighted.

Let us not slight the serviceman who has protected and is now protecting our country in this cold war. H.R. 12410 can be some proof that we have not forgotten him.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas, Chairman TEAGUE, and the Veterans' Affairs Committee for bringing this bill to the floor. There is tremendous sentiment in support of this measure in my home district, and on behalf of my constituents I applaud and thank the committee for acting so swiftly this year.

I would also like to say a few words about Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, the author and prime mover of the cold war GI bill. Many of us in the House are fully aware that were it not for his efforts in the Senate over the past several years, we would not be considering a Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act today. In fact, Senator YARBOROUGH's work and persistence on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of men and women who will benefit from this law is one of the most outstanding legislative feats of the past decade.

For a good number of years Senator YARBOROUGH has been urging Congress to enact the legislation we are considering today. He has had to fight against tremendous resistance both within Congress and within the administration. This resistance has been unrealistic and shortsighted. Fortunately, we can now correct our own shortsightedness. But we should have enacted this legislation years ago, as the senior Senator from Texas has been urging.

Senator YARBOROUGH's dedication to this bill and to those who will benefit from it should serve as an inspiration to all of us. It is easy to understand why Senator TED KENNEDY referred to Senator YARBOROUGH recently as the man of the year every year in working for veterans' benefits. And it is easy to understand why Senator YARBOROUGH was honored a couple of weeks ago at a luncheon given in his behalf by the National Association of State Directors of Veterans' Affairs.

With unanimous consent, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point the story that appeared in the San Antonio News, January 26, 1966, covering the luncheon given for Senator YARBOROUGH. I would also like to insert in the RECORD

articles from the Stars and Stripes, the National Tribune, August 5, 1965, and the Jewish Veteran, September 1965, supporting the cold war GI bill:

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) News, Jan. 26, 1966]

YARBOROUGH LAUDED FOR VET BENEFITS

WASHINGTON.—Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH was characterized Tuesday "as the man of the year, every year" in working for veterans' benefits.

The tribute came from Senator TED KENNEDY at a luncheon in YARBOROUGH'S honor.

The Texas Democrat was presented with a large silver urn by the National Association of State Directors of Veterans' Affairs.

YARBOROUGH, chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, was cited for his contributions to veterans' legislation.

KENNEDY said that the subcommittee is the only panel on which all three of the Kennedy brothers have served.

The late President Kennedy was a member in the Senate days. TED and Senator BOBBY KENNEDY, who also attended the luncheon, are members now.

"And Senator YARBOROUGH always demands that you attend the committee meetings," TED KENNEDY said.

Saying that YARBOROUGH was fighting for veterans benefits when he was in school, KENNEDY added, "In working for such legislation, he is speaking for the best interest of our country as well as for veterans."

Pete Wheeler, former association president, said YARBOROUGH had "fathered, raised, and graduated in the Senate" the latest veterans' bill.

The legislation, called the cold war GI bill, was passed by the Senate last year, but has been stalled in the House.

In his turn, YARBOROUGH plugged for his bill, which would provide benefits for all veterans who have served since 1955, the cutoff date for the Korean war GI bill. Some want a new bill limited to veterans of Vietnam and other trouble spots.

"Never before have we had 'a hotspot' bill. A serviceman doesn't decide where he will go. He is ordered to go," YARBOROUGH said.

[From the Stars and Stripes—The National Tribune, Aug. 5, 1965]

IMAGE OF A VETERAN

During, and immediately after, every war involving our country, the citizen-soldier and veteran has been regarded as a valued, vital part of American security. A feature article, some time ago, in the Saturday Evening Post, written by the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, entitled "Let's Say 'No' to the Veterans," and labeling veterans benefits as "blatant and outrageous plunder."

Recently, the universally respected New York Times, in an editorial, entitled "Veterans' Pork Barrel," strongly impugned the good faith, motives and respectability of veterans groups in the United States when they opposed the closing of VA hospitals before provision was made for the veteran in need of such services.

Monroe R. Sheinberg, executive director of the Jewish War Veterans replied to the Times article. His reply labeled "Image of a Veteran" follows:

WHO IS A VETERAN?

He is some 22 million men and women who served our country in time of war. Over 44 percent of the American population are either veterans, dependent members of veterans families or dependent survivors of deceased veterans, some 81 million in all.

The veteran, in sum, is Mr. Average Man, except for one fact. He is eligible for veterans benefits. These benefits have been called plunder, handouts, and worse.

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF VETERANS BENEFITS

From earliest times, the wars of nations have been tied inseparably with veterans benefits.

The great oriental civilizations of antiquity furnished pensions for soldiers released from duty.

The Greek city states established a system of veterans preference in public offices, pensioned disabled veterans, and cared for and educated children of those who died in battle.

The Romans, early in their history, developed an elaborate system of veterans benefits, involving land grants and lump-sum pensions.

In Europe, when America as a nation was born, veterans pensions were in force and our country followed suit.

WHY VETERANS BENEFITS

The military requirements of our Nation's defense mandate military forces, a comparatively small professional army in times of peace, augmented by a large, citizens force in times of war or emergency.

These citizen soldiers, uprooted from employment and family life and responsibilities, form the most important element of our national defense, a permanent and indispensable part of this Nation's Military Establishment.

Thus, programs of veterans benefits are more than care for the disabled; they are based and justified, as well, upon the necessity of compensating the returning citizen soldier for his sacrifices in health, in time spent, in hardship and danger endured, in opportunity passed by, in earning capacity diminished by virtue of that service.

President Theodore Roosevelt put it this way:

"No other citizen deserves so well of the Republic as the veteran. They did the one deed which, if left undone, would have meant that all else in our history went for nothing. But for their steadfast promise all our annals would be meaningless and our great experience in popular freedom and self-government a gloomy failure."

EFFECT ON OUR DEFENSE FORCES

Perhaps the most important and least recognized basis for such programs of veterans benefits is the necessity of adding to the strength of our Nation's defense by demonstrating to succeeding generations, upon whose willing service in its defense our country's continued security depends, not only that the causes we fight for are just, and not only that it is vitally necessary that in order to protect our cherished institutions every American must stand ready to serve in our Armed Forces, but also that our State and our Nation keep faith with those who serve.

That is why JWV and other great veteran organizations fight and campaign so forcefully and persistently for military pay bills that would increase the compensation and status and restore the shrinking fringe benefits of men in our Armed Forces.

Gen. Curtis LeMay, then Chief of Staff of our Air Force, personally told our commander that the JWV could perform no greater service to our country's security and defense than to help alert Congress and the American people to the danger to our military strength implicit in the loss of our technically trained noncoms and officers by reason of insufficient pay, benefits, and status.

Here then is the picture understood by too few:

The veteran and the soldier on active duty are both part of this country's strength for defense and security. The soldier of today is the veteran of tomorrow, sensitive to the treatment of veterans and the family of veterans.

Fair treatment of veterans is not charity, handouts, or plunder; it is national self-interest based upon the highest ideals of patriotism and moral obligation.

[From the Jewish Veteran, September 1965]

CAPITOL CORRIDORS

(By Felix Putterman)

The hard fact that we have known little peace, if any, since the end of World War II is being driven home by the intensification of the U.S. military commitment in Vietnam.

If we don't have peace, what do we have?

For the generation of young Americans born during and since World War II, there has never been a peace such as their elders knew. The fact of the matter is that the almost continuous armed confrontation of the past 20 years can best be described as war, limited perhaps, but war.

This sticky problem of using a proper label has been a steady source of contention during the long effort to make available to former armed services personnel benefits limited to war veterans. No clearer demonstration of conflicting views can be found than the division over the proposed cold war GI bill once again passed by the Senate now for the time being stymied in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Some Members of Congress, who can quote a price on anything, side with the watchdogs of the Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget, in considering post-Korean service as something less than wartime duty. To them the idyllic years of military service since 1953 have been one long garrison parade with some close order drill and sightseeing tours overseas thrown in for good measure.

Yet the same people, for the most part, rally to support the Strategic Air Command complete with round-the-clock alerts, the permanent watch at the 38th parallel, a prompt response to provocative taunting at Quemoy and Matsu, continuous patrols by nuclear subs, the ready fleet at Cyprus, Lebanon, or southeast Asia. Renewal of selective service won handily in the Congress last year—this year it would be almost unanimous.

Some of the people who downgrade present military service in comparison with World War II are the stanch supporters of NATO, SEATO, and the DEW line. They would have gone slower on the cessation of nuclear testing and faster into Latin American intervention. Would you get a combat ribbon for bulldozing the Berlin wall?

Like everything else in life the concept of war changes. While the United States did not directly involve American military personnel in the three dozen or more armed confrontations taking place during the past 20 years, there was sufficient justification for keeping our powder dry and our men ready. Nervously casting backward glances at the haunting nuclear ghost we are involved in the reality of sustaining military preparedness.

The difference in intensity as between a full blown national emergency and a continuous nagging limited war or to a so-called war of liberation has a meaning in terms of weaponry, terrain and tactics but to American GI's involved it is war, nevertheless.

While it is true that combat divides the men from the boys it has never served as the standard for wartime service benefits. Indeed all seven of the uniformed personnel who supported the one man on the World War II firing line were eligible for GI law benefits. Today, seeking to effectively use uniformed personnel where most needed, Secretary McNamara has set in motion a new program designed to relieve 75,000 officers for combat duty with civilian personnel for clerical and other housekeeping functions.

Contrary to prior American tradition we have interrupted young lives for military conscription—the highest form of patriotic and

public service. As a matter of accepted public policy such service has always been accorded special consideration. Since for the foreseeable future it is anticipated that we may be involved in armed confrontations somewhat less than national emergencies in the classic sense we should be prepared to help the youthful American veterans returning to civilian life in their efforts to recapture lost time and to achieve a constructive niche in the economy and society. To hide behind a specious definition of war in order to save money is demeaning and unworthy of all that is good in America.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my hope that the House of Representatives will speedily adopt the bill known as the Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act.

As a veteran of two wars and having recently returned from an inspection of the Vietnamese battle areas, I can assure my colleagues that the American military men who are fighting in southeast Asia are every bit as entitled to a GI bill as were those men who served in World War II and the Korean fighting.

Under provisions of this measure, veterans who have served in the Armed Forces on and after January 31, 1955, would be eligible for educational assistance, death and disability compensation, farm, home and business loans, and other benefits. They are entitled to no less, Mr. Speaker, and I have introduced my own bill containing these provisions to emphasize my deep feelings on their behalf.

This measure provides an opportunity to demonstrate that the American people recognize and appreciate the many personal sacrifices extracted from our Vietnam war veterans by their military obligations. Many of these young men have gone and are going into the military service directly from high school and some before they have even finished their high school educations. They will return to civilian life after absences of several years, many of them to find they are unskilled, uneducated, and unprepared for a civilian occupation.

The Vietnamese veteran, Mr. Speaker, needs a chance to compete for his future with those who are deferred from active military duty while he is serving and who are utilizing this time to further their own careers. These veterans of the grim Vietnamese fighting should have readjustment assistance and the opportunity to return to civilian life, to find employment, and to realize their educational objectives at the most formative time in their lives. I hope my colleagues will agree and adopt this most worthwhile and important measure.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I should first like to express my gratitude for the opportunity to present my views in support of a cold war veterans' benefits bill. I introduced H.R. 11910 because I am convinced of the necessity of such a measure. The cold war GI bill requires our most conscientious consideration as a matter of vital national interest.

The provision for readjustment assistance to those young citizens who are serving this country in a cold war, that is all too often quite hot, is a matter of equity long overdue in its enactment. In the face of increasing hostilities in southeast Asia, of growing tensions in many areas, and in the fact of the responsibility sustained by the United States throughout the world, the demand on our youth is not diminishing. It is increasing to the extent that the average length of service has increased since the Korean conflict from 24 to 28.2 months. The personal life of the best of our youth is being interrupted for long periods and a grateful Nation can do no less than provide some benefits by way of educational opportunity to those who serve it with devotion.

The 6 million service men and women will be returning to civilian life by 1970 will be at a disadvantage in education and vocational training even greater than that of their predecessors from the last two wars. The age of mechanism has put a premium on the man of special skills, while reducing the need and effectiveness of the unskilled. The importance of a college degree has been magnified even in the past decade, and will no doubt continue to grow as the American level of education steadily rises.

There can be little disagreement with the fact that the first two GI bills made a substantial contribution to the rise in the level of education. More than half of the World War II veterans from my State of Florida took advantage of educational assistance from the Government, that is, 171,000 of the 289,000 veterans from that war. Of the 182,000 Florida veterans of the Korean war, 71,000 have continued their training by means of governmental aid. I was an administrative officer of one of our great universities immediately following World War II and know first hand of the Government benefits, through the GI bill, which were so helpful to our veterans.

Reports from educators in every State point to these veterans returning to high schools, colleges, and trade schools after their military service, as some of the most diligent and often the most productive student in the country. These men and women have become our skilled workers, our professional leaders, our colleagues here in Congress. The higher incomes they have earned have raised the overall standard of living and expanded the wealth of this Nation. Thus a program such as those put into effect following the previous two wars, and such as the one now being considered is actually an investment which will promote education and prosperity as well as help to achieve the aim of fairness to all segments of the population.

In concluding my statement, I would like to express my earnest hope that the interest being shown in a cold war GI bill will assure its quick enactment.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, I introduced H.R. 12347 to provide educational benefits and other specialized assistance for our veterans who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States since January 31, 1955.

It is my firm conviction that those who have served during the cold war period since the termination of the Korean war, and those who are serving now in the Vietnam conflict, are as highly deserving of these benefits as our brave World War II veterans.

Since World War II compulsory military service has not been terminated as it was in prior times of peace, but instead has been continued. The cold war remains unabated, and our servicemen are still scattered all over the globe, and they are still serving under combat or near-combat conditions.

Their courageous and dedicated service has carried our Nation triumphantly through many crises—Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Taiwan, Berlin, Laos. The list is long, and I know it is not necessary to remind my colleagues of their dauntless valor, their heroic service, and their supreme sacrifices.

Their efforts to preserve the peace and protect our freedom are no less than those of our World War II and Korean veterans. They deserve to share equally in the benefits a grateful Nation has extended to its veterans in the past.

I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE, and the members of his committee, for their speedy action in reporting out a GI benefits bill in a form which invites agreement with the version already adopted by the Senate. I commend them on reporting a bill which is generous and fair, but not irresponsible. The committee's bill, H.R. 12410, offers monthly stipends of $100 to single veterans who return to school, $125 for those who are married, and $150 for those with children. Each month of military service would entitle the veteran to 1 month of school-aid payments, up to a total of 36 months of study at any State accredited university or vocational school, provided they have served more than 180 days. Moreover, H.R. 12410 follows the Senate's lead in opening the program to all veterans mustered out since eligibility under the Korean war GI bill expired in January 1955.

In addition to educational assistance, this measure provides home, farm, and business loan assistance, entitlement to medical care in Veterans' Administration hospitals, job counseling, and job placement assistance, preference in Federal employment, and other benefits designed to ease a veteran's readjustment to civilian life.

Mr. Speaker, the need for a GI benefits program, and the eventual success of such a program, has already been eloquently demonstrated. Under the education and training provisions of the World War II GI bill, 7,800,000 veterans—nearly half of all who served during the war—received training. With well over 2 million in college and another 3,500,000 in other schools, they demonstrated that they want the opportunity we can give them. It has been pointed out that, today, we are a far stronger nation because of the manpower skills gained through the earlier GI bill: with 450,000 engineers; 180,000 doctors, dentists, and nurses; 360,000 schoolteachers; 150,000 scientists; 243,000 accountants, 107,000 lawyers; 36,000 clergymen; 17,000 writers; 711,000 mechanics; and almost 700,000 who trained for business and executive careers.

Today our country is still in great need of young people trained to fill technical

and professional positions. The Higher Education Act passed by this Congress last year is alleviating the situation to a great degree. H.R. 12410, which we have before us today, would likewise help to bridge the technical gap that now exists. It would encourage veterans to continue their education so that ultimately they would be qualified to fill these technical positions themselves.

On Memorial Day last year I had the pleasure of sharing the same platform with the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, in addressing the Catholic War Veterans of America. I sat with a young man, a Catholic war veteran from Evanston, who had just returned from active combat in Vietnam. For his gallantry in action there, he had been awarded the Silver Star. This young man told me how proud he was to serve his country and the cause of democracy in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, should sacrifices such as that young veteran's go unacknowledged by this great Nation of ours?

Our vote today will be a special expression of our national purpose in its broadest sense.

Let us show the world how highly this country values the sacrifices of our service men and women.

Let us join together today in passing H.R. 12410, and let us thereby demonstrate the gratitude of our Nation to these men and women in uniform who are doing their utmost to preserve equality and liberty.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I will support H.R. 12410, the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, because under the circumstances it probably represents the only bill which we can get at this time. It represents a first step in the right direction toward meeting the Nation's responsibilities to its veterans.

Of course, under the rules which we are operating today, there can be no amendments or other changes. Indeed, there is little time to even debate such an important piece of legislation.

However, in the face of administration coolness, and until recently outright opposition, toward such proposals, we are fortunate to get consideration of any GI bill at this time.

Since the end of World War II and the Korean conflict, the world really has not known peace. We have lived in times of tension, uneasiness, crisis, and wars of liberation. The United States has continued to call upon its finest young men to help defend and preserve freedom and security around the world.

In just a few short months the President, as Commander in Chief, has determined it necessary to more than double the number of American military forces in Vietnam. They may double again before an honorable peace can be achieved in that area.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation always has provided recognition for those Americans who have interrupted their routine way of life to serve in the Armed Forces. Under the World War II GI bill, nearly 8 million veterans received education and training at a cost of $14½ billion. Under the Korean GI bill, over 2¼ million veterans received similar benefits at a cost of over $4½ billion.

It is regrettable that this bill falls short of placing our Vietnam and cold-war veterans on an equal basis with those of World War II and Korea. It is my understanding that the educational provisions of this bill give allowances to eligible veterans which are $10 per month less than those received by Korean GI's. This is difficult to understand in the face of steadily increasing educational costs and a rising cost of living.

The Federal Government is investing approximately $7,000 per year, per trainee, for those in the Job Corps but there is a reluctance to give equitable benefits to those fighting in Vietnam as we provided Korean GI's.

Frankly, I believe that the bill which I introduced recently, H.R. 12498, is a better and more realistic bill insofar as education is concerned. It is similar to one introduced by my able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], the ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

My bill would authorize payment of an education and training allowance to eligible veterans pursuing further education, including institutional courses, on-the-job or on-the-farm training.

Basic allowance under my bill for a full-time student would be computed at the rate of $130 per month for veterans without dependents, and increased allowances for veterans with dependents.

It is unfortunate that the committee bill before us has refused to qualify veterans taking on-the-job or on-the-farm training for educational benefits.

The need for skilled technicians, tradesmen, and personnel in many occupations has grown severe. In many parts of the country, there is a shortage of farmworkers. It appears to me that we have turned our backs on those who seek to train themselves by experience on the job and on the farm.

While I shall support this bill today, I believe we must work for improvements and adequate benefits in another Congress. Certainly, preparing the serviceman returning from war to take his place in civilian life is as essential to our national interest as was the task of preparing him for his military duty.

This should be viewed as one of the costs of waging war against the challenge of Communist aggression in Vietnam and elsewhere throughout the world.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 12410, a bill to enhance the benefits of service in the Armed Forces of the United States and further extend the benefits of higher education by providing a broad program of educational benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and certain members of the Armed Forces. I urge that it be favorably considered today.

Thousands of our young men are being torn from their homes and families and are being asked to serve their country in a remote land of which very few had even heard before the last several years. They are being asked to sacrifice—even to the point of giving their lives—just as other young Americans before them had been asked to sacrifice during previous wars.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress gave to the veterans of previous wars certain benefits as a very small partial payment for the disruption of the lives of those veterans. In so doing, the Congress recognized the debt owed to those veterans by the United States.

H.R. 12410 would merely extend some of those benefits to the so-called cold war GI's—those with service subsequent to January 31, 1955. It is altogether right that this be done.

Again, I urge passage of H.R. 12410.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, it is most gratifying to see the Congress acting quickly on a permanent GI bill of rights.

The original GI bill was beneficial to the country as well as to the recipients and I am sure that this legislation also will serve that dual purpose. So I am happy to associate myself with the bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas, Representative OLIN TEAGUE, the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, by introducing an identical bill to H.R. 12410.

The bill provides a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving after January 31, 1955, on the basis of a month of training for each month, or fraction thereof, of service, not to exceed 36 calendar months. The rates for full-time training set at $100 per month for a single veteran, $125 per month for a veteran with one dependent, and $150 for a veteran with more than one dependent and proportionate rates for less than full time.

The education provisions are effective June 1, 1966, and education must be completed within 8 years of the date of discharge. The measure also provides for guaranteed and direct loans, with the VA guaranteeing as much as a maximum of $8,500 of any loan by private lenders, and authorizes direct loans where private financing is not available to a maximum of $17,500.

There are miscellaneous provisions of the bill also of great importance—extends presumptions on chronic and tropical diseases; grants medical care for nonservice-connected veterans; provides job counseling and job placement assistance; authorizes a flag to drape the casket of deceased veterans of service after January 31, 1955, as is now provided war veterans; and grants preference in Federal employment.

I am happy to see that the benefits are also extended to those veterans who have not served overseas because, in the words of Milton, "they also served who only stand and wait."

I am proud to associate myself with this bill and hope that the House and Senate will take swift action in passing the legislation.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, last year, when I became keenly aware that our veterans benefits programs failed to cover service after the end of the Korean war, I introduced bill H.R. 9317 to fill this vacuum and testified in its behalf before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. I am gratified that a similar bill, H.R. 12410, is being considered in the House today.

The minor disparities between my bill and H.R. 12410 are eclipsed by their shared broad purpose—to assist the young men and women who protect our security on the vaguely defined fronts of the cold war as they return to their rightful places in our society.

Surely there can be no arguments on the merits of this purpose. It is buttressed by the general awareness that previous GI bills have benefited not only returning veterans but all of society. The contributions in education, medicine, and technology made by those who were trained and educated under these programs have more than repaid their costs. The United States of America is today reaping the skills and knowledge gained by the aid we extended to those earlier veterans.

Today's generation of young men and women are making the same sacrifices of their lives and plans on fronts that are not always "cold." Today we are recognizing and acting on two realities: First, the benefits we seek to extend to cold war veterans have been earned; and second, those benefits are an investment in the continuing stability and enrichment of our Nation. The House can acknowledge these realities by an overwhelming vote in support of H.R. 12410.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we have the opportunity to correct some of the deficiencies in the present veterans' laws which bar many veterans from obtaining benefits, although they served honorably as members of our armed services.

There is no doubt in my mind that the measure now being debated will assist the many veterans who were discharged after January 31, 1955, to obtain assistance for their education, enable them to apply for guaranteed and direct home loans, permit them to obtain non-service-connected medical care, preference in employment in the Federal service, and other miscellaneous benefits which were not previously extended to them.

H.R. 12410 is the vehicle which will provide a permanent program of educational assistance to individuals who were discharged after January 31, 1955. This educational assistance will be on the basis of 1 month of education for each month spent in the services, with a maximum of 36 months for each individual.

We are providing an allowance of $100 per month for single veterans, $125 for veterans with one dependent, and $150 for a veteran with more than one dependent.

In this legislation we guarantee home loans for veterans of up to $7,500, with direct loans of up to $17,500 where private financing is not available.

The present law allows medical care only for service-connected disabilities in a Veterans' Administration facility to those servicemen who were discharged after January 31, 1955. This measure is making it possible for this group to be considered for non-service-connected medical care on the same basis as the veterans of earlier conflicts.

This eligibility is based, as are previous eligibilities, upon the availability of a bed and upon the signing of an oath that the serviceman does not have the necessary funds to pay for outside medical care.

Currently applicable laws permit preference in employment in the various Federal services only to veterans who were discharged prior to January 31, 1955. This measure expands that portion of the law and will be of great benefit to our servicemen who were discharged after January 31, 1955, and are seeking Federal employment.

In enacting this bill into law, we must take cognizance of the fact that these neglected veterans have been disrupted from civilian life to serve their country. They did not hesitate to go into the ranks of the armed services, although to many it was a definite hardship. We must take positive action today to correct this disparity in the law and provide for these loyal, freedom-loving veterans, with assistance which they may have need for.

This measure is similar to the bill which was passed by the other body, except that it provides smaller monthly payments. Our Committee on Veterans' Affairs has held hearings on the proposal set out in the Senate GI bill, and several discussions on the bill now before us. The committee was in agreement that some sort of aid be given to these veterans who were neglected in other measures.

I wish to take this opportunity in congratulating our chairman in taking expeditious action on this bill and hope that the other body will accept this proposal so that it will become effective in as short a period of time as possible.

At present many of our boys are shedding their blood and giving up their lives for their country. We must recognize the fact that those who return to civilian life should have an expression from a grateful nation. This bill will, in a small measure, provide that gratitude, and will assist our servicemen in returning to a normal civilian life. It will show them that we do care for what they have undergone to preserve our standard of living and understanding the problems which they will have to face after the completion of their military mission.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I am unavoidably absent on official business in Georgia; however, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support of and associate myself as a cosponsor of H.R. 12410, introduced on January 31, 1966, by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. This bill, which is designed to extend educational assistance and home loan benefits to persons who have served in the Armed Forces since January 31, 1955, is needed legislation.

The GI bills of World War II and the Korean conflict have worked very well. The revenue expended for these programs has resulted in increased revenue to the U.S. Treasury because of the increased earning capacity of those who received the benefits.

H.R. 12410 is designed to accomplish the same objective, and there is every reason to assume that it will do just that. Because the number of young men available to fill essential technical and professional posts is, at the present time, the lowest in ratio to our total population, our Nation will be able to utilize the skills and abilities of veterans who would benefit from this assistance program.

During the last decade, members of the Armed Forces have served throughout the world, and, in many instances, have served under combat or near-combat conditions. Also, the United States has gone through a series of crises associated with Cuba, Berlin, Laos, Taiwan-Matsu, the Dominican Republic, and Vietnam. The perpetual cold war conditions which have existed during the time period covered by H.R. 12410 make this bill necessary if our servicemen are to receive equitable treatment.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of readjustment assistance for veterans. Certainly, this is a measure that has long commanded the support and the interest of the American public, and it is heartening to note the progress it has made during the 89th Congress. I sincerely hope—and I am sure that a majority of my colleagues are with me on this—that this session will see the enactment of the cold war GI bill.

My concern for the necessity of such legislation led me to introduce H.R. 5413 almost 1 year ago, during the last session. My bill is identical to the measure that passed the Senate last summer, S. 9, and both bills are substantially the same as H.R. 12410, the bill now on the floor. The proposed legislation would provide assistance to veterans with a record of more than 6 months' active service, any part of which occurred after January 31, 1955, who wish to continue their education in secondary schools, institutions of higher learning, or in other approved vocational or professional courses; it would also guarantee loans made before January 31, 1975.

In favoring such a broad program, I am relying with confidence on the pattern of success achieved by the first two GI bills. It has been pointed out many times, we are indeed fortunate to have the advantage of precedents which have yielded such glowing results. The 50 percent of the World War II veterans and the 42 percent of the Korean war veterans who furthered their educational goals my means of governmental assistance distinguished themselves as mature students. They appreciated the value of education. They helped substantially to raise the overall average of education in this country and to increase the level of productivity.

The outcome of Public Laws 346 and 500, the acts which provided readjustment assistance to veterans of the last two wars, is manifest not only in numerical descriptions of success furnished to us by statistics, but in the lives and the work of the Americans who received the benefits. In the light of their contribution to their country not only during the wars but afterward and since, there can be little argument against the assertion that the United States is the real beneficiary of the GI bills.

It is not my intent to take up my colleagues' time with statistical proofs of past success; these figures are familiar and frequently offered justifications for

future action. While I put great stock in past experiences, I am concerned with the special needs of the present. One of these is to alleviate the inequity that results from the impact of the compulsory draft law, which requires all young men to register, but at the same time favors with a deferment those who can afford a college education on their own. The policy of granting deferment to college students is a good one and ought to be retained. However, it has had the effect of allowing many otherwise eligible men to avoid the draft at least partially by virtue of their economic position, while those unable to afford a college education are inducted and often forced to forgo any aspirations for better training and better jobs after they return to civilian life. Fairness demands that we consider the plight of those young men constituting 44 percent of those eligible, who are inducted.

A second need is the fundamental necessity to fortify our Nation against the dangers that weaken us from within. I am not referring to the protection afforded by armies and fighter planes, but the protection that inheres in a well-educated, prosperous, and healthy society. To this end recent Congresses have inaugurated programs laudable for their goals and for the promise of their achievements. Aid to education is an ally in the battle against poverty, unemployment, and denial of opportunity. The Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 would be a true ally on all of these battlefronts. Providing new educational opportunities to veterans, many of whom are currently forced to accept unemployment compensation, would raise their earning capability and help them to help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we are not here legislating a political handout. The proposed measure will unlock the doors that would be otherwise shut in the face of our cold war veteran. The men who will receive the proposed allowances will have to work very hard to achieve their goals, and when they succeed, the country as a whole will reap the benefits.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the veterans' education and loan guaranty bill, H.R. 12410, now before us.

I view this measure as a well-directed Federal program which, unlike many others, goes to the heart of the problem and satisfies the needs of the people involved directly, without having its purposes and funds diluted and siphoned off by bureaucracy and extensive redtape. I congratulate the Veterans' Affairs Committee on producing a bill which represents much thoughtful deliberation and will greatly benefit many present, former, and future servicemen.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, today we consider a bill that has a plain and realistic title—"Education and Other Benefits for Veterans of Service after January 31, 1955." That is an interesting title.

First, it deletes the words "cold war" which heretofore have been used in connection with this legislation. I hope it reflects the demise of the fiction that we are presently engaged in a cold war.

Secondly, the title reflects what is in the bill and what our objective should be and always should have been—to provide educational and other assistance which in some measure makes up for the loss of time and opportunities incurred by those young men who serve their country in military uniform—whether in war or peace, whether stateside or in an area of hostilities. In some measure also, it makes up for the fact that while certain of our young men lose this time and these opportunities, others do not. It is regrettable that it has taken a hot war to drive these points home to us and to bring this legislation this far along toward enactment.

I urge the passage of this bill with its principles essentially intact.

I know the administration would prefer to limit any readjustment assistance to those who have served since heavy fighting began in Vietnam and to distinguish between those who have served in combat zones and those who have not. In my estimation, that approach falls far short of our major purpose. It fails to recognize the inequities resulting from the fact that the burden of military service falls unevenly upon our young men. It largely reduces the assistance to the category of bonuses for service in combat zones when rewards for such service—including extra pay and tax relief—already exist. It places the assignment of military manpower on a roulette wheel and turns it into a game of fate.

I support the bill reported by our Veterans' Affairs Committee because it recognizes, without any reservations, that this investment of the taxpayer's money is one of the most prudent and rewarding ones we could make.

The World War II and Korean war GI bills, after which this one is patterned, have cost us some $19 billion. But it is estimated that this investment will be completely repaid by 1970. It will be paid off by then because the education and training provided under those two programs have enabled nearly 11 million veterans to earn higher incomes and therefore to contribute more taxes to our coffers. For just that reason, this investment now is being repaid at the rate of approximately $1 billion a year.

Moreover, these programs have provided our country with millions of scientists, engineers, teachers and other professional and skilled people we otherwise would not have. Not only have these people greatly strengthened our economy. They have made immeasurable contributions to our cultural life and to the advancement of our civilization.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one to quibble with experiments of the recent past that have proven themselves out so magnificently. I urge that we do it again.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I want to state my wholehearted support for the bill which is now pending before this body. I especially want to commend my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, OLIN TEAGUE, for his determined efforts as chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee to see that as strong a bill as possible was brought before the House. I had the privilege in December to be in Vietnam with the gentleman and to observe with him at firsthand the very real conditions of war which are faced by our military forces in that country and in the rest of southeast Asia.

There are men and women, Mr. Speaker, who in many cases, have given up the beginnings of a family life and a career in order to serve their country in the farthest reaches of the world. This has been their duty, Mr. Speaker, and they have gone.

In the similar situations created by World War II and the Korean war this country has seen fit to compensate its veterans for their sacrifice by passing what has been rather familiarly labeled, the GI bill of rights. Under these veterans' programs thousands of our returning young people have been given a boost as they have attempted to pick up the threads of civilian life and start in anew.

We have the living example of these programs before us, Mr. Speaker, as we consider H.R. 12410 today, and it is an example of success. Not only have the educational and home loan benefits been of tremendous assistance to the veterans, but the assistance that has been theirs has been passed on to the entire country as well in the form of a directly related increase in the national standard of living. The returning GI's have proved to be mature, conscientious students and businessmen. Their renewed sense of purpose and determination has enabled them to capitalize upon the provisions of the GI bill both to their own deserved benefit and to that of their friends and neighbors across the country as well.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 12410. It represents a realistic recognition of the great sacrifices that our young men and women in military service have made, and are presently making, on behalf of freedom around the globe. And it will be one of the greatest investments we in the 89th Congress can possibly make in the continued growth and strength in our country.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in giving my wholehearted support to the cold war veterans' GI bill. As a sponsor of H.R. 4004, a bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period, I am delighted that this measure, H.R. 12410, has been called up for consideration so early in this session of Congress. It is my hope that the House will quickly approve this legislation which is long overdue.

Since the Korean armistice was signed in 1953, American servicemen have been on duty continuously all over the world. They are serving in the Arctic, in the jungles of southeast Asia, in Cuba and Latin America, in Berlin, and on the seven seas; all these men, serving on land, sea, and in the air are on the alert to protect our Nation and to fulfill America's dream of a peaceful world.

The same problems of readjustment and economic dislocation that prevailed during the Korean period are faced today by thousands of young men returning from service in the Armed Forces. Many of these young men will face not only the serious problems of adapting back to

civilian life, but will also find themselves far behind those in their age group who were allowed to continue their schooling and their careers. This is the reason behind the cold war GI bill. It proposes to balance this situation and to give the veteran who has sacrificed 2, 3, or 4 years of his life an opportunity to catch up with his nonveteran companions whose lives were not disrupted by military service.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my support to this proposed legislation.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today we meet to consider a bill of great importance and inestimable value. It is H.R. 12410, a bill to enhance the benefits of service in the Armed Forces of the United States and further extend the benefits of higher education by providing a broad program of educational benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955.

I would like to commend Chairman TEAGUE and the committee for the work it has done and add that it is a matter of great pleasure for me to know that this proposal will soon be before the House of Representatives.

One of the very first bills which I had the pleasure of sponsoring when first coming to the Congress was H.R. 4779, introduced March 12, 1963. This bill would also have provided educational and other benefits for our service veterans who had served since the lapse of the Korean benefit program on January 31, 1955.

My purpose in supporting such legislation was the firm belief, based on the history of the two previous benefit programs, that through it this Nation would benefit significantly by a rich harvest of better educated and trained young Americans and by a deep personal feeling that those Americans who have served their Nation during the uncertain and often dark days of the cold war certainly have shared at times risks, if not equal to, at least measurable to those faced by those who served during time of combat though not in hostile theaters. Certainly those young men moved to alert during the Cuban missile crisis or during those dreadful confrontations in Berlin and at the wall must have felt in their hearts that the risk they faced was indeed grave.

There have been vast amounts expended to date in this area. The Veterans' Administration reports that the cost to the Treasury for the programs of World War II and the Korean war was $14 billion.

But what is more important than expenditure is the return.

Those benefiting from the earlier programs are now taxpayers themselves. More importantly, they are paying more taxes because the knowledge they gained through the availability of these training programs equipped them to secure better and higher paying economic positions in our society.

The facts disclose this harvest now being reaped by our Nation's economy.

I would like to cite just a few:

First. The Bureau of the Census reports that the 2.2 million veterans who have received training under the two previous programs are today paying $1 billion more in taxes each year than they would have paid had they not had the advantages of this education and training.

Second. In addition to increasing our national revenues, as a result of the World War II program alone, our Nation has gained 450 thousand engineers, 350 thousand teachers, 280 thousand metalworkers, and as many doctors, dentists, nurses, scientists as the population total of the State of Alaska. It is important to note these professions, for the most part, require great skill and extensive training at considerable cost. Had it not been for the World War II and Korean war bills, many of these practicing professional persons might never have had the opportunity to train for and earn degrees in these fields which were essential to the scientific, educational, and medical achievements which this Nation has experienced over the last generation.

Third. But it was not only in these fields that the door to greater American future. This opportunity was extended to and received by nearly 11 million veterans. Of these, 44.4 percent took advantage of this opportunity to achieve trade skills and technical training. Another 29 percent entered our colleges and universities. The remainder underwent on-the-job and on-the-farm training.

Fourth. As a result of the two previous programs the general educational level of this Nation has risen significantly though it is still shamefully short of the mark of excellence required to meet our Nation's needs. Prior to the enactment of the original World War II benefit program the educational level of the average head of household was less than 9 years. Since that time it has risen to 10.4 years. This is not to credit the programs with this total increase. But we cannot gainsay the fact they contributed significantly.

Now we have before us a bill which would not only reinstitute a program of benefits for individuals but a program which will indefinitely broaden the horizon of opportunity for past, present, and future young Americans who serve their country. Passage of this bill will add another pillar to the monument of advancement for American education which this Congress has constructed.

We had long accepted the fact that we were not doing enough for education in America.

We had long known that we could do better.

We had long been struck with the fearful knowledge that unless we provided greater opportunity for knowledge this great Nation was in danger of being swept from the strong current of world leadership into the dark swirling eddys of national decline.

We had long acknowledged the challenge.

This Congress has accepted that challenge, moving ahead with accelerated pace to insure that education in America is the broadest in its availability at all levels.

This bill would take us one more step along the path to excellence.

It would significantly enhance the educational opportunities for our sons and daughters of the future while insuring that America's military might and preparedness for the future will be equal to any challenge to our Nation's defense or to the peace and security of the free world.

It was President Johnson who so succinctly stated that each time we broaden the base of abundance, we give more people the chance to produce and consume, create new industry, and provide better incomes. This bill would broaden that base.

We have needed a program such as this for too long a time. But often realization of need requires the catalyst of extraordinary times.

These are extraordinary times.

The war in Vietnam is an extraordinary war.

It has none of the formalities of a declared war.

Yet it has the financial burdens.

It imperils the security of our Nation.

It threatens the peace of the free world.

It endangers the future of the entire world.

And it is costing a terrible price in casualties suffered and lives lost by young Americans.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would again like to express my commendation to Chairman TEAGUE and the work of his committee. I feel this is an excellent program, and would like to express my commitment to its goals.

This bill is realistic. It is long overdue. The question which we now face is not can this Nation afford it; the question is do we dare not afford it.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years, young men have been inducted into military service, either as volunteers or by the Selective Service, where they use 2 or more years of that period of their lives which is normally spent in college or some other type of vocational training or job experience. These men and women are selected as the best physical and mental specimens of their age group.

Once inducted into the service, they no longer control their destinies or assignments and each and every one is available for duty in the hot spots and cold war areas. On that basis, all service personnel are entitled to equal consideration and assistance from their Government.

After 2 years or more of service, they come back to seek their place in our economic system, only to find that they are competing with those who remained in college or received vocational or on-the-job training. The result is that, except for those in the service who received training which can be used in civilian life, they find they are handicapped in competing for employment with those who are not called into the service of their country.

It is essential that these individuals be given an opportunity to compete for their place in our economy on an equal basis and for that reason we must provide an opportunity for them to continue their education, to receive training for

industrial jobs, and/or financial assistance if they wish to go into business for themselves.

I urge every Member of this body to support the committee bill, H.R. 12410, before us today and provide an opportunity for the conference committee to broaden these provisions more in line with my bill, H.R. 10023.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on H.R. 12410, the peacetime veterans' benefit bill introduced by our distinguished colleague, Mr. TEAGUE, of Texas.

On February 1 of this year, concerned with what I thought might result in a very watered-down veterans' bill reaching the floor, I introduced H.R. 12424. Many persons belonging to veterans' groups told me they were fearful that a strong veterans' bill would not be introduced.

Last week, our very able chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, introduced H.R. 12410. I feel that, overall, it is a stronger and better bill than my own. For that reason I plan to support and vote for passage of the bill before this House today.

I urge my colleagues to remember that this bill is not a handout or a special consideration to any veteran. It is an investment in the future of this country. Veterans who took advantage of GI bills offered as a result of World War II and the Korean conflict have returned that money to the Government almost threefold. They have become better educated, learned more skills, and therefore returned many more tax dollars throughout their lifetime than they would have without these advantages.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12410, the so-called cold war GI bill.

I would like to commend the very distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], for his support of this vitally needed piece of legislation.

While I sponsored legislation which is similar to S. 9, legislation sponsored by another able Texan in the other body, the senior Senator from the Lone Star State, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, I realize that the exigencies of practical politics require that some kind of bill be brought to the floor. While this measure does not provide all the benefits to our young men in uniform that it might, it is, however, a satisfactory compromise between what we would like to do and what we can do.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an investment in America. When this legislation is signed into law we will increase educational opportunities for millions of young men and women with a minimum of red-tape and bureaucracy. I have no doubt that this bill will pay for itself in the form of increased revenue just as the earlier World War II and Korean GI bills did. Eleven million Americans took advantage of these two bills and their educational success and their accomplishments are a proud page in American history. Very rarely do we have an opportunity to see the fruits of legislative action so clearly demonstrated.

There are so many arguments in favor of this bill which have been expressed by so many Members that I will not take the time of this House to reiterate what has been said so many times by so many Members. But I would like to speak briefly about a constituent of mine, and his wife who have been among the most ardent supporters of this bill. William Withee, a native of Jersey City, is a student at the University of Maryland. He is an honorably discharged veteran who served his country in the U.S. Marine Corps. While a marine he met a very lovely girl, then serving with the women marines, whom he subsequently married. When he was discharged he enrolled at the University of Maryland and with the help of his wife and part-time work, he is getting by, as a student, but his wife has had to postpone her own education in order to allow her husband to continue his schooling. When this bill is passed life will be a little brighter for William and Doris Withee. More than this, however, Congress will have helped two ambitious and energetic young people to make a greater contribution to their community. These are the kind of Americans that we should invest in, and make no mistake about it, the Withees are not unique. They are, I feel, typical of the most dynamic element in our society, the young Americans who will leave this Nation a better place than they found it.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the many Members of this House, who sponsored legislation to provide educational opportunity for our peacetime veterans, I am very happy to speak in favor of H.R. 12410. This is a great day for millions of young servicemen and veterans. I urge every Member of this House to demonstrate his confidence in these young people by supporting this bill.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12410 which in my opinion is a piece of legislation long overdue. I have long been in favor of such legislation and I commend Chairman TEAGUE and the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for bringing this measure before the House. The GI bill of World War II proved to be one of the greatest legislative measures passed by the Congress this century. Thousands upon thousands of veterans are now college graduates making tremendous contributions to the strength and greatness of American who would not have been able to obtain a college education without the GI bill.

Thousands upon thousands of veterans are now homeowners only because of the GI bill. This bill will extend similar benefits to our veterans now fighting for our country in the jungles of South Vietnam. This bill should pass the House without a single dissenting vote, acted upon by the Senate in similar fashion, and signed into law immediately by the President as a measure which America owes to its veterans now serving their country and those having served since 1955.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today the House is debating a historic and important bill, one which will compensate those who have served their country in the armed services and will increase this Nation's stock of well-trained minds. I have urged the House to pass such a bill ever since I introduced H.R. 8196 in the 88th Congress. I recall making a major speech in support of my cold war GI bill on August 21, 1963. What I said then on the floor is applicable today. This bill represents an investment in the youth of America.

If this new GI bill has one fraction the success of the World War II GI bill, it will be a grand triumph. That earlier bill was responsible for the training of 18,000 doctors and registered nurses, 113,000 physical and research scientists, 450,000 civil engineers, 36,000 clergymen, and 711,000 skilled mechanics. Its contribution to the energetic transition from a wartime to a peacetime America was immense.

My only reservation about H.R. 12410, is that I do not feel that it goes far enough. I would have preferred the enactment of my own H.R. 5678 which is substantially the same as S. 9. My bill would have provided one-half again as many days of training for each day of service. It would have provided substantially larger payments. Moreover, it would have provided payments for on-the-job trainees and on-farm trainees. In short, it would have duplicated the provisions of the highly successful World War II GI bill.

Nevertheless, the bill before us today should boost the morale of the men in our armed services and promise them a brighter future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for H.R. 12410 and commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to lend my support to that of others of my colleagues for the GI education bill under discussion this afternoon—H.R. 12410. While I think it could have provided more generously for our GI's, many of whom now are in combat in the jungles of Vietnam, it is indeed an improvement over what the administration had budgeted for such a program. I believe the figures are some $327 million in this bill as against $100 million proposed by the administration.

I am disappointed that the monthly rates provided veterans for education in this bill are not as high as was provided under the Korean program. I would like to have seen adopted the rates proposed by my colleague from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR]. But there is always the possibility of improving this measure at some future date.

I should like to remind this body, that Republicans, for more than a year, have called on the administration to bring forth some kind of GI bill. I cannot understand the reluctance to do so when we seem to have money for every other program that comes down the pike. I do not understand why it has been necessary for anyone to plead and argue for GI benefits, when right at this moment our American boys are fighting a tougher, more treacherous war than Americans have ever fought, including the trenches of World War I. These young men are fighting, and dying, for the freedom of a

distant land. It is an idealistic war, not fought by us for gain of any material sort. Surely, when their painful assignments are ended, and they return to their country, some gratitude is due them.

I should like to point out too, that past GI education bills have been tremendously successful. GI students proved themselves better, more ambitious students than the usual undergraduates. They benefited from what they learned because they, many of them, had family responsibilities to meet, and saw clearly the benefits, indeed, the necessity, of an education. And of course the country benefited too.

For these reasons, I support this measure with the hope that the program it produces can be improved in the future.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, after one of Gen. Wallace Greene's inspection trips to Vietnam last year, the Marine Corps Commandant returned to the United States where an anxious press and Nation awaited his professional evaluation of the situation. Remembering contributions of other marines in other wars, one might say it is almost a part of our national heritage to weigh and value the comments of a Marine Corps Commandant returning from the front in time of war.

As I recall watching parts of General Greene's television interview, one remark seemed particularly appropriate in view of all of the demonstrations and draft card burnings. General Greene was not only concerned with the welfare of our military and naval forces in South Vietnam, but about the attitude of the American people here at home.

The general assured us of the competence of our men and equipment in South Vietnam. Their loyalty and devotion to duty and country cannot be challenged.

The general in his remarks did, however, inject one thought relating to the concern that the fighting men have as it relates to our attitude here at home toward the war in South Vietnam. They will not let us down, and we, as a nation, must not let them down; therefore, I am grateful for this time, Mr. Speaker, to go on record in support of the GI bill legislation we are considering here today. I know of no other thing that we could do here today to bolster the morale of our fighting men in South Vietnam. The House Veterans' Affairs Committee is to be commended for the prompt attention it gave to this measure.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12410, to provide a broad program of educational benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and certain members of the Armed Forces. This is one of many bills introduced by Members of the House to provide fair treatment for our soldiers, referred to as the "cold war GI bills."

On January 27, 1966, I introduced H.R. 12379, which is identical to S. 9 passed by the Senate last session providing broader benefits in the range of the Korean war GI bill of rights. While the version before the House today is not as broad a legislative proposal as the Senate-passed version, it is a start—an important step in the right direction. We have come to realize that the distinction between wartime and peacetime veterans for the purpose of computing veterans' benefits can be quite artificial. Today our servicemen are found in various corners of the world, defending freedom and resisting aggression with as much determination and facing as much danger as those who were engaged in wartime service. The distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, has drafted the legislation before us today with this concept in mind. This is an attempt to establish a model for a permanent program of veterans' benefits, a worthy and a desirable cause.

While my bill would have provided broader benefits to our servicemen, I support H.R. 12410, and urge my colleagues to support it. We take a step forward today in the field of education and other benefits for those men who answer their Nation's call to duty. This truly falls within the category of priority legislation—those bills which establish or expand programs in the fields of health, education, and others designed to meet human needs at home—a category which must not be sacrificed because of our extensive commitments abroad. Rather, this legislation is part of that commitment to freedom abroad and at home, because it provides fair treatment for those who represent us in the fight for freedom.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the action taken by the House this afternoon in passing a cold war GI benefits bill. It is with much pleasure that I supported such action relative to this much-needed legislation, for congressional initiative is the means by which GI benefits can be extended to veterans of current and recent service. Passage of this bill by the House has been a crucial step forward in making available to these men certain opportunities and assistance accorded veterans of World War II and the Korean war.

It is apparent that our involvement in Vietnam has served to increase the recognition that has been given Armed Forces personnel who have had to postpone their education and career plans because of military service, and this legislation is in response to the needs of Armed Forces personnel who are returning to civilian life.

Congress must act in accordance with the sacrifices and contributions made by our men in the Armed Forces to national and international security. The favorable action taken today on the bill, which was reported by the Veterans' Affairs Committee last Thursday, is most encouraging, and I am pleased to have worked for and supported legislation to extend cold war GI benefits.

Though this bill differs from mine in that it does not allow for institutional on-farm training, apprenticeship or on-the-job training, or provide as great an education assistance allowance, I still take pleasure in having voted in favor of the bill before us. It is my sincere hope that the House and Senate may soon reach agreement on a single version so that enactment into law will become a reality at the earliest possible time.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see action being taken on this bill to grant to the veterans of our armed services educational and other benefits similar to those which had been extended to veterans of World War II and the Korean war.

I believe the favorable results of the previous law are ample justification for enactment of the one now under consideration.

The young men who devote 2 or more years of their lives to serving in the Armed Forces are most deserving of these benefits. Many of them serve at great sacrifice—delaying their education, their careers, being separated from their families.

This measure will in a small way compensate for those sacrifices and will, in the long run, be of tremendous benefit to the Nation as a whole. An educated citizenry is essential to the strength and progress of our country, and many of the veterans who otherwise would not have the opportunity to receive higher education or specialized training will now be able to pursue those goals.

I am more than happy to express my complete and wholehearted support of this bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of two wars—the Spanish-American War and World War I—I always have felt a warm closeness to the cause of the veterans.

Today I am glad to join with my colleagues in support of H.R. 12410 and in commendation of its author, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, the great and dedicated chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. This good measure will provide educational and other readjustment benefits to the men and women of our armed services after the Korean war. Included in its coverage are those who now are engaged in the bloody conflict with communism in Vietnam. I know of no measure that possibly could be received by the entire membership of this House with a greater depth of approving sentiment.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that at this session of the 89th Congress legislation will be enacted giving to all the veterans of World War I a pension comparable to that which Congress in its wisdom and patriotic generosity some years ago voted to the veterans of the war with Spain.

The cruel fact is that many thousands of the veterans of World War I are unable to meet the high cost of living on pensions, many as low as $78 a month. Many without any pensions at all are in miserable need. These are the men and women who in their youth offered their all in the cause of the country of their affection. It is revolting to any sense of decency and contrary to any conception of common gratitude that they should continue to go unaided and unattended by the Republic they served.

I earnestly call upon the fine and virile organization of the Veterans of World War I to drive with all its strength for the enactment of its bill at this session of the Congress and to that drive I pledge my full support.

There was no such thing as a bill of rights for World War I veterans and they had a hard time getting back on their feet after discharge in 1919 and 1920. In giving my enthusiastic support to legislation for the returning veterans of World War II and the Korean war, and in supporting this bill with all my heart, I am not unmindful that there is still much to be done for the remaining veterans of World War I that in some measure could make amends for the neglect of the past. I urge the great Veterans' Affairs Committee to give its immediate and intensive attention to this end.

Mr. Speaker, I think it not inappropriate at this time to include in my remarks on H.R. 12410 my speech on June 26, 1958, when the House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, as follows:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as the last Spanish War veteran in this body, I feel that my comrades in a conflict of six decades ago would wish me to speak. I am giving full and enthusiastic support to this bill. I commend the great Judiciary Committee for reporting out a measure calculated at long last to bring the veterans of World War I into their own organization with the dignity, prestige, and authority of a charter granted by the Congress of the United States.

Illinois is proud that she is the birth State of the Grand Army of the Republic, which set the pattern of veterans of one war being banded in an organization to serve God, country, and the veteran cause as long as any of the veterans of that war remained alive, and then to go the way of all things human. In supporting this bill I am responding to the spirit of Illinois and the sentiment of her people.

For many years after the close of the Civil War it was the Union veterans banded in the Grand Army of the Republic that carried in every northern State and in every northern city and village the banner of veteran solidarity and of the patriotism that has its highest expression in the veterans who have fought together in their youth for the country of their love.

Then, while many in the Grand Army of the Republic were still alive and active, came the war with Spain and after that conflict the forming and the chartering of the United Spanish War Veterans. As the years passed and death thinned the ranks of the Grand Army of the Republic, the service of taking over fell to the United Spanish War Veterans.

There had been a link between the Grand Army of the Republic and the United Spanish War Veterans by reason of the fact that many who had fought in the War of the States, both on the northern and on the southern side, fought again in the war with Spain. They were a little older in years but still young in patriotism. There were members of the Grand Army of the Republic who also were members of the United Spanish War Veterans. Each veteran organization had its own work to do.

When World War I came the Grand Army of the Republic, to a large extent, had been replaced by the United Spanish War Veterans. The Grand Army of the Republic, even though its ranks had been decimated by the passage of years, continued still to function, but it chores were passed on to the younger man who had fought in the war with Spain.

The Grand Army of the Republic now is gone. It will be remembered with affection in all the years ahead and its history will be an inspiration to all the generations to come. Soon the United Spanish War Veterans will have gone its way, its camps closed, its books and records turned over to history and its last member resting in the grave of an American soldier, sailor, or marine.

I am deeply moved to contemplate that the place of the veterans' organizations that have united those who served the Union in the Civil War and those who served in the war with Spain is to be taken over by a veteran organization chartered by the Congress of the United States, and memberships in which is confined exclusively to those who served in World War I and were honorably discharged at the completion of their service.

There will come a day, and it is not too long away considering that the average age today of those eligible is over 65, when the veterans of World War I of the United States will follow the way of the Grand Army of the Republic and of the United Spanish War Veterans. Then will come, I predict, the formation and chartering of the veterans of World War II and at a little later date the organization and chartering of the veterans of the Korean war.

This, Mr. Chairman, follows the American tradition and it conforms with the rule that persons of common experience and common interest are more efficient in their undertakings when they act in unison.

There were many veterans of the war with Spain who served in World War I, and their interest in the United Spanish War Veterans did not diminish when also they became members of veterans organizations that were open to qualified veterans of later wars.

The chartering of the Veterans of World War I of the United States will not in any way dampen the interest or diminish the loyalty of the veterans of its membership to the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in which great organizations they also may hold membership. I know that has been true in my case. I have been a member of the United Spanish War Veterans since the very earliest days, and I have been a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars during all the years of its existence, and there has never been a moment when my loyalty to one organization made demands upon my loyalty to the other organization. I was among the founders of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, and my loyalty to the United Spanish War Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars was only strengthened by my loyalty to the American Legion. My membership in the Veterans of World War I of the United States further strengthens me in my loyalty to these older organizations and in that devotion to country that every man and woman who has ever served in time of war finds is part and parcel of his being.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that when this bill comes up for passage there will be a rollcall in order that all Members may be put on record. I anticipate that every Member who is on the floor will vote for this bill. When they have done that, there is one further thing that they can do to make this a memorable day and prove fidelity to the veteran cause and friendship to the veterans of World War I, all of them now well on the march to the sunset. On the Clerk's desk is a discharge petition to bring to the floor of the House a bill granting to veterans of World War I a pension similar to the Spanish War pension. That petition has been on the Clerk's desk for many days, and there are not too many signatures. The reason I would say is that the Members of the House, engrossed in many legislative duties, have had good intentions but forgetful minds. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this reminder will play some small part in causing an immediate rush to sign the petition.

The veterans of World War I are no longer young. They now constitute the army of veterans that is passing on, just as the Grand Army of the Republic passed on and as soon the United Spanish War Veterans will pass on. Many of them are in need, and with each year as the disabilities of age multiply their need will intensify. We should not wish it said of our country that any of its servitors in time of military peril was left unaided in his age and in his distresses.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 12410, the cold war veterans' benefit bill. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is to be enthusiastically commended for the outstanding job they did in bringing this legislation to the floor of the House this afternoon. With over 135 bills introduced on the subject, the committee molded the best parts of each into a single bill that is supported by virtually every veteran in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of education, this bill provides for a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving in the Armed Forces, discharged after January 31, 1955. College level and below college level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools is provided. Part-time training is permitted. Eligibility accrues at the rate of 1 month training for 1 month of service, not to exceed 36 months. A minimum of 180 days' service is required to establish eligibility unless the individual is discharged for a service-connected disability. Persons serving on active duty for training do not accrue eligibility. The education and training allowance set by this bill for full-time training is $100 per month for a single veteran, $125 a month for a veteran with one dependent, and $150 a month for a veteran with more than one dependent.

Proportionate rates are paid for three-quarters and half-time training. Education must be completed within 8 years from the date of discharge or 8 years from the effective date of this act. Training is provided for active duty members of the armed services who have served at least 2 years, a portion of which occurred after January 31, 1955. These active-duty members may receive payments for fees and tuition. The administrative provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, for Korean conflict veterans, and the war orphans' training program are applicable to this new program. Schools will be approved by the State approval agencies of the various States, and these agencies will be responsible for extending supervision to approved schools.

Other provisions of this act call for the Veterans' Administration home loan guarantee program to be extended to this new group of veterans discharged after January 31, 1955. The guaranteed loan by a private lender of $7,500 is continued. Direct loans for housing in rural areas and small towns, established as direct-loan areas, will be available to this group. The maximum amount of the direct loan is increased from $15,000 to $17,500. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is

given authority to regulate the interest rate, consistent with the ceiling established for the Federal Housing Administration. A fund is established for the Administrator to offset losses, by requiring the veteran to pay five one-hundredths of 1 percent of his loan at closing.

At the present time, veterans serving after January 31, 1955, are eligible for medical care in Veterans' Administration facilities only for service-connected disabilities. Under this act, this group is made eligible for non-service-connected medical care on the same basis as veterans of earlier wars. Eligibility for non-service-connected medical care is based on availability of a bed and the signing of an oath of inability to pay, as is required of veterans of earlier wars entering for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities.

Preference in employment in Federal service is extended to this group being discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as is currently applicable to war veterans. Persons serving on duty for training purposes do not accrue veterans' preference rights.

War veterans are now covered by certain presumptions of service connection for a long list of chronic and tropical diseases. Peacetime veterans do not enjoy these presumptions of service connection. Under this bill, the wartime presumptions are extended to the group being discharged after January 31, 1955.

A flag is provided to drape the casket of war veterans. This provision is extended to peacetime veterans.

War veterans are provided job counseling and job placement assistance by the Department of Labor. The bill provides that peacetime veterans should be placed on the same basis.

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act is amended to increase protection for individuals who are renting homes when they are called to service. The amount of rental covered is increased from $80 monthly to $150 monthly.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is designed to recognize the dedicated service of our military personnel during the so-called cold war. The people of this country have spoken out in support of this bill. They have asked that we help the men who risked their lives to protect our freedom.

Some people who do not fully understand the provisions of this bill might label it as fringe benefits for our veterans. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, could be further from the truth. The provisions of this act are rightful benefits which should accompany the service of men and women to our country.

The legislation has my full support and I urge my colleagues to join me in giving the bill our unanimous support.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I vigorously support H.R. 12410, the bill to provide education and other benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955.

This bill was unanimously approved by the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. It is a good bill, and a major step forward in providing cold war veterans realistic compensation for service in Vietnam and elsewhere.

The bill is more far reaching than the bill passed by the Senate last year, and it contains most of the provisions of my own GI cold war bill, H.R. 12215, which I introduced on January 20, 1966, and which extended the provisions of the Korean conflict GI bill.

The new GI bill provides a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving after January 31, 1955, on the basis of a month of training for each month of service up to 3 years. It also provides the same educational benefits as those provided by the Korean conflict GI bill.

The loan-guarantee provisions are the same as for veterans of the Korean service. The Veterans' Administration guarantees as much as $7,500, and direct loans also are authorized where private financing is not available, up to $17,500.

H.R. 12410 also contains all of the important provisions for medical care and job training for veterans as were provided in the Korean conflict GI bill.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am glad that so many of the provisions of my bill have been included in H.R. 12410. I am satisfied that this bill is complete in all essential details and will adequately provide for veterans of the Vietnam conflict as well as areas of potential conflict.

I am confident that the President will sign this legislation promptly.

During the congressional recess it was my privilege, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to travel to Vietnam, and to observe firsthand the hazards faced by American fighting men, and to see their dedication to duty in the swamps and jungles under the most difficult conditions.

It was also my privilege to visit our troops in Korea which are holding the cease-fire line in that sensitive and important area which was won at such great cost.

Every Member of Congress who has visited these areas has been impressed with the quality of character and dedication of American fighting men who are serving on the frontiers of freedom. Today our servicemen are serving under combat or near-combat conditions in many areas of the world. During the period of time which is covered by this bill, our Nation has gone through a series of crises associated with Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Taiwan-Matsu, Lebanon, Berlin, Laos, and now Vietnam. As the committee report says, "The perpetual cold war condition, with its crises, compulsory military service, and expanded overseas commitments, makes this bill necessary if our servicemen, during this tense period of history, are to receive equitable treatment."

In Vietnam, in Korea, in the Dominican Republic, in Berlin, and in other posts which are now, or may at any moment become hot spots in this cold war period, American fighting men must be ready at any moment to make great sacrifices to preserve our precious heritage of freedom. The cost of stopping aggression is a high one.

It is, therefore, entirely proper and fitting that we at home express our gratitude to and support of our fighting men of the Armed Forces now, as we have in the past, to veterans of World War II, and the Korean conflict, and of World War I. In my opinion, there is no better way to do this than to establish the permanent program provided in H.R. 12410, which will assist these men in obtaining educational benefits and other assistance upon their return to civilian life.

Those who serve in the Armed Forces in this cold war period shoulder a disproportionate burden of citizenship. While they are exposed to great hazards in the service of their country, other young men of their age at home are preparing for occupational or professional careers.

Here at home we must make certain sacrifices to insure that our Armed Forces personnel can, when they return, pick up their lives and progress at a normal rate in our rapidly changing society and economy. We must assist our veterans to adjust to our economy at home when they return, as we pray they will.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the veterans of past wars have not forgotten the benefits they received from the World War II and Korean GI bills.

Early in January, I introduced H.R. 11981 to provide benefits for the cold war and Vietnam veterans. Today the House demonstrated its support by passing a revised bill to 381 to 0.

This bill received the support of all the major veterans organizations, and I am inserting the letters I received from the national commanders:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. RAY ROBERTS,
Washington, D.C.:

We understand that H.R. 12410 reported by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee will be taken up in the House on Monday, February 7. While this bill does not completely satisfy the American Legion's proposals as set forth in H.R. 12186 it does, among other things, provide immediate benefits to the servicemen now returning to civilian life.

We are grateful to the committee for its efforts and hope that the House will act promptly so that a readjustment program for our veterans can be enacted without delay.

L. ELDON JAMES,
National Commander,
American Legion.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D.C., February 3, 1966.

Hon. RAY ROBERTS,
U.S. House of Representatives, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBERTS: The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported H.R. 12410 which will be considered under suspension of the rules by the House, Monday, February 7, 1966.

This cold war GI bill provides for education and training benefits; GI loans; presumptive service connection for tropical and chronic diseases; medical care; job counseling and placement, and other miscellaneous benefits.

The Disabled American Veterans urge your support of this bill.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director of Legislation.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 5, 1966.

Hon. RAY ROBERTS,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Amvets strongly urge the early passage of H.R. 12410 which embraces substantive veterans benefits programs. We feel that the intent of this bill will justify the mandates of our organization and we urge the continued support of you and your colleagues to accomplish this end.

RALPH E. HALL,
Amvets National Commander.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
February 4, 1966.

MEMBER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to H.R. 12410, the cold war GI bill, which is scheduled for your consideration and vote on Monday, February 7.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States favors the extension of wartime veterans rights and benefits to all who have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States since January 31, 1955, the official end of the Korean conflict.

H.R. 12410 is more than a GI bill. Besides educational training and home loan assistance, the bill proposes entitlement to VA hospital care, job counseling assistance, veterans preference in Federal employment, wartime presumptions for service-connected disability for chronic and tropical diseases and other provisions.

Accordingly, H.R. 12410 represents a giant step in the direction of carrying out our national resolution to elevate cold war service in the Armed Forces to wartime status so far as veterans programs are concerned.

Your support and vote in favor of H.R. 12410, therefore, will be deeply appreciated by the 1,300,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Sincerely,

ANDY BORG,
Commander in Chief.

It is a source of personal pride to me and the other members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee that a companion bill, H.R. 12410, received the unanimous vote of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the cold war GI bill will provide an adjustment program necessary to meet the changing needs of our times. Like its predecessors, it reflects our deep-seated gratitude to the men and women who have faithfully served in our Armed Forces during what is termed the cold war. The label "cold war" is in a sense a misnomer since every individual entering the service, regardless of the year or particular world situation can incur risks of a special nature. Furthermore, he may be required to interrupt his education or career, often for an extended period. During this time he receives relatively low pay, certainly not enough to enable him to save for the future education or training essential to a successful career. As a result, some readjustment benefit plan is necessary to help the veteran obtain the education or skills vital in this age of technology. This bill is designed to accomplish just this objective.

It should be remembered that this legislation is of economic value not only to the veteran, but also to his community and Nation. Our society is bound to be enriched by the strengthening of the capabilities of those who will be called upon to lead our Nation in the important years ahead. They will be treated in a manner comparable to that accorded their fathers, brothers, and uncles, who were the beneficiaries of previous GI bills.

In terms of return on investment, there is none better. Experience has shown that the past GI programs have more than repaid their cost in tax revenue received as a result of the increased income of the veterans. I am confident the result of this bill will be likewise.

While much has been said about the educational benefits provided by this legislation, its other provisions are also significant. The home-loan benefits, non-service-connected disability rights and veterans preference provisions are particularly noteworthy. These considerations have been reflected in prior programs which over the years, have proven effective and justifiable.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming bipartisan support which is accorded to this measure deserves more than passing mention. It is not often that legislation of this import can pass without a single dissenting vote. Such backing is a tribute to our veterans and reflects the attitude of a grateful people.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, for some time during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, I had been prodding some of my friends on the Veterans' Affairs Committee to report out H.R. 12410, the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, so I was extremely pleased to see it on the calendar early in this session.

Many of my constituents have written expressing their concern about this measure, particularly with respect to our boys fighting in Vietnam.

This is an excellent bill, Mr. Speaker, as it designs a permanent program for our veterans. As the committee pointed out, the structure of veterans' laws which have developed over the past 200 years has been based on the concept of wartime and peacetime service. In the past, war veterans have been given substantially more benefits than peacetime veterans and this system worked very well through World War II. However, after World War II, when we entered the so-called cold war, problems began to arise. It has been during this period that we have continued compulsory military service for an extended period of time for the first time in our history. Prior to World War II, we had few servicemen stationed outside the United States. Today, however, our servicemen are scattered throughout the world, and in many instances are serving under combat or near combat conditions. During the period of time which is covered by this bill, our Nation has gone through a series of crises associated with Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Taiwan-Matsu, Lebanon, Berlin, Laos, and Vietnam. The perpetual cold war condition, with its crises, compulsory military service, and expanded overseas commitments, makes this bill necessary if our servicemen, during this period of our history, are to receive equitable treatment.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to: first, enhance and make more attractive service in the Armed Forces of the United States; second, extend the benefits of a higher education to qualified and deserving young persons who might not otherwise be able to afford such an education; third, provide vocational readjustment and restore lost educational opportunities to those servicemen and women whose careers have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty after January 31, 1955; and fourth, aid such persons in attaining the vocational and educational status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country.

The committee emphasizes that, as in the case of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, it is not the intention of this legislation to establish a program which completely subsidizes the cost of a veteran's education program, as well as his living costs. This legislation is designed as an aid program and it is expected that in many cases the veteran will be required to make a contribution to the cost of his own education program. It is believed that the veteran will maintain a greater interest in the use made of the funds provided by this bill, if he is required to make a contribution from his own resources.

Moreover, the purpose of the committee is not to equalize educational opportunities for the veteran population, but rather to provide assistance to help a veteran follow the educational plan that he might have adopted had he never entered the Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation further insures that the Nation shall be able to utilize the highest skills and abilities of the veterans who benefit from it. This is especially important since at this time the number of young men available to fill the essential technical and professional posts is the lowest in ratio to our total population which we have had or probably ever will have for a decade to come. In my opinion, it is doubly essential that we make fullest use of the skills of the young men who are available.

I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, this bill has my unconditional support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 12410, as amended.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 381, nays 0, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—381

Abbitt	Andrews, George W.	Bandstra
Abernethy	Andrews, Glenn	Baring
Adair	Annunzio	Barrett
Adams	Ashbrook	Bates
Addabbo	Ashley	Battin
Albert	Ashmore	Beckworth
Anderson, Ill.	Ayres	Belcher
Anderson, Tenn.		Bell
		Bennett

Betts
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—50

Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Aspinall
Baldwin
Berry
Blatnik
Cahill
Craley
Daddario
Devine
Dowdy
Ellsworth
Farnsley
Feighan
Flynt
Fuqua
Griffin
Hansen, Idaho
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Love
McClory
MacGregor
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Michel
Mink
Moorhead
Murray
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Pelly
Pepper
Pickle
Powell
Rogers, Tex.
Rostenkowski
Schisler
Scott
Sweeney
Thomas
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tuck
Vanik
Vivian
Willis

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Arends.

Mr. King of California with Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mrs. Mink with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Love with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Schisler with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Scott with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Ottinger.

Mr. Vivian with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Murray with Mr. Cooley.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Blatnik.

Mr. Vanik with Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Farnsley.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Matsunaga.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Tuck.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Fuqua.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE TO VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

S. 9

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act."

SEC. 2. (a) Title 38 of the United States Code is amended by adding after chapter 39 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 40—EDUCATION OF VETERANS WHO SERVE BETWEEN JANUARY 31, 1955 AND JULY 1, 1967

"Subchapter I—Definitions

"Sec.
"1908. Definitions.

"Subchapter II—Eligibility

"1910. Entitlement to education or training generally.
"1911. Duration of veterans' education or training.
"1912. Commencement; time limitations.
"1913. Expiration of all education and training.

"Subchapter III—Enrollment

"1920. Selection of program.
"1921. Applications; approval.
"1922. Change of program.
"1923. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses.
"1924. Discontinuance for unsatisfactory progress.
"1925. Period of operation for approval.
"1926. Institutions listed by Attorney General.

"Subchapter IV—Payments to veterans

"1931. Education and training allowance.
"1932. Computation of education and training allowances.
"1933. Measurement of courses.
"1934. Overcharges by educational institutions.

"Subchapter V—State approving agencies

"1941. Designation.
"1942. Approval of courses.
"1943. Cooperation.
"1944. Use of Office of Education and other Federal agencies.
"1945. Reimbursement of expenses.

"Subchapter VI—Approval of courses of education and training

"1951. Apprentice or other training on the job.
"1952. Institutional on-farm training.
"1953. Approval of accredited courses.
"1954. Approval of nonaccredited courses.
"1955. Notice of approval of courses.
"1956. Disapproval of courses and discontinuance of allowances.

"Subchapter VII—Miscellaneous provisions

"Sec.
"1961. Authority and duties of Administrator.
"1962. Educational and vocational counseling.
"1963. Control by agencies of United States.
"1964. Conflicting interests.
"1965. Reports by institutions.
"1966. Overpayments to veterans.
"1967. Examination of records.
"1968. False or misleading statements.
"1969. Information furnished by Federal Trade Commission.
"1970. Effective date and retroactive allowances.

"Subchapter I—Definitions

"§ 1908. Definitions

"(a) For the purpose of this chapter—

"(1) The term 'eligible veteran' means any veteran who is not on active duty and who—

"(A) served on active duty at any time between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967;

"(B) was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable; and

"(C) served on active duty for a period of more than one hundred and eighty days (exclusive of any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians, or as cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies), or was discharged or released from a period of active duty, any part of which occurred between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967, for an actual service-connected disability.

"(2) The term 'program of education or training' means any single unit course or subject, any curriculum, or any combination of unit courses or subjects, which is generally accepted as necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"(3) The term 'course' means an organized unit of subject matter in which instruction is offered within a given period of time or which covers a specific amount of related subject matter for which credit toward graduation or certification is usually given.

"(4) The term 'dependent' means—

"(A) a child of an eligible veteran;

"(B) a parent of an eligible veteran, if the parent is in fact dependent upon the veteran; and

"(C) the wife of an eligible veteran, or, in the case of an eligible veteran who is a woman, her husband if he is in fact dependent upon her.

"(5) The term 'educational institution' means any public or private elementary school, secondary school, vocational school, correspondence school, business school, junior college, teachers college, college, normal school, professional school, university, scientific or technical institution, or other institution furnishing education for adults.

"(6) The term 'training establishment' means any business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job, including those under the supervision of a college or university or any State department of education, or any State apprenticeship agency, or any State board of vocational education, or any joint apprentice committee, or the Bureau of Apprenticeship established in accordance with chapter 4C of title 29, or any agency of the Federal Government authorized to supervise such training.

"(7) The term 'State' includes the Canal Zone.

"(8) The term 'Commissioner' means the United States Commissioner of Education.

"(b) Benefits shall not be afforded under this chapter to any individual on account of service as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or of the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service.

"(c) The Congress of the United States hereby declares that the veterans' education and training program created by this chapter is for the purpose of providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose educational or vocational ambitions have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967, and for the purpose of aiding such persons in attaining the educational and training status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country.

"Subchapter II—Eligibility

"§ 1910. Entitlement to education or training generally

"Each eligible veteran shall, subject to the provisions of this chapter, be entitled to the education or training provided under this chapter.

"§ 1911. Duration of veteran's education or training

"(a) Each eligible veteran shall be entitled to education or training under this chapter for a period equal to one and a half times the duration of his service on active duty between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967, and, with respect to an eligible veteran on active duty on June 30, 1967, service on active duty after such date until his first discharge or release from such active duty after such date (or to the equivalent thereof in part-time training), except that—

"(1) in computing the duration of such service, there shall be excluded a period equal to any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians or served as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies;

"(2) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this chapter shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed thirty-six months reduced by a period equivalent to any period of educational assistance afforded him under chapters 33 and 35 of this title; and

"(3) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this chapter together with vocational rehabilitation training received under chapter 31 of this title, and education or training received under part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1(a), and section 12(a) of the Act enacting this title shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed thirty-six months in the aggregate.

"(b) Whenever the period of entitlement to education or training under this chapter of an eligible veteran who is enrolled in an educational institution regularly operated on the quarter or semester system ends during a quarter or semester and after a major part of such semester or quarter has expired, such period shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester. In all other courses offered by educational institutions, whenever the period of eligibility ends after a major portion of the course is completed such period may be extended to the end of the course or for nine weeks, whichever is the lesser period.

"(c) In the case of any eligible veteran who is pursuing any program of education or training exclusively by correspondence, one-fourth of the elapsed time in following such program of education or training shall be charged against the veteran's period of entitlement.

"§ 1912. Commencement; time limitations

"(a) No eligible veteran shall be entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter after three years after his discharge or release from active duty or after three years after the date of enactment of this chapter, whichever is later. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, any otherwise eligible veteran whom the Administrator determines to have been prevented from initiating a program of education or training under this chapter within the period prescribed by the preceding sentence because he had not met the nature of discharge requirements of section 1908(a)(1)(B) of this title before a change, correction, or modification of a discharge or dismissal made pursuant to section 1553 of title 10, the correction of the military records of the proper service department under section 1552 of title 10, or other corrective action by competent authority, shall be permitted to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter within three years after the date of his discharge or dismissal was so changed, corrected, or modified, or within three years after the date of enactment of this chapter, whichever is later.

"(b) The program of education and training of an eligible veteran under this chapter shall, on and after the delimiting date for the veteran to initiate his program, be pursued continuously until completion, except that an eligible veteran may suspend the pursuit of his program for periods of not more than twelve consecutive months, and may suspend the pursuit of such program for longer periods if the Administrator finds that the suspension for each such period was due to conditions beyond the control of the eligible veteran.

"(c) For the purposes of computing the three-year period under this section and the eight-year period under section 1913, the date of an eligible veteran's discharge or release shall be the date of his discharge or release from his last period of active duty which began before July 1, 1967, but no period of active duty performed after July 1, 1967, shall be included in computing such periods unless it follows a break in active duty status of more than ninety days.

"§ 1913. Expiration of all education and training

"No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran under this chapter beyond eight years after his discharge or release from active duty or eight years after the enactment of this chapter, whichever is later, except that any veteran who is eligible to initiate a program of education or training by reason of the second sentence of section 1912(a) of this title shall be permitted to pursue, subject to the other provisions of this chapter, such program for a period of not more than five years after the date of initiation thereof; but in no event shall education or training be afforded under this chapter after June 30, 1977, unless the veteran's date for initiating his program occurs after June 30, 1972.

"Subchapter III—Enrollment

"§ 1920. Selection of program

"Subject to the provisions of this chapter, each eligible veteran may select a program of education or training to assist him in attaining an educational, professional, or vocational objective at any educational institution or training establishment selected by him, whether or not located in the State in which he resides, which will accept and retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution or establishment finds him qualified to undertake or pursue. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, an eligible veteran may not pursue a program of education or training at an educational institution or training establishment which is not located in a State, unless such program is pursued at an approved educational institution of higher learning. The Administrator in his discretion may deny or discontinue the enrollment under this chapter of any veteran in a foreign educational institution if he finds that such enrollment is not for the best interest of the veteran or the Government.

"§ 1921. Applications; approval

"Any eligible veteran who desires to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter shall submit an application to the Administrator which shall be in such form, and contain such information, as the Administrator shall prescribe. The Administrator shall approve such application unless he finds that such veteran is not eligible for or entitled to the education or training applied for or that his program of education or training fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter, or that the eligible veteran is already qualified, by reason of previous education and training, for the educational, professional, or vocational objective for which the courses of the program of education or training are offered.

The Administrator shall notify the eligible veteran of the approval or disapproval of his application.

"§ 1922. Change of program

"(a) Subject to the provisions of section 1921 of this title, each eligible veteran (except an eligible veteran whose program has been interrupted or discontinued due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application) may, at any time before the end of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter, make not more than one change of program of education or training.

"(b) Each eligible veteran, who has not made a change of program of education or training before the expiration of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter, may make not more than one change of program of education or training with the approval of the Administrator. The Administrator shall approve such a change if he finds that—

"(1) the eligible veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present program and that the failure is not due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application, and if the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude or previous education and training; or

"(2) the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change, while not a part of the program currently pursued by him, is a normal progression from such progam.

"(c) As used in this section the term 'change of program of education or training' shall not be deemed to include a change from the pursuit of one program to pursuit of another where the first program is prerequisite to, or generally required for, entrance into pursuit of the second.

"§ 1923. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses

"(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any bartending course, dancing course, or personality development course.

"(b) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran—

"(1) in any photography course or entertainment course; or

"(2) in any music course—instrumental or vocal—public speaking course, or course in sports or athletics such as horseback riding, swimming, fishing, skiing, golf, baseball, tennis, bowling, sports officiating, or other sport or athletic courses, except courses of applied music, physical education, or public speaking which are offered by institutions of higher learning for credit as an integral part of a program leading to an educational objective; or

"(3) in any other type of course which the Administrator finds to be avocational or recreational in character;

unless the eligible veteran submits justification showing that the course will be of bona fide use in the pursuit of his present or contemplated business or occupation.

"(c) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of any eligible veteran, not already enrolled, in any nonaccredited course below the college level offered by a proprietary profit or proprietary nonprofit educational institution for any period during which the Administrator finds that more than 85 per centum of the students enrolled in the course are having all or any part of their tuition, fees, or other charges paid to or for them by the educational institution or the Veterans' Administration under this chapter, chapter 31 of this title, or section 12(a) of the Act enacting this title.

"§ 1924. Discontinuance for unsatisfactory progress

"The Administrator shall discontinue the education and training allowance of an eligible veteran if, at any time, he finds that, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the educational institution or training establishment, the conduct or progress of such veteran is unsatisfactory.

"§ 1925. Period of operation for approval

"(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any course offered by an educational institution when such course has been in operation for less than two years.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

"(1) any course to be pursued in a public or other tax-supported educational institution;

"(2) any course which is offered by an educational institution which has been in operation for more than two years, if such course is similar in character to the instruction previously given by such institution;

"(3) any course which has been been offered by an institution for a period of more than two years, notwithstanding the institution has moved to another location within the same general locality; or

"(4) any course which is offered by a nonprofit educational institution of college level and which is recognized for credit toward a standard college degree.

"§ 1926. Institutions listed by Attorney General

"The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of, or payment of an education and training allowance to, any eligible veteran in any course in an educational institution or training establishment while it is listed by the Attorney General under section 3 of part III of Executive Order 9835, as amended.

"Subchapter IV—Payments to veterans

"§ 1931. Education and training allowance

"(a) The Administrator shall pay to each eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this chapter, and who applies therefor, an education and training allowance to meet in part the expenses of his subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment.

"(b) The education and training allowance for an eligible veteran shall be paid, as provided in section 1932 of this title, only for the period of the veterans' enrollment as approved by the Administrator, but no allowance shall be paid—

"(1) to any veteran enrolled in an institutional course which leads to a standard college degree or a course of institutional on-farm training for any period when the veteran is not pursuing his course in accordance with the regularly established policies and regulations of the institution and the requirements of this chapter;

"(2) to any veteran enrolled in an institutional course which does not lead to a standard college degree or in a course of apprentice or other training on the job for any day of absence in excess of thirty days in a twelve-month period, not counting as absences weekends or legal holidays established by Federal or State law during which the institution or establishment is not regularly in session or operation; or

"(3) to any veteran pursuing his program of education exclusively by correspondence for any period during which no lessons were serviced by the institution.

"(c) No education and training allowance shall be paid to an eligible veteran for any period until the Administrator shall have received—

"(1) from the eligible veteran (A) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in an institutional course which leads to a standard college degree or a course of institutional on-farm training, a certification that he was actually enrolled in and pursuing the course as approved by the Administrator, or (B) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in an institutional course which does not lead to a standard college degree or a course of apprentice or other training on the job, a certification as to actual attendance during such period, or (C) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in a program of education or training by correspondence, a certification as to the number of lessons actually completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution; and

"(2) from the educational institution or training establishment, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, that such veteran was enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training during such period, and, in the case of an institution furnishing education or training to a veteran exclusively by correspondence, a certification or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, as to the number of lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution. Education and training allowances shall, insofar as practicable, be paid within twenty days after receipt by the Administrator of the certifications required by this subsection.

"§ 1932. Computation of education and training allowances

"(a) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training in an educational institution and is not entitled to receive an education and training allowance under subsection (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f) shall be computed as follows:

"(1) If such program is pursued on a full-time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of $110 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $135 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of $160 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(2) If such program is pursued on a three-quarters time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of $80 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $100 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of $120 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(3) If such program is pursued on a half-time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of $50 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $60 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of $80 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(b) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a full-time program of education and training which consists of institutional courses and on-the-job training, with the on-the-job training portion of the program being strictly supplemental to the institutional portion, shall be computed at the rate of (1) $90 per month, if has no dependent, or (2) $110 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $130 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(c) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing apprentice or other training on the job shall be computed at the rate of (1) $70 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $85 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $105 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training allowance shall be reduced at the end of each four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to the basic education and training allowance as four months bears to the total duration of his apprentice or other training on the job; but in no case shall the Administrator pay an education and training allowance under this subsection in an amount which, when added to the compensation to be paid to the veteran, in accordance with his approved training program, for productive labor performed as a part of his course, would exceed the rate of $310 per month. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the

period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of months of such training a multiple of four.

"(d) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing institutional on-farm training shall be computed at the rate of (1) $95 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $110 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $130 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training allowance shall be reduced at the end of the third, and each subsequent, four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to $65 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or $80 per month, if he has one dependent, or $100 per month, if he has more than one dependent, as four months bears to the total duration of such veterans' institutional on-farm training reduced by eight months. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of such months of such training a multiple of four.

"(e) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing a program of education or training exclusively by correspondence shall be computed on the basis of the established charge which the institution requires nonveterans to pay for the course or courses pursued by the eligible veteran. Such allowance shall be paid quarterly on a pro rata basis for the lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution, as certified by the institution.

"(f) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this chapter in an educational institution on a less than half-time basis shall be computed at the rate of (1) the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, or (2) $110 per month for a full-time course, whichever is the lesser.

"(g) Each eligible veteran who is pursuing an approved course of flight training shall be paid an education and training allowance to be computed at the rate of 75 per centum of the established charge which similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same flight course are required to pay for tuition for the course. If such veteran's program of education or training consists exclusively of flight training, he shall not be paid an education and training allowance under one of the preceding subsections of this section; if his program of education or training consists of flight training and other education or training, the allowance payable under this subsection shall be in addition to any education and training allowance payable to him under one of the preceding subsections of this section for education or training other than flight training. Such allowance shall be paid monthly upon receipt of certification from the eligible veteran and the institution as to the actual flight training received by the veteran. In each such case the eligible veteran's period of entitlement shall be charged (in addition to any charge made against his entitlement by reason of education or training other than flight training) with one day of each $1.25 which is paid to the veteran as an education and training allowance for such course.

"(h) No eligible veteran shall be paid an education and training allowance under this chapter for any period during which (1) he is enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training paid for by the United States under any provision of law other than this chapter, where the payment of such allowance would constitute a duplication of benefits paid to the veteran from the Federal Treasury, or (2) he is pursuing a course of apprentice or other training on the job, a course of institutional on-farm training, or a course of education and training described in subsection (b) on a less than full-time basis.

"§ 1933. Measurement of courses

"(a) For the purposes of this chapter (1) an institutional trade or technical course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level involving shop practice as an integral part thereof, shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of thirty hours per week of attendance is required with not more than two and one-half hours of rest periods per week allowed, (2) an institutional course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of twenty-five hours per week net of instruction is required, and (3) an institutional undergraduate course offered by a college or university on a quarter or semester-hour basis for which credit is granted toward a standard college degree shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of fourteen semester hours or its equivalent is required.

"(b) The Administrator shall define full-time training in the case of all types of courses of education or training other than institutional on-farm training and the types of courses referred to in subsection (a); except that, the Administrator shall not define full-time apprentice training for a particular establishment other than that established as the standard workweek through bona fide collective bargaining between employers and employees.

"§ 1934. Overcharges by educational institutions

"The Administrator may, if he finds that an institution has charged or received from any eligible veteran any amount in excess of the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, disapprove such educational institution for the enrollment of any veteran not already enrolled therein, except that, in the case of a tax-supported public educational institution which does not have established charges for tuition and fees which it requires nonveteran residents to pay, such institution may charge and receive from each eligible veteran who is a resident an amount equal to the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction attributable to such veteran, but in no event to exceed the rate of $10 per month for a full-time course. Any educational institution or training establishment disapproved under this section shall also be disapproved for the enrollment of any veteran not already enrolled therein under chapter 31, or for the enrollment of any eligible person not already enrolled therein under chapter 35.

"Subchapter V—State Approving Agencies

"§ 1941. Designation

"(a) Unless otherwise established by the law of the State concerned, the chief executive of each State is requested to create or designate a State department or agency as the 'State approving agency' for his State for the purposes of this chapter.

"(b) (1) If any State fails or declines to create or designate a State approving agency, the provisions of this chapter which refer to the State approving agency shall, with respect to such State, be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"(2) In the case of courses subject to approval by the Administrator under section 1942 of this title, the provisions of this chapter which refer to a State approving agency shall be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"§ 1942. Approval of courses

"(a) An eligible veteran shall receive the benefits of this chapter while enrolled in a course of education or training offered by an educational institution or training establishment only if such course is approved by the State approving agency for the State where such educational institution or training establishment is situated or by the Administrator. Approval of courses by State approving agencies shall be in accordance with the provisions of this chapter and such other regulations and policies as the State approving agency may adopt. Each State approving agency shall furnish the Administration with a current list of educational institutions and training establishments, specifying courses which it has approved, and, in addition to such list, it shall furnish such other information to the Administrator as it and the Administrator may determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter. Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of the disapproval of any course previously approved and shall set forth the reasons for such disapproval.

"(b) The Administrator shall be responsible for the approval of courses of education or training offered by any agency of the Federal Government authorized under other laws to supervise such education or training. The Administrator may approve any course in any other educational institution or training establishment in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"(c) Any course offered by an educational institution or training establishment shall be considered approved for the purposes of this chapter if it is in an approved status for education or training under chapter 33 of this title, and has not been disapproved under the provisions of this chapter.

"§ 1943. Cooperation

"(a) The Administrator and each State approving agency shall take cognizance of the fact that definite duties, functions, and responsibilities are conferred upon the Administrator and each State approving agency under the veterans' educational programs. To assure that such programs are effectively and efficiently administered, the cooperation of the Administrator and the State approving agencies is essential. It is necessary to establish an exchange of information pertaining to activities of educational institutions and training establishments, and particular attention should be given to the enforcement of approval standards, enforcement of wage and income limitations, enforcement of enrollment restrictions, and fraudulant and other criminal activities on the part of persons connected with educational institutions and training establishments in which veterans are enrolled under this chapter.

"(b) The Administrator will furnish the State approving agencies with copies of such Veterans' Administration informational material as may aid them in carrying out this chapter.

"§ 1944. Use of Office of Education and other Federal agencies

"(a) In carrying out his functions under this chapter, the Administrator may utilize the facilities and services of any other Federal department or agency. The Administrator shall utilize the services of the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education or training as provided for in section 1945 of this title, in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such agreements, and in rendering technical assistance to such State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation

in connection with their duties under this chapter.

"(b) Any such utilization shall be pursuant to proper agreement with the Federal department or agency concerned; and payment to cover the cost thereof shall (except in the case of the Office of Education) be made either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in such agreement. Funds necessary to enable the Office of Education to carry out its functions under this chapter are authorized to be appropriated directly to such Office.

"§ 1945. Reimbursement of expenses

"The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with State and local agencies to pay such State and local agencies for reasonable and necessary expenses of salary and travel incurred by employees of such agencies in (1) rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of educational institutions and training establishments for furnishing courses of education or training to eligible veterans under this chapter, and in the supervision of such educational institutions and training establishments, and (2) furnishing, at the request of the Administrator, any other services in connection with this chapter. Each such contract or agreement shall be conditioned upon compliance with the standards and provisions of this chapter.

"Subchapter VI—Approval of courses of education and training

"§ 1951. Apprentice or other training on the job

"(a) Apprentice or other training on the job shall consist of courses offered by training establishments whenever such courses of training are furnished in accordance with the provisions of this section. Any training establishment desiring to furnish a course of apprentice or other training on the job shall submit to the appropriate State approving agency a written application setting forth the course of training for each job for which an eligible veteran is to be trained. The written application covering the course of training shall include the following:

"(1) Title and description of the specific job objective for which the eligible veteran is to be trained;

"(2) The length of the training period;

"(3) A schedule listing various operations for major kinds of work or tasks to be learned and showing for each, job operations or work, tasks to be performed, and the approximate length of time to be spent on each operation or task;

"(4) The wage or salary to be paid at the beginning of the course of training, at each successive step in the course, and at the completion of training;

"(5) The entrance wage or salary paid by the establishment to employees already trained in the kind of work for which the veteran is to be trained; and

"(6) The number of hours of supplemental related instruction required.

"(b) The appropriate State approving agency may approve a course of apprentice or other training on the job specified in an application submitted by a training establishment in accordance with subsection (a) if such training establishment is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The training content of the course is adequate to qualify the eligible veteran for appointment to the job for which he is to be trained.

"(2) There is reasonable certainty that the job for which the eligible veteran is to be trained will be available to him at the end of the training period.

"(3) The job is one in which progression and appointment to the next higher classification are based upon skills learned through organized training on the job and not on such factors as length of service and normal turnover.

"(4) The wages to be paid the eligible veteran for each successive period of training are not less than those customarily paid in the training establishment and in the community to a learner in the same job who is not a veteran.

"(5) The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than three months and not more than two years of full-time training, except that this provision shall not apply to apprentice training.

"(6) The length of the training period is no longer than that customarily requested by the training establishment and other training establishments in the community to provide an eligible veteran with the required skills, arrange for the acquiring of job knowledge, technical information, and other facts which the eligible veteran will need to learn in order to become competent on the job for which he is being trained.

"(7) Provision is made for related instruction for the individual eligible veteran who may need it.

"(8) There is in the training establishment adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training on the job.

"(9) Adequate records are kept to show the progress made by each eligible veteran toward his job objective.

"(10) Appropriate credit is given the eligible veteran for previous training and job experience, whether in the military service or elsewhere, his beginning wage adjusted to the level to which such credit advances him, and his training period shortened accordingly, and provision is made for certification by the training establishment that such credit has been granted and the beginning wage adjusted accordingly. No course of training will be considered bona fide if given to an eligible veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the job objective.

"(11) A signed copy of the training agreement for each eligible veteran, including the training program and wage scale as approved by the State approving agency, is provided to the veteran and to the Administrator and the State approving agency by the employer.

"(12) Upon completion of the course of training furnished by the training establishment the eligible veteran is given a certificate by the employer indicating the length and type of training provided and that the eligible veteran has completed the course of training on the job satisfactorily.

"(13) That the course meets such other criteria as may be established by the State approving agency.

"§ 1952. Institutional on-farm training

"(a) An eligible veteran shall be entitled to the benefits of this chapter while enrolled in a course of full-time institutional on-farm training which has been approved by the appropriate State approving agency in accordance with the provisions of this section;

"(b) The State approving agency may approve a course of institutional on-farm training when it satisfies the following requirements:

"(1) The course combines organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least two hundred hours per year (and of at least eight hours each month) at an educational institution, with supervised work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment.

"(2) The eligible veteran will perform a part of such course on a farm or other agricultural establishment under his control.

"(3) The course is developed with due consideration to the size and character of the farm or other agricultural establishment on which the eligible veteran will receive his supervised work experience and to the need of such eligible veteran, in the type of farming for which he is training, for proficiency in planning, producing, marketing, farm mechanics, conservation of resources, food conservation, farm financing, farming management, and the keeping of farm and home accounts.

"(4) The eligible veteran will receive not less than one hundred hours of individual instruction per year, not less than fifty hours of which shall be on such farm or other agricultural establishment (with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction and shall include instruction and home-study assignments in the preparation of budgets, inventories, and statements showing the production, use on the farm, and sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products.

"(5) The eligible veteran will be assured of control of such farm or other agricultural establishment (whether by ownership, lease, management, agreement, or other tenure arrangement) until the completion of his course.

"(6) Such farm or other agricultural establishment shall be of a size and character which (A) will, together with the group-instruction part of the course, occupy the full time of the eligible veteran, (B) will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of the farm or other agricultural establishment of the type for which the eligible veteran is being trained, and will provide the eligible veteran an opportunity to apply to the operation of his farm or other agricultural estblishment the major portion of the farm practices taught in the group-instruction part of the course, and (C) will assure him a satisfactory income for a reasonable living under normal conditions at least by the end of his course.

"(7) Provision shall be made for certification by the institution and the veteran that the training offered does not repeat or duplicate training previously received by the veteran.

"(8) The institutional on-farm training meets such other fair and reasonable standards as may be established by the State approving agency.

"§ 1953. Approval of accredited courses

"(a) A State approving agency may approve the courses offered by an educational institution when—

"(1) such courses have been accredited and approved by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association;

"(2) credit for such course is approved by the State department of education for credit toward a high school diploma;

"(3) such courses are conducted under sections 11–28 of title 20; or

"(4) such courses are accepted by the State department of education for credit for a teacher's certificate or a teacher's degree.

For the purposes of this chapter the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations which he determines to be a reliable authority as to the quality of training offered by an educational institution and the State approving agencies may, upon concurrence, utilize the accreditation of such accrediting associations or agencies for approval of the courses specifically accredited and approved by such accrediting association or agency. In making application for approval, the institution shall transmit to the State approving agency copies of its catalog or bulletin.

"(b) As a condition to approval under this section, the State approving agency must find that adequate records are kept by the educational institution to show the progress of each eligible veteran. The State approving agency must also find that the educational institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with

the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

"§ 1954. Approval of nonaccredited courses

"(a) No course of education or training (other than a course of institutional on-farm training) which has not been approved by a State approving agency pursuant to section 1953 of this title, which is offered by a public or private, profit or nonprofit, educational institution shall be approved for the purposes of this chapter unless the educational institution offering such course submits to the appropriate State approving agency a written application for approval of such course in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"(b) Such application shall be accompanied by not less than two copies of the current catalog or bulletin which is certified as true and correct in content and policy by an authorized owner or official and includes the following:

"(1) Identifying data, such as volume number and date of publication;

"(2) Names of the institution and its governing body, officials, and faculty;

"(3) A calendar of the institution showing legal holidays, beginning and ending date of each quarter, term, or semester, and other important dates;

"(4) Institution policy and regulations on enrollment with respect to enrollment dates and specific entrance requirements for each course;

"(5) Institution policy and regulations relative to leave, absences, class cuts, makeup work, tardiness and interruptions for unsatisfactory attendance;

"(6) Institution policy and regulations relative to standards of progress required of the student by the institution (this policy will define the grading system of the institution, the minimum grades considered satisfactory, conditions for interruption for unsatisfactory grades or progress and a description of the probationary period, if any, allowed by the institution, and conditions of reentrance for those students dismissed for unsatisfactory progress. A statement will be made regarding progress records kept by the institution and furnished the student);

"(7) Institution policy and regulations relating to student conduct and conditions for dismissal for unsatisfactory conduct;

"(8) Detailed schedules of fees, charges for tuition, books, supplies, tools, student activities, laboratory fees, service charges, rentals, deposits, and all other charges;

"(9) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the student does not enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom;

"(10) A description of the available space, facilities, and equipment;

"(11) A course outline for each course for which approval is requested, showing subjects or units in the course, type of work or skill to be learned, and approximate time and clock hours to be spent on each subject or unit; and

"(12) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to granting credit for previous educational training.

"(c) The appropriate State approving agency may approve the application of such institution when the institution and its nonaccredited courses are found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The courses, curriculum, and instruction are consistent with quality, content, and length with similar courses in public schools and other private schools in the State, with recognized accepted standards.

"(2) There is in the institution adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide training of good quality.

"(3) Educational and experience qualifications of directors, administrators, and instructors are adequate.

"(4) The institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

"(5) A copy of the course outline, schedule of tuition, fees, and other charges, regulations pertaining to absence, grading policy, and rules of operation and conduct will be furnished the veteran upon enrollment.

"(6) Upon completion of training, the veteran is given a certificate by the institution indicating the approved course and indicating that training was satisfactorily completed.

"(7) Adequate records as prescribed by the State approving agency are kept to show attendance and progress or grades, and satisfactory standards relating to attendance, progress, and conduct are enforced.

"(8) The institution complies with all local, city, county, municipal, State, and Federal regulations, such as fire codes, building and sanitation codes. The State approving agency may require such evidence of compliance as is deemed necessary.

"(9) The institution is financially sound and capable of fulfilling its commitments for training.

"(10) The institution does not utilize advertising of any type which is erroneous or misleading, either by actual statement, omission, or intimation. The institution shall not be deemed to have met this requirement until the State approving agency (A) has ascertained from the Federal Trade Commission whether the Commission has issued an order to the institution to cease and desist from any act or practice, and (B) has, if such an order has been issued, given due weight to that fact.

"(11) The institution does not exceed its enrollment limitations as established by the State approving agency.

"(12) The institution's administrators, directors, owners, and instructors are of good reputation and character.

"(13) The institution has and maintains a policy for the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the veteran fails to enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom at any time prior to completion and such policy must provide that the amount charged to the veteran for tuition, fees, and other charges for a portion of the course shall not exceed the approximate pro rata portion of the total charges for tuition, fees, and other charges that the length of the complete portion of the course bears to its total length.

"(14) Such additional criteria as may be deemed necessary by the State approving agency.

"§ 1955. Notice of approval of courses

"The State approving agency, upon determining that an educational institution has complied with all the requirements of this chapter, will issue a letter to such institution setting forth the courses which have been approved for the purposes of this chapter, and will furnish an official copy of such letter and any subsequent amendments to the Administrator. The letter of approval shall be accompanied by a copy of the catalog or bulletin of the institution, as approved by the State approving agency, and shall contain the following information:

"(1) date of letter and effective date of approval of courses;

"(2) proper address and name of each educational institution or training establishment;

"(3) authority for approval and conditions of approval, referring specifically to the approved catalog or bulletin published by the educational institution;

"(4) name of each course approved;

"(5) where applicable, enrollment limitations such as maximum numbers authorized and student-teacher ratio;

"(6) signature of responsible official of State approving agency; and

"(7) such other fair and reasonable provisions as are considered necessary by the appropriate State approving agency.

"§ 1956. Disapproval of courses and discontinuance of allowances

"(a) Any course approved for the purposes of this chapter which fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter shall be immediately disapproved by the appropriate State approving agency. An educational institution or training establishment which has its courses disapproved by a State approving agency will be notified of such disapproval by a certified or registered letter of notification and a return receipt secured.

"(b) The Administrator may discontinue the education and training allowance of any eligible veteran if he finds that the course of education or training in which such veteran is enrolled fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter or if he finds that the educational institution or training establishment offering such course has violated any provisions of this chapter or fails to meet any of its requirements.

"(c) Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of each course which it has disapproved under this section.

Subchapter VII—Miscellaneous provisions

"§ 1961. Authority and duties of Administrator

"Payments under this chapter shall be subject to audit and review by the General Accounting Office as provided by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

"§ 1962. Educational and vocational counseling

"The Administrator may arrange for educational and vocational counseling to persons eligible for education and training under this chapter. At such intervals as he deems necessary, he shall make available information respecting the need for general education and for trained personnel in the various crafts, trades, and professions. Facilities of other Federal agencies collecting such information shall be utilized to the extent he deems practicable.

"§ 1963. Control by agencies of United States

"No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out this chapter, shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any State approving agency, State educational agency, or State apprenticeship agency, or any educational institution or training establishment. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent any department, agency, or officer of the United States from exercising any supervision or control which such department, agency, or officer is authorized by law to exercise over any Federal educational institution or training establishment, or to prevent the furnishing of education or training under this chapter in any institution or establishment over which supervision or control is exercised by such other department, agency, or officer under authority of existing provisions of law.

"§ 1964. Conflicting interests

"(a) Every officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, or of the Office of Education, who has, while such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, any educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education

or training under this chapter shall be immediately dismissed from his office or employment.

"(b) If the Administrator finds that any person who is an officer or employee of a State approving agency has, while he was such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, an educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this chapter, he shall discontinue making payments under section 1945 of this title to such State approving agency unless such agency shall, without delay, take such steps as may be necessary to terminate the employment of such person and such payments shall not be resumed while such person is an officer or employee of the State approving agency, or State department of veterans affairs or State department of education.

"(c) A State approving agency shall not approve any course offered by an educational institution operated for profit and, if any such course has been approved, shall disapprove each such course, if it finds that any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, the Office of Education, or the State approving agency owns an interest in, or receives any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, such institution.

"(d) The Administrator may, after reasonable notice and public hearings, waive in writing the application of this section in the case of any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, of the Office of Education, or of a State approving agency, if he finds that no detriment will result to the United States or to eligible veterans by reason of such interest or connection of such officer or employee.

"§ 1965. Reports by institutions

"(a) Educational institutions and training establishments shall, without delay, report to the Administrator in the form prescribed by him, the enrollment, interruption, and termination of the education or training of each eligible veteran enrolled therein under this chapter.

"(b) The Administrator shall pay to each educational institution which is required to submit reports and certifications to the Administrator under this chapter, an allowance at the rate of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution under the provisions of this chapter to assist the educational institution in defraying the expense of preparing and submitting such reports and certifications. Such allowances shall be paid in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by the Administrator, except that if any institution fails to submit reports or certifications to the Administrator as required by this chapter, no allowance shall be paid to such institution for the month or months during which such reports or certifications were not submitted as required by the Administrator.

"§ 1966. Overpayments to veterans

"Whenever the Administrator finds that an overpayment has been made to a veteran as the result of (1) the willful or negligent failure of the educational institution or training establishment to report, as required by this chapter and applicable regulations, to the Veterans' Administration excessive absences from a course, or discontinuance or interruption of a course by the veteran or (2) false certification by the educational institution or training establishment, the amount of such overpayment shall constitute a liability of such institution or establishment, and may be recovered in the same manner as any other debt due the United States. Any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is recovered from the veteran. This section shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal liability under this or any other law.

"§ 1967. Examination of records

"The records and accounts of educational institutions and training establishments pertaining to eligible veterans who received education or training under this chapter shall be available for examination by duly authorized representatives of the Government.

"§ 1968. False or misleading statements

"In each case where the Administrator finds that an educational institution or training establishment has willfully submitted a false or misleading claim, or where a veteran, with the complicity of an educational institution or training establishment, has submitted such a claim, he shall make a complete report of the facts of the case to the appropriate State approving agency and where deemed advisable to the Attorney General of the United States for appropriate action.

"§ 1969. Information furnished by Federal Trade Commission

"The Federal Trade Commission shall keep all State approving agencies advised of any information coming to its attention which would be of assistance to such agencies in carrying out their duties under this chapter.

"§ 1970. Effective date and retroactive allowances

"The provisions of this chapter shall take effect as of September 1, 1965. In the event this chapter is enacted subsequent to such date, the Administrator shall prescribe regulations for making retroactive payments of education and training allowances, upon application therefor, to eligible veterans for education or training pursued by them on or after September 1, 1965, and prior to the date of the enactment of this chapter."

(b) The table of contents at the beginning of such title is amended by inserting immediately after

"39. Automobiles for Disabled Veterans ..... 1901"

the following:

"40. Education of Veterans Who Serve Between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967 ..... 1908".

(c) The table of chapters at the beginning of part III of such title is amended by inserting immediately after

"39. Automobiles for Disabled Veterans ..... 1901"

the following:

"40. Education of Veterans Who Serve Between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967 ..... 1908".

(d) Such title is further amended—

(1) by inserting in section 102(a)(2) immediately after "chapter 33" the following: "or 40", and by striking out "chapters 19 and 33" in section 102(b), and inserting in lieu thereof "chapters 19, 33, and 40";

(2) by striking out in section 111(a) "33 or 35", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "33, 35, or 40";

(3) by inserting in section 211(a) after "1761," the following: "1961,";

(4) by striking out in section 1662(b) "chapters 31 and 35" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "chapters 31, 35, and 40";

(5) by striking out in section 1711(b) "chapter 31 or 33", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "chapter 31, 33, or 40";

(6) by striking out in section 1734(a) "chapter 31 or 33" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "chapter 31, 33, or 40";

(7) by striking out in section 3013 "and 35" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "35, and 40";

(8) by inserting after "chapter 35" in section 1611(a)(2) the following: "or education or training under chapter 40"; and

(9) by inserting in section 1634 immediately before the comma following "therein" the following: "under this chapter or chapter 40".

SEC. 3. (a) Chapter 37 of title 38 of the United States Code is amended by inserting immediately after section 1817 the following new section:

"§ 1818. Veterans who serve between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967

"(a) Each veteran who served on active duty at any time between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967, shall be eligible for the benefits of this chapter (except sections 1813 and 1815, and business loans under section 1814, of this title), subject to the provisions of this section, if his total service was for a period of more than one hundred and eighty days, or if he was discharged or released from a period of active duty, any part of which occurred between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967, for a service-connected disability.

"(b) No veteran shall be eligible for benefits under this section so long as he is eligible under this chapter for any unused benefits derived from service during World War II or the Korean conflict. Any veteran who is eligible for benefits under this section and who has obtained benefits under this chapter by reason of service during World War II or the Korean conflict shall have his benefits under this section reduced by the amount of any benefits previously obtained under this chapter. Benefits shall not be afforded under this section to any individual on account of service as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service.

"(c) Loans may be guaranteed under this section if made before July 1, 1977. If a loan report or application for loan guaranty is received by the Administrator before July 1, 1977, the loan may be guaranteed after such date. Direct loans authorized by this section shall not be made after June 30, 1977, except pursuant to commitments issued by the Administrator on or before that date.

"(d) A fee shall be collected from each veteran obtaining a loan guaranteed or made under this section, and no loan shall be guaranteed or made under this section until the fee payable with respect to such loan has been collected and remitted to the Administrator. The amount of the fee shall be established from time to time by the Administrator, but shall in no event exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the total loan amount. The amount of the fee may be included in the loan to the veteran and paid from the proceeds thereof. The Administrator shall deposit all fees collected hereunder in the revolving fund established under the provisions of section 1824 of this title."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 37 of such title is amended by inserting immediately below

"1817. Release from liability under guaranty."

the following:

"1818. Veterans who serve between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967."

(c) Section 1822 (a) of such title is amended by striking out "or 1813", and inserting in lieu thereof "1813, or 1818".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TEAGUE OF TEXAS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Strike all after the enacting clause of S. 9 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 12410 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table, and a similar House bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have previously asked and been given unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks. I now further request that all Members have authority to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

REREFERRAL OF RESOLUTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 640 was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Rules and it should be referred to the Committee on House Administration. I ask unanimous consent that the rereference be made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], is on leave in his district with Vice President HUMPHREY, who is to make an address to the National Association of Secondary School Principals. If present, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] indicates that he would have voted "aye" on H.R. 12410, the peacetime veterans' benefit bill. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD so reflect Mr. FEIGHAN's position.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement is in the RECORD.

TO REPEAL CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO THE PRINTING AS HOUSE DOCUMENTS OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 9273 to repeal certain provisions of law relating to the printing as House documents of certain proceedings.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 9273

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of March 2, 1931, as amended (44 U.S.C. 275b), and the Act of April 16, 1951 (36 U.S.C. 39), are hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the report on this bill recites very clearly the purpose. This bill would repeal legislation authorizing the printing of certain reports and proceedings of the conventions of organizations that are chartered by Congress. At the present time the cost of this printing is a very nominal amount. It amounts to only approximately $30,000 in some years, probably $35,000 in other years. The reason this bill was offered is because of the fact that there are some 300 or more different organizations that are chartered by Congress and which conceivably might come in and ask for the same treatment that has been accorded those organizations that get this preferential treatment at the present time.

Each year the Committee on House Administration is called upon to act on resolutions authorizing either the printing of the proceedings of conventions or of official reports of those organizations. Each time the question arises as to the necessity or, rather, the justification for spending public funds for printing these reports.

Frankly, over the years I have never heard anyone give a justification for the expenditure of these funds, and that was the reason this legislation was introduced.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Missouri has adequately explained this bill.

Time after time, when these requests are presented, to appropriate funds and authorize printing of these proceedings and annual reports, the question arises as to the justification for doing this at public expense. Each time it seems to be the consensus of the committee that it is not justified. They do not seem to desire, and rightly so, to choose one particular organization or another to be the one denied what has been done in the past—that is, printing of these reports at public expense.

I think the approach of this bill is the proper approach, to set broad policy affecting all of these organizations, instead of choosing one or the other, and to stop this practice which I think is wasteful of public funds. Therefore, I support this bill and hope that it will pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9273.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on H.R. 9273.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL AIR MUSEUM OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 6125, to amend Public Law 722 of the 79th Congress and Public Law 85–935, relating to the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6125

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That this Act may be cited as "the National Air Museum Amendments Act of 1965".

PART I—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 722 OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

SEC. 2. Section 1(a) of Public Law 722 of the Seventy-ninth Congress (60 Stat 997) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is hereby established under the Smithsonian Institution a bureau to be known as a National Air and Space Museum, which shall be administered by the Smithsonial Institution with the advice of a board to be composed of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or his designee, the Chief of Naval Operations, or his designee, the Chief of Staff of the Army, or his designee, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, or his designee, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, or his designee, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or his designee, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, or his designee, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and three citizens of the United States appointed by the President from civilian life who shall serve at the pleasure of the President. The members of the board shall serve as such members without compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the board."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 1(b) of Public Law 722 of the Seventy-ninth Congress is amended by—

(1) inserting "and space" immediately following "national air" and before "museum"; and

(2) deleting "and salary" and "or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended" so as to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, with the advice of the board, may appoint and fix the compensation and duties of the head of a national air and space museum whose appointment shall not be subject to the civil service laws."

SEC. 4. Section 2 of Public Law 722 of the Seventy-ninth Congress is amended by—

(1) inserting "and space" immediately after "national air" and before "museum";

(2) inserting "and space flight" immediately after "aviation" wherever "aviation" appears in said section; and

(3) inserting "and space flight" immediately following "aeronautical" and before "equipment" so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Said national air and space museum shall memorialize the national development of aviation and space flight; collect, preserve, and display aeronautical and space flight equipment of historical interest and significance; serve as a repository for scientific equipment and data pertaining to the development of aviation and space flight; and provide educational material for the historical study of aviation and space flight."

SEC. 5. Section 3 of Public Law 722 of the Seventy-ninth Congress is repealed.

SEC. 6. The second sentence of section 4(a) of Public Law 722 of the Seventy-ninth Congress is amended by deleting "three" and inserting in lieu thereof "six" so as to read as

follows: "The board may function notwithstanding vacancies and six members of the board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business."

SEC. 7. Section 4(b) of Public Law 722 of the Seventy-ninth Congress is amended by inserting "and space" immediately after "national air" and before "museum" so as to read as follows:

"(b) The Smithsonian Institution shall include in its annual report of its operations to Congress a statement of the operations of said national air and space museum, including all public and private moneys received and disbursed."

SEC. 8. Section 5(a) of Public Law 722 of the Seventy-ninth Congress is amended by—

(1) inserting "and independent agencies" after "departments";

(2) inserting "and space" immediately after "national air" and before "museum";

(3) inserting "spacecraft" and a comma immediately after "aircraft," and before "aircraft parts";

(4) inserting "and spacecraft" immediately after "aircraft" in the phrase "aircraft parts"; and

(5) inserting "and space flight" immediately after "aeronautical" and before "equipment" so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) The heads of executive departments and independent agencies of the Government are authorized to transfer or loan to said national air and space museum without charge therefor, aircraft, spacecraft, aircraft and spacecraft parts, instruments, engines, or other aeronautical and space flight equipment or records for exhibition, historical, or educational purposes."

SEC. 9. Section 5(b) of Public Law 722 of the Seventy-ninth Congress is amended by inserting "and space" immediately after "national air" and before "museum" so as to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, is authorized (1) to accept as a gift to the Smithsonian Institution from George H. Stephenson, of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, a statue of Brigadier General William L. Mitchell of such character as may be deemed appropriate, and (2) without expense to the United States, to cause such statute to be erected at a suitable location on the grounds of the national air and space museum."

SEC. 10. Section 6 of Public Law 722 of the Seventy-ninth Congress is amended by inserting "and space" immediately after "national air" and before "museum" so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $50,000 for the purposes of this Act and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually hereafter such sums as may be necessary to maintain and administer said national air and space museum including salaries and all other necessary expenses."

SEC. 11. Payments of compensation heretofore made to the head of the National Air Museum at rates fixed by the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby ratified and affirmed.

PART II—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 85-935

SEC. 12. Section 1 of Public Law 85-935 (72 Stat. 1794) is amended by—

(1) deleting "for the construction of" and inserting in lieu thereof ", and to construct"; and

(2) inserting "and Space" immediately following "National Air" and before "Museum" so as to read as follows:

"That the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution are hereby authorized and directed to prepare plans, including drawings and specifications, and to construct a suitable building for a National Air and Space Museum (with requisite equipment, approaches, architectural landscape treatment of the grounds, and connections with public utilities and the Federal heating system) for the use of the Smithsonian Institution, to be located on that part of reservation which is bounded by Fourth Street Southwest on the east, Seventh Street Southwest on the west, Independence Avenue on the south, and Jefferson Drive on the north, title to which is in the United States."

SEC. 13. Section 4 of Public Law 85-935 is amended by:

(1) deleting "shall" and inserting in lieu thereof "may"; and

(2) by adding the following sentence at the end of the section: "When so specified in the pertinent appropriation Act, amounts appropriated under this authorization are available without fiscal year limitation."

so as to read as follows:

SEC. 4. That there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act: *Provided*, That appropriations for this purpose, except such part as may be necessary for the incidental expenses of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution in connection with this project, may be transferred to the General Services Administration for the performance of the work. When so specified in the pertinent Appropriation Act, amounts appropriated under this authorization are available without fiscal year limitation."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6125 was authored by our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

This measure has history behind it, having started in the 79th Congress, 1946, with Public Law 722, which authorized the National Air Museum as part of the Smithsonian Institution.

In 1958 the site of the building was designated and there was appropriated the sum of $1,875,000 for planning and architectural expenses. It is estimated that the cost of this measure over a period of 5 years, beginning with fiscal year 1967, will amount to approximately $40 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that we are in an age and time of fast-moving events and rapid scientific development.

We now have as a part of the Smithsonian Institution a very bare exhibition of the air age, but much less exhibitions reflecting advancement of the space age. That is one thing which, among others, this proposal will accomplish, and that is to include the space part of what has already been authorized as an air museum.

Now, for $40 million, we understand this should be a very handsome building.

The Members of this House know that I am not given to suggesting needless expenditures; at least, I do not think so. This is a thing needed for our Nation, for the District of Columbia, and it is something we owe to the Nation.

It has been a number of years since I had occasion to see the way of the air age. But I know they have no place to put all this new equipment as we move along. It is proposed here that this would be a building which would have facilities arranged in such a utilitarian manner that exhibits could be changed from time to time and keep up with the fast developments in the space age.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we are doing a service to the country by authorizing this building. I hope that the author of the bill, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], who is a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, together with our eminent and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], will discuss this proposal.

I trust that we may hear from all of these gentlemen, because they are supporters of this resolution. They are interested in this much-needed development. I might add parenthetically—and I am sure it will be developed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and by these other distinguished gentlemen to whom I have referred—it is proposed that the board of the Air and Space Museum be increased to include the heads of the military agencies of the Department of Defense. This means the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Federal Aviation Agency, and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, as well as three public members to be appointed by the President of the United States. This brings in a vast amount of talent to develop a museum which should be the finest of its kind in the world, as a further indication of the wide interest in this effort.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I urgently recommend favorable action now by the Congress on H.R. 6125, relating to the National Air and Space Museum of the Smithsonian Institution. I introduced this bill on March 11, 1965 on behalf of the Smithsonian Board of Regents, comprised of the Vice President of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, Representatives MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, GEORGE H. MAHON, and myself, Senators CLINTON P. ANDERSON, J. W. FULBRIGHT, and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, and six distinguished citizen members.

H.R. 6125 would designate the existing National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution as the National Air and Space Museum. It would grant the Smithsonian Institution the same responsibilities with respect to space objects as it presently has with regard to aviation objects. And it would authorize the construction of a National Air and Space Museum building.

I should add that this bill is for authorization only. It does not appropriate. That is a decision to be made by the Congress on another day, not today.

The enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of a suitable building to house the Nation's air and space collections will be the successful culmination of 20 years of congressional encouragement and legislative action in the interest of air and space science and history.

Starting with the act of August 12, 1946, the Congress established the National Air Museum as a part of the Smithsonian Institution. The Congress included provisions for selecting a site for a National Air Museum building to be located in the Nation's Capital. More recently, by the act of September 6, 1958, the Congress designated a site for a building to be on the Mall from Fourth to Seventh Streets, Independence Avenue to Jefferson Drive. Within the past 2 years, planning appropriations in the amount of $511,000 and $1,364,000 have been made available to the Smithsonian by the Congress for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965, respectively. Construction plans and specifications for the proposed museum building are nearing completion. Now it is necessary to request the Congress for legislative authorization in order to complete the series of authorizations starting in 1946.

The National Air and Space Museum will be notable in two particular aspects. First, it will be visited by unprecedented crowds of citizens from every State in the Union. In our existing World War I hangar, where only six air and space craft are on exhibition, but including the original space capsules of John Glenn and Alan Shepard, we packed in 1,700,000 visitors last year. In the new Museum of History and Technology, dedicated just 2 years ago, we have already received over 10 million visitors, in the 2 years. We can predict with complete confidence therefore that in the first year of the National Air and Space Museum, well over 5 million visitors will come and that the crowds will increase steadily in the years ahead.

Here will be displayed the full panoply of American achievement in air and in space:

The original Wright Brothers flyer, first to fly at Kitty Hawk in 1903.

General Billy Mitchell's Spad of World War I.

The U.S. Navy's NC–4, first to fly across the Atlantic Ocean, 1919.

The U.S. Army's T–2 Fokker monoplane, first transcontinental nonstop, 1924.

Gen. Jimmy Doolittle's Schneider Cup racer, 1925.

Lindberg's "Spirit of St. Louis," first solo across the Atlantic, 1927.

Wiley Post's "Winnie Mae," flown twice around the world, 1931–33.

The Bell X–1, first airplane to fly faster than sound.

And now the spacecraft:

First U.S. Earth satellites, Explorer I and Vanguard I;

TIROS—first U.S. weather satellite;

Alan Shepard's Freedom 7, and John Glenn's Friendship 7, manned orbiting spacecraft;

Gemini and Apollo, manned spacecraft; and

The pioneering rocket launch vehicles—Atlas, Jupiter, Agena.

The second important aspect of this museum I should call to your attention is its great educational and research potential. Not only will our youth and our citizens of all ages respond to the inspiration of seeing these historymaking air and space craft—but also scholars, historians, and professionals in many fields of learning will come to work with the museums' unrivaled reference collections. Thus will be created a center of educational and historical research.

We know that this museum will open a new dimension in research in air and space science, technology, and history. For the first time in our Nation's history, these developments and achievements will become accessible and apparent to the scholar and to the general public alike.

This great scientific facility will contribute significantly to the concepts expressed by the President in his speech before the convocation of scholars assembled from all over the world for the Smithsonian's Bicentennial Celebration last September:

> That ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace.
>
> That the knowledge of our citizens is a treasure which grows when shared.

Functioning as a center of exposition and education, the building will provide capacity both for large crowds of visitors and for a comprehensive array of air and space craft, instrumentation, engines, models, and historical reference documents. Exhibitions will be changed periodically and a series of most timely presentations will continually be on display. The building design will provide excellent flexibility for its functional requirements. The location on the Mall as designated by the Congress is most appropriate, being immediately adjacent to the other Smithsonian museums where it will be most convenient to the crowds of visitors. The location is adjacent also to the headquarters of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Federal Aviation Agency.

The Congress has directed that the national development of flight shall be memorialized; that air and space objects of historical and scientific significance shall be preserved and displayed; and that educational material for the study of air and space history and development shall be provided. The Congress has dedicated the site for the museum and has appropriated funds for the preparation of plans and specifications.

I appeal to the Congress to complete the undertaking it had the foresight to initiate 20 years ago. The Congress is now requested, therefore, to authorize construction, through the enactment of H.R. 6125.

DATA ON SIZE AND COST OF PROPOSED NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM

Based on the total estimate of $41,920,000, which includes planning fees, construction costs, contingencies, and a garage for 1,300 cars, and Smithsonian expenses—$100,000—the following data is presented:

Total estimated cost of building construction, exclusive of contingencies and planning fees	$37,300,000
Total square footage (square feet)	1,281,612
Total cubage (cubic feet)	26,570,580
Breakdown of floor areas:	
(a) Exhibit area (square feet)	382,940
(b) Office and research (square feet)	166,200
Breakdown of floor areas—Con.	
(c) Garage (square feet)	453,066
(d) Miscellaneous spaces which include service facilities, storage, vertical circulation, rest rooms, and mechanical areas (square feet)	244,786
(e) Auditorium, cafeteria, and kitchen (square feet)	34,620
Total square footage (square feet)	1,281,612
Cost per square foot	$29.10
Cost per cubic foot	$1.40
Size of building:	
(a) Length (feet)	782
(b) Width (feet)	250
(c) Height (feet)	97

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

Mr. BOW. I am happy to yield to my distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I want to especially commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], for his very aggressive support of this worthy proposal. As we look to the future, and to the final construction of this building, we can foresee that it will perform a very important and necessary function.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to join the gentleman from Ohio in his support of the bill which has been presented to the House today, and which I hope will be approved unanimously.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], who was responsible for putting this bill on the list of suspensions of legislation to be considered here today.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of my service on the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations for the past 24 years, it is my opinion that this Air Museum is badly needed.

Mr. Speaker, 14 million Americans, visitors, came to this city last year. While here they spent $400 million. However, when all of them try to get into that little bit of museum which is there now with a corregated tin roof on it, with the sun beating down, it is impossible to do so.

Mr. Speaker, there were 8 million Americans who went through there last year. At times it smelled like the hellhole of Calcutta. To think that this condition has been allowed to exist, with 8 million people going through that makeshift Air Museum that we have today, is a disgrace. It is disgraceful that this great body long ago when Lindbergh made his first flight, his solo flight across the Atlantic to Paris, has waited this long to construct a modern Air Museum. That is when it should have been constructed.

Mr. Speaker, in 1975 we are told that there will be 25 million tourists who will visit the Nation's Capital and who will spend $800 million while here. What are we going to do with them?

Mr Speaker, if ever a bill is passed by the House of Representatives, it should be this one today, with no questions asked. We should construct this Air Museum as quickly as we can in order to take care of the many Americans who are coming to see their National Capital.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, I have yielded myself this time in order to say to the House and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives how much I appreciate the fact that this bill is on the list of suspensions to be considered today so that we could pass it.

I appreciate the fact that the Speaker has seen to it that the bill was put on the suspension calendar today.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I find no pleasure in taking the floor today in opposition to legislation which has such splendid sponsors in the House as those who have spoken earlier. But I must in all conscience oppose this bill at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this will provide for a $40 million structure, without any cost for land acquisition, but apparently there is nothing in the bill that will limit the expenditure to $40 million.

Mr. Speaker, we have the recent experience of the so-called Rayburn House Office Building. I can remember when that came to the floor of the House a good many years ago, and we were assured at that time that it would cost about $65 million. It wound up costing in the neighborhood of $125 million.

I would like to see some kind of a limitation contained in this bill in order to stop the spending for this purpose at $40 million, if this is what is meant to be spent. Of course, such an amendment cannot be offered because we are operating under suspension of the rules which precludes amendments of any nature.

But more importantly, this is no time to be constructing this kind of a building. There may be a day, and I would like to support a building for that purpose, at some later time. But we just passed in this House of Representatives a bill calling for the initial expenditure of some $327 million for the purpose of taking care of our war veterans. When are we going to stop spending money for projects that can be deferred? There will be other bills coming before the House to protect the life, limb, and property of citizens of this country and these are bills we will have to support. But I say to you, we can very well delay the construction of this National Air Museum until a later day when we can see some daylight; when we at least have some evidence that we are not going to be fighting an interminable war at a cost of billions each year.

That is my plea to you—to delay every possible project that can be delayed that will not affect the life, limb, and property of the citizens of this country—to delay what we can until a later day when we can see some end to this business of going deeper and deeper into debt while fighting a war.

I cannot help but wonder as I stand here today what the next museum will be. Are we going to have a museum for old bicycles and old railroad equipment and so on and so forth—especially designed and devised buildings for those purposes? I say to you again, this is not the day to be authorizing the expenditure of $40 million for the purpose of constructing an Air Museum.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat pleased by the restraint of our friend, the gentleman from Iowa with respect to this bill. I might suggest to the Members of the House that there are many more important things than simply guns and butter or the absolute necessities in life. This is a nation which is many, many years behind in granting recognition to its great creative minds—at least as compared with other nations.

I am as familiar as I can be with the genesis of this proposal. This is to occupy land which some years ago I felt should be occupied by a national cultural center. We had a considerable discussion, particularly with the senior Senator from New Mexico, at that time and were persuaded to yield the prime location on which this museum is to be located. This is property owned now by all of the people of the United States of America. It has been paid for for many generations. It is something that the American people need and deserve.

If our colleagues are concerned about what the millions of visitors to this Capital need, they should be enthusiastically in support of this.

This Nation is a pioneer in aviation. This Nation certainly deserves to preserve its priceless heritage in this regard and in other regards as well.

I might suggest that there is no future day—we should really be embarrassed now that we did not erect such a museum many, many years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I support with great enthusiasm the proposal today, and I think a great majority of our people whose Capital this is—and whose city this is—millions of whom visit it each year—have a right to see appropriately preserved for posterity the relics and the great landmarks of our history in aviation.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think that for the record it should be pointed out we have close to a couple of million dollars invested, aside from the land which will accommodate this building. We have a couple of million dollars invested in architectural planning fees. Of course, I do not suppose that these architectural plans would be outmoded very, very quickly, but at least the personnel would most likely be lost to us sometime in the future down through the years and unless we utilize the plans that have been produced by these people who have been paid for this work, then there would be that loss involved.

It might also be proper to point out that the first year, 1967, the cost is estimated at $11 million. In 1968, $11 million. In 1969, $15 million. And for the last year, 1970, to be completed in 1971—$3½ million.

So this is sort of an installment plan operation. At least we do not have to produce the entire $40 million at this particular time because it is going to be developed in a proper and systematic way.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I agree we will not have to produce the money immediately and I would call attention to the fact that there is absolutely no economy in deferring this matter especially in view of the ever-increasing costs of construction and planning.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill and to draw the attention of the House to my resolution, House Joint Resolution 635, authorizing an appropriate memorial to the late Robert H. Goddard, to be built on the grounds of the National Air Museum, to which H.R. 6125 refers.

Because of the unique contribution made by Dr. Goddard to America's place in space exploration, I feel that he should be commemorated by a statue prominently displayed at the site of the museum, that demonstrates our accomplishments in this field. America owes her prominence in the space race to the fact that one of her own citizens demonstrated the feasibility of rocket flight. Goddard's successful firing of a liquid fuel rocket was an achievement as significant as the first flight of the Wright brothers' airplane. For, although in both cases there was theoretical acceptance of the principle involved, no one prior to these two pioneers had been able to turn hypothesis into fact. The foundation laid by Dr. Goddard is largely responsible for the necessity of renaming the Air Museum the "Air and Space Museum."

I hope that the House will see fit to authorize the construction of this building and the Goddard memorial on its grounds.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the National Air and Space Museum is a fine step forward, in the presentation to the millions of members of the public who will visit it, the Nation's air and space collections. It is only by the display of the original air and space craft that the visitors to the museum will be able to relive the notable events in our history and gain an understanding of the principles of technology which has made such achievements possible.

The inspirational and educational character of the museum's exhibits will spark a response in the interest and enthusiasm of America's youth. It will also serve as a monument to the dedication and the perseverence of those who have made such achievements possible. The presentations, including mathematics, physics, fuel chemistry, metallurgy, and broad bases of aeronautics and space explorations will be a showplace for the Nation's science and technological advances.

It has been my pleasure to do my part for such a worthwhile enterprise. The joy and understanding that this museum will bring to the millions of visitors, makes me extremely proud of

my role in this, and as a member of the Joint Senate and House Committee for the Construction of the Museum of History and Technology.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6125?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on Rollcall No. 11 I was necessarily absent. Had I been able to be present for the vote on H.R. 12410, a bill to enhance the benefits of service in the Armed Forces of the United States, I would have voted "Yea."

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF EXPLORATION EXPENDITURES IN THE CASE OF MINING

Mr. MILLS. 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. 4665, to amend section 615 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4665, as amended and reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to provide for the removal of certain restrictions on the deductibility of mining exploration expenditures for minerals—other than coal, oil, and gas—paid before the beginning of the development stage of a mine.

Under present law such deductions are allowed up to a maximum of $100,000 a year, with a total, overall maximum of $400,000 for each taxpayer. The bill would permit the current deduction of mining exploration expenditures without regard to these limitations. The deduction would be elective and would be limited to expenditures for exploration in the United States.

The bill, however, would retain present law with respect to exploration expenditures for coal. It would also have no effect on the deduction for intangible drilling and development costs provided for separately under present law in the case of oil and gas wells.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4665 would also provide for the "recapture" of amounts deducted under this provision; that is, it would provide for the amounts deducted thereunder to be later added back into income. This recapture would occur with respect to all future deduction, whether or not they exceed the present maximums of $100,000 or $400,000 overall. In the case of a mine which comes into production, the recapture would occur either by the taxpayer including the amounts previously deducted in income in the year the mine reaches the production stage or by his reducing the depletion allowance, beginning in that year, by the amount of the deduction. The depletion allowance in respect of a bonus or royalty received with respect to a property would be similarly reduced. Deductions still not yet recovered, including those for nonproductive property, would be subject to recapture upon disposition of the property.

Mr. Speaker, because of the recapture provisions of H.R. 4665, it is not expected that there will be any appreciable long-run revenue reduction under the bill.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. GROSS. This is not in the nature of a depletion allowance?

Mr. MILLS. No; this does not apply to oil and gas; it does not apply to coal. It has to do with the exploration of mining properties only.

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. 4665

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 615 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to mine exploration expenditures) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) EXPENDITURES IN EXCESS OF LIMITATION.—

"(1) ELECTION OF TAXPAYER.—If expenditures described in subsection (a) which are paid or incurred during the taxable year are not deductible in the manner provided by subsection (a) or (b) solely because they exceed—

"(A) the limitation of $100,000 set forth in subsection (a), or

"(B) the limitation of $400,000 set forth in subsection (c),

at the election of the taxpayer such excess expenditures shall be allowed as a deduction for such taxable year despite such limitations.

"(2) RECAPTURE ON REACHING PRODUCING STAGE.—If a mine reaches the producing stage after the taxpayer has made an election provided by paragraph (1), then—

"(A) If the taxpayer so elects with respect to such mine, he shall include in gross income for the taxable year in which the mine reaches the producing stage an amount equal to the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to the mine, and the amount so included in income shall be treated for purposes of this subtitle as an expenditure which (i) is paid or incurred on the date on which the mine reaches the producing stage, and (ii) is properly chargeable to capital account.

"(B) If the taxpayer does not elect the application of subparagraph (A) with respect to such mine, then the deduction for depletion under section 611 with respect to the property shall be disallowed until the amount of depletion which would be allowable but for this subparagraph equals the amount of the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to such mine.

"(3) RECAPTURE IN CASE OF BONUS OR ROYALTY.—If the taxpayer has made an election provided by paragraph (1) and receives or accrues a bonus or royalty with respect to a property, then the deduction for depletion under section 611 with respect to the bonus or royalty shall be disallowed until the amount of depletion which would be allowable but for this paragraph equals the amount of the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to the property to which the bonus or royalty relates.

"(4) BASIS OF PROPERTY.—The basis of any property shall not be reduced by the amount of any depletion which would be allowable but for the application of this subsection.

"(5) ELECTIONS.—

"(A) METHOD.—Any election under this subsection shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe.

"(B) TIME AND SCOPE.—

"(i) The election provided by paragraph (1) for any taxable year may be made or changed at any time before the expiration of the period prescribed for making a claim for credit or refund of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year. Such an election for a taxable year shall apply to all expenditures described in subsection (a) paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year.

"(ii) The election provided by paragraph (2)(A) may be made or changed not later than the time prescribed by law for filing the return (including extensions thereof) for the taxable year during which the mine reaches the producing stage.

"(6) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection and subsection (f)—

"(A) The term 'mine' includes a well (other than an oil or gas well) or other natural deposit.

"(B) The term 'property' has the meaning determined under section 614 (a), (c), and (e).

"(C) The term 'adjusted exploration expenditures' means, with respect to any property or mine—

"(i) the amount of the expenditures allowed as deductions under paragraph (1) which are properly chargeable to such property or mine, reduced by

"(ii) the amount (if any) by which the allowances for percentage depletion under section 613 were reduced on account of the deduction of such expenditures,

properly adjusted for any amounts included in gross income under this subsection and for any amounts of gain to which subsection (f) applied.

"(f) GAIN FROM DEPOSITIONS OF CERTAIN MINING PROPERTY.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, if mining property is disposed of during a taxable year ending after December 31, 1964, the lower of—

"(A) the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to such property, or

"(B) the excess of—

"(i) the amount realized (in the case of a sale, exchange, or involuntary conversion), or the fair market value (in the case of any other disposition), over

"(ii) the adjusted basis of such property,

shall be treated as gain from the sale or exchange of property which is neither a capital asset nor property described in section 1231. Such gain shall be recognized notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle.

"(2) DISPOSITION OF PORTION OF PROPERTY.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

"(A) In the case of the disposition of a portion of a mining property (other than an undivided interest), the entire amount of the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to such property shall be treated as attributable to such portion to the extent of the amount of the gain to which paragraph (1) applies.

"(B) In the case of the disposition of an undivided interest in a mining property (or a portion thereof) a proportionate part of the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to such property shall be treated as attributable to such undivided interest to the extent of the amount of the gain to which paragraph (1) applies.

This paragraph shall not apply to any expenditure to the extent the taxpayer establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that such expenditure relates neither to the portion (or interest therein) disposed of nor to any mine, in the property held by the taxpayer before the disposition, which has reached the producing stage.

"(3) EXCEPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS.—Section 1245(b) (relating to exceptions and limitations with respect to gain from disposition of certain depreciable property) shall apply in respect of this subsection in the same manner and with the same effect as if references in section 1245(b) to section 1245 or any provision thereof were references to this subsection or the corresponding provisions of this subsection and as if references to section 1245 property were references to mining property.

"(4) ADJUSTMENTS TO BASIS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to provide for adjustments to the basis of property to reflect gain recognized under paragraph (1).

"(5) DEFINITIONS, ETC.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) MINING PROPERTY. The term 'mining property' means any property (within the meaning determined under section 614 (a), (c), and (e)) with respect to which any expenditures allowed as a deduction under subsection (e)(1) are properly chargeable.

"(B) DISPOSAL OF COAL OR DOMESTIC IRON ORE WITH A RETAINED ECONOMIC INTEREST. A transaction which constitutes a disposal under section 631(c) shall be treated as a disposition.

"(6) APPLICATION OF SUBSECTION. This subsection shall apply notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle."

SEC. 2. (a) The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are each amended by striking out "section 1245(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 615 (f)(1), 1245(a),":

(1) Section 170(e) (relating to charitable contributions).

(2) Subsections (b)(1)(B)(ii) and (d)(1)(B) of section 301 (relating to amount distributed).

(3) Paragraph (3) of section 312(c) (relating to adjustments of earnings and profits).

(4) Paragraph (12) of section 341(e) (relating to collapsible corporations).

(5) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 453(d)(4) (relating to distribution of installment obligations in certain corporate liquidations).

(b) The last sentence of section 751(c) of such Code (relating to definition of "unrealized receivables" for purposes of subchapter K) is amended—

(1) by striking out "section 1245 property (as defined in section 1245(a)(3))" and inserting in lieu thereof "mining property (as defined in section 615(f)(5)(A)), section 1245 property (as defined in section 1245 (a)(3)),", and

(2) by striking out "section 1245(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 615(f)(1), 1245(a),".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1964, but only in respect of expenditures paid or incurred after such date.

With the following committee amendment:

That (a) part I of subchapter I of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to natural resources) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 617. EXPLORATION EXPENDITURES IN THE CASE OF MINING.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—At the election of the taxpayer, expenditures paid or incurred during the taxable year for the purpose of ascertaining the existence, location, extent, or quality of any deposit of ore or other mineral in the United States or on the Outer Continental Shelf (within the meaning of section 2 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, as amended and supplemented; 43 U.S.C. 1331), and paid or incurred before the beginning of the development stage of the mine, shall be allowed as a deduction in computing taxable income. This subsection shall apply only with respect to the amount of such expenditures which, but for this subsection, would not be allowable as a deduction for the taxable year. This subsection shall not apply to expenditures for the acquisition or improvement of property of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167, but allowances for depreciation shall be considered, for purposes of this subsection, as expenditures paid or incurred. In no case shall this subsection apply with respect to amounts paid or incurred for the purpose of ascertaining the existence, location, extent, or quality of any deposit of oil, gas, or coal or of any mineral with respect to which a deduction for percentage depletion is not allowable under section 613.

"(2) ELECTIONS.—

"(A) METHOD.—Any election under this subsection shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe.

"(B) TIME AND SCOPE.—The election provided by paragraph (1) for the taxable year may be made at any time before the expiration of the period prescribed for making a claim for credit or refund of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year. Such an election for the taxable year shall apply to all expenditures described in paragraph (1) paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year or during any subsequent taxable year. Such an election may not be revoked after the last day of the third month following the month in which the final regulations issued under the authority of this subsection are published in the Federal Register, unless the Secretary or his delegate consents to such revocation.

"(C) DEFICIENCIES.—The statutory period for the assessment of any deficiency for any taxable year, to the extent such deficiency is attributable to an election or revocation of an election under this subsection, shall not expire before the last day of the 2-year period beginning on the day after the date on which such election or revocation of election is made; and such deficiency may be assessed at any time before the expiration of such 2-year period, notwithstanding any law or rule of law which would otherwise prevent such assessment.

"(b) RECAPTURE ON REACHING PRODUCING STAGE.—

(1) RECAPTURE.—If, in any taxable year, any mine with respect to which expenditures were deducted pursuant to subsection (a) reaches the producing stage, then—

"(A) If the taxpayer so elects with respect to all such mines reaching the producing stage during the taxable year, he shall include in gross income for the taxable year an amount equal to the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to such mines, and the amount so included in income shall be treated for purposes of this subtitle as expenditures which (i) are paid or incurred on the respective dates on which the mines reach the producing stage, and (ii) are properly chargeable to capital account.

"(B) If subparagraph (A) does not apply with respect to any such mine, then the deduction for depletion under section 611 with respect to the property shall be disallowed until the amount of depletion which would be allowable but for this subparagraph equals the amount of the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to such mine.

"(2) ELECTIONS.—

"(A) METHOD.—Any election under this subsection shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe.

"(B) TIME AND SCOPE.—The election provided by paragraph (1) for any taxable year may be made or changed not later than the time prescribed by law for filing the return (including extensions thereof) for such taxable year.

"(c) RECAPTURE IN CASE OF BONUS OR ROYALTY.—If an election has been made under subsection (a) with respect to expenditures relating to a mining property and the taxpayer receives or accrues a bonus or a royalty with respect to such property, then the deduction for depletion under section 611 with respect to the bonus or royalty shall be disallowed until the amount of depletion which would be allowable but for this subsection equals the amount of the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to the property to which the bonus or royalty relates.

"(d) GAIN FROM DISPOSITIONS OF CERTAIN MINING PROPERTY.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, if mining property is disposed of the lower of—

"(A) the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to such property, or

"(B) the excess of—

"(i) the amount realized (in the case of a sale, exchange, or involuntary conversion), or the fair market value (in the case of any other disposition), over

"(ii) the adjusted basis of such property, shall be treated as gain from the sale or exchange of property which is neither a capital asset nor property described in section 1231. Such gain shall be recognized notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle.

"(2) DISPOSITION OF PORTION OF PROPERTY.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

"(A) In the case of the disposition of a portion of a mining property (other than an undivided interest), the entire amount of the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to such property shall be treated as attributable to such portion to the extent of the amount of the gain to which paragraph (1) applies.

"(B) In the case of the disposition of an undivided interest in a mining property (or a portion thereof), a proportionate part of the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to such property shall be treated as attributable to such undivided interest to the extent of the amount of the gain to which paragraph (1) applies.

This paragraph shall not apply to any expenditure to the extent the taxpayer establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that such expenditure relates neither to the portion (or interest therein) disposed of nor to any mine, in the property

held by the taxpayer before the disposition, which has reached the producing stage.

"(3) EXCEPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS.—Paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (6) of section 1245(b) (relating to exceptions and limitations with respect to gain from disposition of certain depreciable property) shall apply in respect of this subsection in the same manner and with the same effect as if references in section 1245(b) to section 1245 or any provision thereof were references to this subsection or the corresponding provisions of this subsection and as if references to section 1245 property were references to mining property.

"(4) APPLICATION OF SUBSECTION.—This subsection shall apply notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle.

"(e) BASIS OF PROPERTY—

"(1) BASIS.—The basis of any property shall not be reduced by the amount of any depletion which would be allowable but for the application of this section.

"(2) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to provide for adjustments to the basis of property to reflect gain recognized under subsection (d)(1).

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) ADJUSTED EXPLORATION EXPENDITURES.—The term 'adjusted exploration expenditures' means, with respect to any property or mine—

"(A) the amount of the expenditures allowed for the taxable year and all preceding taxable years as deductions under subsection (a) to the taxpayer or any other person which are properly chargeable to such property or mine and which (but for the election under subsection (a)) would be reflected in the adjusted basis of such property or mine, reduced by

"(B) for the taxable year and for each preceding taxable year, the amount (if any) by which (i) the amount which would have been allowable for percentage depletion under section 613 but for the deduction of such expenditures, exceeds (ii) the amount allowable for depletion under section 611, properly adjusted for any amounts included in gross income under subsection (b) or (c) and for any amounts of gain to which subsection (d) applied.

"(2) MINING PROPERTY.—The term 'mining property' means any property (within the meaning of section 614 after the application of subsections (c) and (e) thereof) with respect to which any expenditures allowed as a deduction under subsection (a)(1) are properly chargeable.

"(3) DISPOSAL OF DOMESTIC IRON ORE WITH A RETAINED ECONOMIC INTEREST.—A transaction which constitutes a disposal of iron ore under section 631(c) shall be treated as a disposition. In such a case, the excess referred to in subsection (d)(1)(B) shall be treated as equal to the gain (if any) referred to in section 631(c)."

(b) The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are each amended by striking out "section 1245(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 617(d)(1), 1245(a),":

(1) Section 170(e) (relating to charitable contributions).

(2) Subsections (b)(1)(B)(ii) and (d)(2)(B) of section 301 (relating to amount distributed).

(3) Paragraph (3) of section 312(c) (relating to adjustments of earnings and profits).

(4) Paragraph (12) of section 341(e) (relating to collapsible corporations).

(5) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 453(d)(4) (relating to distribution of installment obligations in certain corporate liquidations).

(c) The last sentence of section 751(c) of such Code (relating to definition of "unrealized receivables" for purposes of subchapter K) is amended—

(1) by striking out "section 1245 property (as defined in section 1245(a)(3))" and inserting in lieu thereof "mining property (as defined in section 617(f)(2)), section 1245 property (as defined in section 1245(a)(3)),", and

(2) by striking out "section 1245(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 617(d)(1), 1245(a),".

(d) The table of sections for part I of subchapter I of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding after the item relating to section 616 the following new item:

"Sec. 617. Exploration expenditures in the case of mining."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 615 of such Code (relating to exploration expenditures) is amended—

(1) By striking out the heading and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 615. EXPLORATION EXPENDITURES IN THE CASE OF COAL."

(2) By striking out "deposit of ore or other mineral" in the first sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "deposit of coal".

(3) By striking out the last sentence of subsection (a).

(b) The table of sections for part I of subchapter I of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out the item relating to section 615 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 615. Exploration expenditures in the case of coal."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act but only in respect of expenditures paid or incurred after such date.

Mr. MILLS (interrupting the reading of the committee amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment, which is rather lengthy, be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this bill (H.R. 4665) removes the existing limitations on the maximum deduction allowable for exploration expenditures for minerals, other than coal, oil, and gas. Under existing law, deductions are limited to a maximum of $100,000 in any taxable year, with an overall maximum of $400,000 for each taxpayer. Once the maximum limits are reached, there is very little incentive for further exploration.

The bill removes the maximum limitations, both for a taxable year and the minimum overall limitation. It is restricted to exploration for minerals other than coal, oil, and gas for which no change in law was deemed necessary or desirable.

The law protects the revenues in that provision is made for the recapture of a tax on exploration expenditures previously deducted, where the property becomes productive or where the property is sold by the taxpayer. The new rules will provide a much more flexible basis for scheduling of exploration expenditures by this industry and, in the long run, should result in an increase in the Federal revenues. I urge favorable consideration of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and confidence that I recommend to my colleagues the passage of H.R. 4665.

I introduced this bill to correct a longstanding inequity in our tax code with respect to deductions for mining exploration expenditures. Under present law, a taxpayer may deduct only up to $100,000 for any single year for such exploration costs, with a lifetime maximum of $400,000. Any additional exploration costs must be capitalized as a cost of the property and may be recovered only in the event of abandonment, sale, or exchange. It is my feeling, and that of the committee, that such a restriction inhibits the level of mineral exploration in the United States and often encourages the premature abandonment or sale of properties that might otherwise become productive. In those cases where a company retains the property over a long period in anticipation of new uses or changing technology, it must suffer an indefinite postponement of a deduction.

The bill removes the existing limitations on deductions for exploration costs of minerals—except oil, gas, and coal—and provides instead for a recapture of the deducted amount in the event the property becomes operable. The taxpayer, if he exercises the option allowed by the legislation, may deduct all exploration expenses, but must include the deducted amounts as income in the first year the mine reaches production stage, or he must reduce his allowance for depletion by the amount of the deduction. This provision assures that total revenues to the U.S. Treasury will not be adversely affected over the long term.

If, as I fully expect, mineral exploration and development in the United States is encouraged by the enactment of these provisions, then the total revenues to the Treasury may well be increased from new income-producing mining properties.

The provisions of the bill limit deductions to properties within the United States. Many of the sophisticated minerals strategic to our defense and space efforts are now supplied entirely from foreign sources. A revitalization of the domestic mineral industry through increased exploration and development will assure a constant source of many of those minerals, and at the same time will benefit our domestic economy.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been most carefully drafted and the accompanying report contains very clear and detailed explanations of its technical provisions. The bill was reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee, and I urge its approval today by the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I support this very desirable bill and urge its adoption.

America's mining industry should benefit directly, and with it the entire economy through the growth and development of this basic industry.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4665 to liberalize tax deductions of exploration expenditures by the mining industry in regard to metalliferous mines. I am convinced that removal of the restriction in the Internal Revenue Code which limits deductions of expenses of exploration by our mining people will strengthen our mining industry for the benefit of all concerned.

In closing I wish to compliment the gentleman from Oregon upon his work in introducing and fostering this legislation and I commend the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. MILLS], and the members of his committee for reporting this meritorious measure. I hope it passes overwhelmingly.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the Ways and Means Committee for its excellent work in reporting H.R. 4665, Mr. ULLMAN's bill to remove the present limitations placed on the deduction of exploration expenditures in the case of mining. Last year, I introduced similar legislation, H.R. 2485, which I consider a necessary step in stimulating mineral production in the United States.

Removal of the present limitations will restore to the mining industry an incentive that has marked its adventurous spirit throughout its history. Mining is a risk capital business, particularly in the hard rock areas of this country. For the mining economy to progress every dollar of capital must be available for use. In the uncertain areas of gold, silver, lead, zinc, copper, and other metal exploration, capital expenditures for searching out the metals is a very expensive business. Even in mineral-rich northern Idaho it is not unusual for a company to spend a million dollars searching for a deposit, and to have nothing at the end of this expense but a large hole.

The committee report admirably sets forth the need for this legislation. As pointed out by the committee, the present restrictions of $100,000 per year and $400,000 lifetime limitation on the deduction of exploration costs reduces the incentive to continue mining and sometimes forces disadvantageous property disposals.

The impact of such a loss of incentive is highly disastrous for the industrial progress of this country. Every Member knows the shameful course we took last year by taking silver from our coins. This was done in the name of supply, not meeting demand. International monetary circles are searching for substitutes for gold, because many feel that not enough exists to carry the burden of world trade. This country imports huge amounts of lead and zinc, although they are in abundant supply here; the cost of bringing a mine into production is so high that we are forced to send dollars abroad to meet our needs. Recently stockpile disposals were ordered to control the price of other metals. A great deal of this pressure would be relieved by enactment of H.R. 4665.

H.R. 4665 is not designed to create a tax loophole. The stiff provisions for recapture of the deduction upon establishment of production or disposal of the property prevents every possibility of a double deduction. As the committee pointed out, the revenue effect of this measure in the long run is nonappreciable. The bill creates present incentive to seek new mines, an incentive which amounts to the saving of the taxpayers interest costs during the period between exploration and development. For the purpose of maintaining this much-needed incentive, I urge the adoption of H.R. 4665.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read, "A bill relating to the income tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining."

SUBCHAPTER S OF CHAPTER 1 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. MILLS. 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. 9883) to amend section 1373(c) and section 316(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1373(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) UNDISTRIBUTED TAXABLE INCOME DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'undistributed taxable income' means taxable income (computed as provided in subsection (d)) minus the amount of money distributed as dividends during the taxable year to the extent that any such amount is a distribution out of earnings and profits of the taxable year as specified in section 316(a)(2): *Provided, however,* That distributions to persons who were shareholders at the close of such taxable year made within two and one-half months following the close of the taxable year, shall be considered (but only to the extent of the undistributed net income of the taxable year determined without taking into account distributions during such two and one-half month period) to have been made immediately prior to the close of the taxable year."

SEC. 2. Section 316(b) is amended by adding thereto the following new paragraph (3):

"(3) SUBCHAPTER S CORPORATIONS.—The treatment under this chapter as a dividend of amounts distributed by an electing small business corporation under subchapter S within two and one-half months after the close of the taxable year of such corporation shall be determined as if such amounts had been actually distributed on the last day of the preceding taxable year."

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall apply to distributions made after December 31, 1964.

With the following committee amendment:

That (a)(1) section 1375 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special rules applicable to distributions of electing small business corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) DISTRIBUTIONS WITHIN 2½-MONTH PERIOD AFTER CLOSE OF TAXABLE YEAR.—

"(1) DISTRIBUTIONS CONSIDERED AS DISTRIBUTIONS OF UNDISTRIBUTED TAXABLE INCOME.—Any distribution of money made by a corporation after the close of a taxable year with respect to which it was an electing small business corporation and on or before the 15th day of the third month following the close of such taxable year to a person who was a shareholder of such corporation at the close of such taxable year shall be treated as a distribution of the corporation's undistributed taxable income for such year, to the extent such distribution (when added to the sum of all prior distributions of money made to such person by such corporation following the close of such year) does not exceed such person's share of the corporation's undistributed taxable income for such year. Any distribution so treated shall, for purposes of this chapter, be considered a distribution which is not a dividend, and the earnings and profits of the corporation shall not be reduced by reason of such distribution.

"(2) SHARE OF UNDISTRIBUTED TAXABALE INCOME.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a person's share of a corporation's undistributed taxable income for a taxable year is the amount required to be included in his gross income under section 1373(b) as a shareholder of such corporation for the taxable year in which or with which the taxable year of the corporation ends.

"(3) ELECTION UNDER SUBSECTION (e).—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any distribution with respect to which an election under subsection (e) applies."

(2) Subsection (e) of section 1375 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is repealed effective with respect to distributions made

after the close of any taxable year of the corporation beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Section 1375(d)(2)(B)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking out "under paragraph (1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "under subsection (f) or paragraph (1) of this subsection".

(c) Except as provided by subsection (d), the amendments made by subsections (a)(1) and (b) shall apply only with respect to distributions made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d)(1) The amendments made by subsections (a)(1) and (b) shall also apply with respect to distributions of money (other than distributions with respect to which an election under section 1375(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 applies) made by a corporation on or before the date of the enactment of this Act and on or after the date of the first distribution of money during the taxable year designated by the corporation if—

(A) such corporation elects to have such amendments apply to all such distributions made by it, and

(B) except as otherwise provided by this subsection, all persons (or their personal representatives) who were shareholders of such corporation at any time on or after the date of such first distribution and before the date on which the corporation files the election with the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate consent to such election and to the application of this subsection.

(2) An election by a corporation under this subsection, and the consent thereto of the persons who are or were shareholders of such corporation, shall be made in such manner and within such time as the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate prescribes by regulations, but the period for making such election shall not expire before 1 year after the date on which the regulations prescribed under this subsection are published in the Federal Register.

(3) In applying paragraphs (1) and (2), the consent of a person (or his personal representative) shall not be required if, under regulations prescribed under this subsection, it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the liability of such person for Federal income tax for any taxable year cannot be affected by the election of the corporation of which he is or was a shareholder.

(4) In applying this subsection, the reference in section 1375(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by subsection (a)(1)) to the 15th day of the third month following the close of the taxable year shall be treated as referring to the 15th day of the fourth month following the close of the taxable year.

(5) The statutory period for the assessment of any deficiency for any taxable year against the corporation filing the election or any person consenting thereto, to the extent such deficiency is attributable to an election under this subsection, shall not expire before the last day of the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the regulations prescribed under this subsection are published in the Federal Register; and such deficiency may be assessed at any time before the expiration of such 2-year period, notwithstanding any law or rule of law which would otherwise prevent such assessment.

(6) If—

(A) credit or refund of the amount of any overpayment for any taxable year attributable to an election under this subsection is not prevented, on the date of the enactment of this Act, by the operation of any law or rule of law, and

(B) credit or refund of the amount of such overpayment is prevented, by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than chapter 74 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to closing agreements and compromises), at any time on or before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the regulations prescribed under this subsection are published in the Federal Register,

credit or refund of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be allowed or made, to the extent such overpayment is attributable to such election, if claim therefor is filed before the expiration of such 2-year period.

(7) If—

(A)(i) one or more consecutive distributions of money made by the corporation after the close of a taxable year and on or before the 15th day of the fourth month following the close of the taxable year were substantially the same in amount as the undistributed taxable income of such corporation for such year, or

(ii) it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that one or more distributions of money made by the corporation during the period described in clause (i) were intended to be distributions of the undistributed taxable income of such corporation for the taxable year preceding such period, and

(B) credit or refund of the amount of any overpayment for the taxable year in which such distribution or distributions were received is prevented on the date of the enactment of this Act, by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than chapter 74 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to closing agreements and compromises),

credit or refund of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be allowed or made, to the extent such overpayment is attributable to an election under this subsection, if claim therefor is filed before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the regulations prescribed under this subsection are published in the Federal Register.

(8) No interest on any deficiency attributable to an election under this subsection shall be assessed or collected for any period before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the regulations prescribed under this subsection are published in the Federal Register. No interest on any overpayment attributable to an election under this subsection shall be allowed or paid for any period before the expiration of such 2-year period.

SEC. 2. (a) Subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to election by certain small business corporations as to taxable status) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 1378. TAX IMPOSED ON CERTAIN CAPITAL GAINS

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—If for a taxable year of an electing small business corporation to which this subsection applies—

"(1) The excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss of such corporation exceeds $25,000, and exceeds 50 percent of its taxable income for such year, and

"(2) the taxable income of such corporation for such year exceeds $25,000,

there is hereby imposed a tax (computed under subsection (b)) on the income of such corporation.

"(b) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be the lower of—

"(1) an amount equal to 25 percent of the amount by which the excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss of the corporation for the taxable year exceeds $25,000, or

"(2) an amount equal to the tax which would be imposed by section 11 on the taxable income (computed as provided in section 1373(d)) of the corporation for the taxable year if the corporation was not an electing small business corporation.

No credit shall be allowable under part IV of subchapter A of this chapter (other than under section 39) against the tax imposed by subsection (a).

"(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to an electing small business corporation for any taxable year if the election under section 1372(a) which is in effect with respect to such corporation for such taxable year has been in effect for the 3 immediately preceding taxable years.

"(2) NEW CORPORATIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to an electing small business corporation if—

"(A) it has been in existence for less than 4 taxable years, and

"(B) an election under section 1372(a) has been in effect with respect to such corporation for each of its taxable years.

"(3) PROPERTY WITH SUBSTITUTED BASIS.—If—

"(A) but for paragraph (1) or (2), subsection (a) would apply for the taxable year,

"(B) any long-term capital gain is attributable to property acquired by the electing small business corporation during the period beginning 3 years before the first day of the taxable year and ending on the last day of the taxable year, and

"(C) the basis of such property is determined in whole or in part by reference to the basis of any property in the hands of another corporation which was not an electing small business corporation throughout all of the period described in subparagraph (B) before the transfer by such other corporation and during which such other corporation was in existence,

then subsection (a) shall apply for the taxable year, but the amount of the tax determined under subsection (b) shall not exceed 25 percent of the excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss attributable to property acquired as provided in subparagraph (B) and having a basis described in subparagraph (C)."

(b)(1) The table of sections for subchapter S of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 1378. Tax imposed on certain capital gains."

(2) Section 1372(b)(1) of such Code (relating to effect of election by small business corporation) is amended by inserting "(other than the tax imposed by section 1378)" after "this chapter".

(3) Section 1373(c) of such Code (relating to definition of undistributed taxable income) is amended by inserting "the sum of (1) the tax imposed by section 1378(a) and (2)" after "minus".

(4) Section 1375(a) of such Code (relating to treatment of capital gains in the hands of shareholders) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) REDUCTION FOR TAX IMPOSED BY SECTION 1378.—For purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2), the excess of an electing small business corporation's net long-term capital gain over its net short-term capital loss for a taxable year shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount of the tax imposed by section 1378(a) on the income of such corporation for such year."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years of electing small business corporations beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 1372(e)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to termination of election by small business corporations) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) PASSIVE INVESTMENT INCOME.—

"(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an election under subsection (a) made by a small business corporation shall terminate if, for any taxable year of the corporation for which the election is in effect, such

corporation has gross receipts more than 20 percent of which is passive investment income. Such termination shall be effective for the taxable year of the corporation in which it has gross receipts of such amount, and for all succeeding taxable years of the corporation.

"(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to a taxable year in which a small business corporation has gross receipts more than 20 percent of which is passive investment income, if—

"(i) such taxable year is the first taxable year in which the corporation commenced the active conduct of any trade or business or the next succeeding taxable year; and

"(ii) the amount of passive investment income for such taxable year is less than $3,000.

"(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'passive investment income' means gross receipts derived from royalties, rents, dividends, interest, annuities, and sales or exchanges of stock or securities (gross receipts from such sales or exchanges being taken into account for purposes of this paragraph only to the extent of gains therefrom)."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years of electing small business corporations ending after the date of the enactment of this Act. Such amendment shall also apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962, and ending on or before such date of enactment, if (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate prescribes by regulations)—

(1) the corporation elects to have such amendment so apply, and

(2) all persons (or their personal representatives) who were shareholders of such corporation at any time during any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1962, and ending on or before the date of the enactment of this Act consent to such election and to the application of the amendment made by subsection (a).

Mr. MILLS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment, which is rather long, be considered as read and printed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, The purpose of H.R. 9883, as amended and reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to make three amendments to the provisions of the tax law which provide a special option for small business corporations to be taxed basically like partnerships.

The option provisions of present law, subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code, permit small business corporations and their shareholders to be taxed like partnerships and partners. Thus, corporations electing this status are not subject to tax but, instead, "pass through" to their shareholders the taxable consequences of their activities.

Since the original enactment of these provisions in 1958, which as will be recalled were added as the result of an amendment in the other body, certain problems have arisen with the operation of this election. H.R. 9883 deals with three such problems. Two of the bill's provisions are designed to alleviate unintended hardships that have developed, and the third is designed to prevent the possibility of tax manipulation which could lead to unintended benefits.

The first section of the bill provides that distributions made within 2½ months after the end of a year are to be considered as the distribution of undistributed taxable income of the corporation which was taxed to the shareholders on the last day of the corporation's taxable year. As a result, distributions made in this first 2½-month period after the end of the year will not again be taxed to the shareholders. This provision will alleviate the inequity in present law under which it is possible for a shareholder to have two inclusions in his income in 1 year with respect to what was intended to be the same corporate earnings. The change would apply with respect to distributions made after the date of enactment of the bill.

Also, Mr. Speaker, because it appears that numerous taxpayers have suffered unintended burdens because of the widely held misunderstanding of the distribution rules under existing law, the bill provides special rules of application for this new provision, on an elective basis, to distributions made before enactment.

Section 3 of the bill is the other provision to which I have referred that is intended to alleviate an unanticipated burden. This section would eliminate a hardship in the present automatic termination of "pass through" election where a corporation in its initial period of operation derives more than 20 percent of its income from passive investment sources. The bill suspends the 20-percent requirement in the first 2 years of a corporation's active conduct of business where the passive income for any year involved is less than $3,000. The new provision recognizes that delays attendant on the initial commencement of business operations have in frequent instances brought about unexpected termination of the "pass through" election, and it is designed to alleviate the hardship in this area.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the provision of the bill which would prevent tax manipulation is section 2. It amends the "pass through" election to prevent its use as a device to avoid a capital gains tax. Thus, under this provision, except where a small business corporation has elected the "pass through" treatment for the 3 prior years—or from the time of its existence, if shorter—under certain conditions capital gains are to be taxed to the corporation as well as to the shareholders. Capital gains in such cases will be taxed to the corporation, as well as to the shareholders, if such gains are greater than the corporation's ordinary income, but only to the extent they exceed $25,000 and only if the corporation's taxable income exceeds $25,000.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department has stated that it has no objection to the bill as amended and favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. The committee is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9883.

H.R. 9883 embodies certain amendments to the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code governing the so-called subchapter S corporations. These are small corporations, the stockholders of which have elected to be taxed as partnerships. The bill complements the action of the Congress when we granted this privilege to these corporations in 1958.

Under the tax rules generally applicable to corporations, a corporation is treated as a separate taxable person. At the end of a corporation's taxable year, its taxable income is computed and the corporate income tax is imposed. If dividends are distributed to the shareholders, the amounts of the dividends are generally taxable to the shareholders. Thus, income earned by a corporation is taxed to the corporation at the corporate level and taxed again to the shareholder when corporate earnings are distributed as dividends. The income earned by the business is taxed twice.

When a business is not conducted as a corporation, the taxable income from the business is simply included in the annual income tax return of the individuals conducting the business. The income earned by the business is taxed only once.

In order to permit small businesses to organize their operations without regard to differences in tax treatment, Congress enacted special legislation in 1958. This legislation permits the shareholders of certain small business corporations to make an election preventing the business income from being taxed at the corporate level and again at the shareholder level. Under this election the taxable income of the corporation, whether distributed to the shareholders or not, is taxed only once, by being included in the annual income tax returns of the shareholders.

In order to prevent abuses and insure that all the shareholders of a corporation agree to the special tax treatment, Congress provided that certain changes in a corporation enjoying this special tax treatment would automatically terminate the election. In the application of the statute, it was brought to the attention of the committee that the termination of this election resulted, in certain cases, in unintended and unduly harsh results. In other words, the provision which the Congress enacted to aid small business became, in those cases, a trap for the unwary.

This bill removes the inequity resulting from the termination of a subchapter S election either because of a change in stockholding or because within the first 2 years of operation the corporation failed to realize sufficient operating income to qualify under the income test.

In addition, at the request of the Treasury Department, the bill deals with what has been termed a "loophole," where the corporation intends to sell a substantial part of its assets, and pass

through the resulting gain to its stockholders. This change in the law will not have any effect on the usual small business corporation, the owners of which merely wish to be taxed as partners.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my sponsorship of this legislation was prompted by a tax trap that has befallen many taxpayers through no fault of their own.

In 1953 President Eisenhower recommended to the Congress that small businesses should be able to operate under whatever form of organization is desirable for their particular circumstances, without incurring unnecessary tax penalties. Ultimately, the Congress enacted legislation to carry out this intent by permitting corporations with a small number of active stockholders to be given the option to be taxed as partnerships and that certain partnerships be given the option to be taxed as corporations.

Since then a number of glaring weaknesses and inequities have shown themselves in subchapter S of the Internal Revenue Code, the most glaring of which deals with the distribution of profits by a corporation which is qualified to take advantage of this subchapter.

The measure before us, among other amendments, would provide relief for small business corporations operating under subchapter S of the Code which have been unable to determine their earnings prior to the end of their fiscal years. The sole purpose of this amendment is to give the corporate officers and the accountants a reasonable period of time after the end of the fiscal year to determine the earnings of the small business corporation for that year.

In many cases, it is not possible to determine their earnings prior to the end of the year because of, for example, the necessity of taking an inventory or accruing outstanding bills. The present statute forces the directors to declare a dividend of the earnings for the year before the end of the year, and therefore before the real earnings for that year are known. Otherwise, they run the risk of double taxation for such earnings.

This particular amendment has long been sought by the American Bar Association and the Association of Certified Public Accountants. The Small Business Administration has endorsed it, and the Treasury Department has no objection to it.

Another amendment proposed in this bill is one that would prevent a device from being used whereby a small business corporation could avoid a capital gains tax under certain circumstances. This matter came to the attention of the committee and it was realized that on some occasions undue advantage was taken of a provision in the present law which was not intended when enacted.

Finally, the bill includes an amendment to provide that a small business corporation is not to lose its pass-through status merely because its passive investment income exceeds 20 percent of its gross receipts during the first 2 taxable years in which it carried on the active conduct of a trade or business if its passive investment income for the year in question is less than $3,000.

The committee's attention was called to a type of instance which may well occur with some frequency whereby new corporations, for justifiable reasons, have been unable to commence their operations as soon as anticipated. This could place them in an unfair position in taking advantage of the present statute. This amendment is designed to eliminate this unintended hardship.

The bill was unanimously adopted by the committee with no objections from the Treasury Department.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes."

AMENDING CERTAIN ESTATE TAX PROVISIONS OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1939

Mr. MILLS. 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. 10185) amending certain estate tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, 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?

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the last sentence of section 894(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to the penalty in the case of a false or fraudulent estate tax return) is amended to read as follows: "If any part of any deficiency is due to fraud with intent to evade tax, then 50 per centum of the total amount of the deficiency (in addition to such deficiency) shall be assessed, collected, and paid, in lieu of the 50 per centum addition to the tax provided in section 3612(d)(2)."

(b) Section 871(i) of such code (relating to method of assessment) is amended by striking out "section 3612(d)(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 894(a)".

(c) The amendments made by this Act shall be applicable with respect to estates of decedents subject to the provisions of chapter 3 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. No interest shall be paid or allowed on any refund or credit of any overpayment attributable to such amendments.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the pending bill is to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that if any part of a deficiency with respect to estate tax liability is due to fraud with intent to evade tax, the penalty to be imposed is 50 percent of the total amount of the deficiency, rather than 50 percent of the total tax liability. This conforms the rule under the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to the rule now applicable in the case of estate tax deficiencies under the 1954 code.

The attention of the Committee on Ways and Means was called to a recent court case in which a circuit court of appeals, reversing the decision of the Tax Court, held that under the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 the penalty, in the case of a fraudulent estate tax return, is 50 percent of the entire estate tax—instead of 50 percent of the deficiency in the estate tax, as is the case under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The court of appeals stated in its decision that this had presented a case of first impression for which it could find "no guiding casebook authority," the issue not having been previously litigated.

The decision is contrary to the committee's understanding of the 1939 code provision at the time of enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the committee having stated, in its report on that bill:

> Existing law imposes a 50-percent addition in the case of fraud applicable to all taxes but, in the case of taxes other than income, estate, and gift, that addition is based on the total amount of tax imposed (H. Rept. No. 1337, p. A419, 83d Cong.).

The committee is of the opinion that the court decision described above produces a harsh result which cannot be justified, particularly in view of the fact that the burden of the penalty may fall in part on innocent beneficiaries of an estate who had nothing at all to do with the filing of the false estate tax return.

The Treasury Department does not object to this bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from California, Hon. JAMES B. UTT—an identical bill having been introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from New York, Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH—and the committee is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Having thoroughly enjoyed my work on this committee, I wish to advise the House that this resignation is being submitted in accordance with a decision of our committee on committees that members of the Committee on Rules should not have dual committee assignments.

Sincerely yours,

DELBERT L. LATTA,
Representative to Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 720

Resolved, That GEORGE V. HANSEN, of Idaho, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Agriculture.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPOSAL TO DROP PLASTIC ACES OF SPADES ON THE ENEMY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California's [Mr. HOSMER] weekly speeches are making a most valuable contribution to our strategic thinking on Vietnam, in fact, it is not too much to say that they are beginning to do for Monday what is already being done for Sunday by Steve Canyon.

Admirers of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] have been in a state of suspense since last week when he closed with this warning:

Both the targets and the ammunition may turn out to be quite unconventional—I shall say more about them in the near future.

Monday is here again, and we can now read on.

What the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has come up with is certainly original—a welcome new initiative—but we should recognize that his suggestions are no more than a beginning; we should all be grateful to him and the GOP conference committee on nuclear affairs, but one cannot help feeling that their specific suggestions betray an uncharacteristic timidity, one might almost say "conservatism."

His suggestion of showering enemy areas with plastic aces of spades is interesting; even more effective in convincing the enemy that their luck is running out would be the scattering of dice so loaded that they can never roll higher than acey-deucey. Again, the suggestion of dropping plastic women in dawn raids is indeed stimulating; but once again compromised by the gentleman from California's [Mr. HOSMER] disturbing addiction to the synthetic, why should we be content with polystyrene when the Daughters of the American Revolution are clamoring to do their bit?

The only danger that I see in all this is, of course, the ever present possibility of escalation which always has to be balanced against the advantages of any new military initiative. The discovery of new chinks in the enemy's armor—my apologies, Mr. Speaker, for an inadvertent pun—a frivolity inappropriate to the discussion the suggestions of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] deserve—this discovery should always alert one's mind to one's own corresponding vulnerability.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] wants us to take advantage of superstition in North Vietnam; is he so confident that there are no such weaknesses in his own back yard? What if the enemy retaliated in southern California? A few ladders judiciously arranged over the Long Beach Freeway, the Harbor Freeway, and the San Diego Freeway would isolate millions of commuters in his district; a systematic loosening of the tops of salt-cellars would produce lunchtime paralysis; and instead of hundreds of thousands of plastic aces of spades, the distribution of hundreds of thousands of meaningless IBM cards could create economic chaos.

The thought of the gentleman from California's [Mr. HOSMER] district, Mr. Speaker, reminds me of another feature of his speech—a political pointer of great interest, quite apart from the military value of his suggestions: As I listened to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] speech, I was struck by that uncanny feeling "I have been here before", where is it, I thought, that I have seen these plastic women, these plastic running dogs, these hooting devices, these "bizarre and ominous plant forms"? And then I remembered and realized where the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has been getting his inspiration—right next door, Mr. Speaker, in Disneyland. Dare we infer from this that Mr. Disney has now undertaken a role in the councils of the Republican party even more significant than that of advising Senator MURPHY?

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] says, and I have no difficulty in believing him, that his ideas are the outcome of the lucubrations of the GOP conference committee on nuclear affairs analysis; I think I can best sum up my reaction to these distinguished colleagues of ours in the words used by the Duke of Wellington of the British Regulars before Waterloo:

I don't know what they do to the enemy, but by God they frighten me.

SEVENTY-TWO PERCENT THINK DOMESTIC PROGRAM SHOULD NOT BE REDUCED DESPITE VIETNAM

Mr. GILLIGAN. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people again have backed the course set by President Johnson. This time, a poll reveals, 72 percent of the public believe the President's domestic program should not be reduced in the face of the Nation's Vietnam commitment.

The Louis Harris poll, published today, February 7, in the Washington Post, indicates that even a majority of conservatives who backed Barry Goldwater in 1964 do not wish to see key programs of the Great Society cut back.

Education and health assistance programs drew the strongest support, the poll indicated. The poll also seems to show the people have answered with a loud "No" the President's questions in his state of the Union message. The questions were:

There are men who cry out that we must sacrifice. Well, let us rather ask them who will they sacrifice? Are they going to sacrifice the children who seek the learning, or the sick who need the medical care, or the families who dwell in squalor now brightened by the hope of home? Will they sacrifice opportunity for the distressed, the beauty of our land, the hope of the poor?

Results of the poll which I call to the attention of my colleagues:

PUBLIC GENERALLY SEES NO REASON YET TO CHOOSE BETWEEN GUNS AND BUTTER

(By Louis Harris)

Although the American people tend to think Congress should slow down from its 1965 pace, 72 percent of the public is equally convinced that President Johnson's domestic program should not be reduced in the face of mounting commitments in Vietnam. The popular conviction seems to be that a nation so rich and prosperous need not yet choose between guns and butter.

Conservatives who backed Barry Goldwater in 1964, southerners who have consistently resented Federal incursions into their way of life, even high-income groups who suspect recent tax cuts may be short lived are included among the solid majority opposed to reducing expenditures for key programs of the Great Society.

When pressed to name those Government programs which in case of necessity ought to be cut first, two prime candidates emerged: the space program and aid to cities. The untouchables, in the judgment of most, would be aid to college education and health assistance.

A cross section of the public was asked: "In general, because of Vietnam, do you think President Johnson should reduce the size of his programs at home, such as education, poverty and health, or do you feel these programs should not be reduced?"

[In percent]

	Reduce	Don't reduce	Not sure
Nationwide	22	72	6
By politics:			
Voted Goldwater in 1964	41	50	9
Voted Johnson in 1964	12	84	4
By region:			
East	16	81	3
Midwest	24	69	7
South	28	64	8
West	24	69	7
By income:			
Under $5,000	18	75	7
$5,000 to $9,999	21	74	5
$10,000 and over	30	65	5

Time and again, people come back to their central view that domestic programs are im-

portant and essential and are high on the list of what our young men are fighting for. But if reductions are to be made, further questioning made clear, people are prepared to draw up their own list of priorities—both for cutting and for keeping.

The cross section was asked:

"Which one of the following programs would you cut first, if one Government program had to be reduced?" and "Which one of the following programs would you cut last, if one of the Government's programs had to be reduced?"

[In percent]

	1st cut	Last cut
Space program	28	15
Aid to cities	24	6
Poverty program	20	21
Aid to farmers	11	7
Aid to college education	6	33
Aid to health care	5	15
Not sure	6	3

It is possible, of course, that Mr. Johnson's already expressed aim of providing both guns and butter will be realized in 1966. This is the clear hope of a large majority. But if reductions do become necessary, the President's treasured "consensus" may prove to be more difficult to achieve.

MODERNIZATION OF POSTAL FACILITIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, recently Postmaster Lawrence O'Brien announced a new and expanded effort to modernize our postal facilities through increased mechanization. He proposes to take advantage of all present and future resources offered by science and technology.

Mr. O'Brien is to be commended for his ambition and foresight. The American postal system is the primary means of communication upon which our population relies. With private industry becoming increasingly mechanized, it is only logical and fitting that our national system of communication—the mails—should have the benefit of equivalent mechanized techniques in order to keep up with the times. Keeping abreast of modern methods is a debt owed the consumer public by the Post Office, and I greatly admire Mr. O'Brien for taking the initiative toward a public service of monumental proportion.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I should like to add that I am confident that Mr. O'Brien, while dedicated to modernizing the postal system through mechanization, is very conscious of the importance of the role of the individual worker in transporting the mails. He has indicated his concern for future adequate manpower, both at management and other levels. For this reason, I can fully support this new and expanded program, for I know the Postmaster General will implement the new mechanization for the greater good of the individual postal worker, as well as for the general public.

This new mechanization means not only better, more efficient mail service, but it also means improved working conditions for thousands of postal employees. Everyone stands to profit from the new postal mechanization.

The only reservation which I have concerning Mr. O'Brien's program is the purchase of 4,000 mailsters. A mailster is the little three-wheeled motorized vehicle used for suburban mail delivery. My office has received some reports of accidents involving these vehicles, and I am concerned for the safety of the postal carriers who make deliveries via these mailsters. If the safety record of these carts is shown to be poor, however, I am certain that the Postmaster General will delete the mailster portion of his program in the interest of the safety of the individual employee. I intend to appeal to him for reconsideration about these mailsters.

I should further like to call to mind at this time an outstanding innovation in the new Post Office program. This is the Office of Planning which Mr. O'Brien will establish. The Office will be staffed by a small, professional core of workers who will concern themselves with planning for the future of the postal service, by coordinating research efforts of Government and private industry. Furthermore, policy and operational decisions in the postal service will be facilitated by the aid of computers.

Americans should be proud of these steps toward progress which Mr. O'Brien has outlined for execution. The U.S. postal system stands to become the most modern postal operation in the world today.

EVERETT L. PALMER—PENNSYLVANIA IS LOSING AN OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

Mr. SAYLOR. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on February 1 one of Pennsylvania's outstanding citizens retired as vice president of the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. and is moving to Hanover, N.H. Everett L. Palmer is known and respected by many of us here in the Congress as a trusted friend.

I am sure the people of my State join me in wishing Ev Godspeed and great enjoyment in his retirement. Yet, I cannot help but view this event with some regret. We are all acquainted with the great economic and industrial advancement that has occurred in Pennsylvania in recent decades. As a public utility executive for the past 40 years, Ev Palmer contributed substantially to this growth—growth which is reflected in a higher standard of living for every Pennsylvanian; and, indeed, has contributed to our national prosperity. He will not be easily replaced.

Ev Palmer's interest and contribution has not alone been measured in his work with the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. but also in his interest and concern for education. He has been a trustee of the Western College for Women and of the Moravian College. He was also president of the board of the Moravian Seminary for Girls from 1954 to 1963. In these capacities he has done much to improve these educational institutions.

When Thomas Jefferson spoke to the Republican Citizens of Washington County, Md., on March 31, 1809, he said:

> If, in my retirement to the humble station of a private citizen, I am accompanied with the esteem and approbation of my fellow citizens, trophies obtained by the blood-stained steel, or the tattered flags of the tented fields, will never be envied. The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government.

Ev Palmer can be assured that his retirement will be accompanied with the esteem and approbation of his fellow citizens. Furthermore, he may be strengthened in his retirement by the knowledge that he has worked tirelessly toward successful implementation of the "only legitimate object of good government," the care of human life and happiness.

Mr. Speaker, to say merely that Everett L. Palmer's contribution to our growth is appreciated is an understatement. We are all indebted to him. To say simply that Everett L. Palmer is well liked is similarly an understatement. He is loved by many of us not only for his contributions to our material well-being, but, rather, just for being Ev.

Now, he and his lovely wife, Sara, are moving to Hanover, N.H., where, because of his love of skiing, he can spend more time on the slopes. As he leaves Pennsylvania, I can only say to him, "Good luck, Mizpah, and may the ski run be fast."

THE JOB CORPS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and I are friends of the Job Corps concept. As friends of the Job Corps concept, we are deeply distressed and angry about the philosophy prevailing in its administration today. Situations involving Job Corps enrollees from all over the country have come to our attention dramatizing this point. Perhaps the most disgraceful of them all involves the Job Corps camp at Mountain Home, Idaho, which we wish to discuss and express our indignant protest about today.

In doing so, let the record be clear that we sponsored legislation for experimental "residential skill centers" as far back as 1961. Although the administration opposed these proposals, we were able in 1963 to add such a provision to the Vocational Education Act. The projects were never funded by the administration.

The 1964 Poverty Act launched us on a mass production of Job Corps camps without the benefit of experience. The present philosophy of Job Corps administrators is endangering the entire Job Corps approach, which can and should help many youngsters help themselves. The following case history forcefully illustrates our point:

MEMORANDUM ON MOUNTAIN HOME, IDAHO

On November 15, 1965, a vicious fight took place in a dormitory at the Mountain Home Job Corps camp. A corpsman was brutally beaten by Paul Dennis Jones, a fellow corpsman, for playing a radio in the dormitory. With his victim prone, Jones slashed his face and hands with a knife and then plunged the knife into his abdomen.

Up to this point, the story seems like one of those unfortunate incidents that can happen occasionally when you put rough, hardcore young men together in a camp. The full sequence of events, however, is appalling and incredible. They can be summarized in the following 10 points:

1. Jones, the assailant, was what is known in the trade as a three-time loser. He had three felony convictions against him, plus a parole violation, when admitted to the camp.

2. Job Corps officials violated the interstate compact on parole and probations by failing to notify Idaho authorities that Jones was a parolee from California. Not only that, in response to a request from Idaho authorities, officials at the Mountain Home camp are unable to determine, or have refused to determine, how many of their corpsmen are presently on parole or probation from other States.

3. Jones not only was a three-time felony loser, he was serving in a supervisory capacity in the Mountain Home camp as a dormitory leader, wing leader and squad leader.

4. The Job Corps paid for an attorney, bail, and psychiatric treatment for Jones.

5. The Job Corps, by telegram from Washington, asked the court to release Jones on probation, without punishment, on the assurance he would be accepted back at camp.

6. After release from the hospital, the victim was so mistreated and threatened by Jones' friends at the Mountain Home camp that he was forced to resign from the Job Corps.

7. Job Corps officials refused to sign a criminal complaint against Jones and refused to cooperate with the local prosecuting attorney, Mr. Fred Kennedy.

8. The prosecuting attorney had to subpena other corpsmen in order to get them to testify and at least one of the eye witnesses to the assault, standing 3 feet from the scene, said he saw nothing. The prosecuting attorney is convinced that this witness is guilty of outright perjury, but once again Job Corps officials refused to cooperate or take action to assist the prosecution.

9. The U.S. attorney, Mr. Sylvan Jeppesen, the prosecuting attorney, the warden of the Idaho State Penitentiary, Mr. L. E. Clapp; the vice chairman of the Idaho Board of Correction, Mr. Mark Maxwell; an Idaho parole and probation officer, Mr. Al Roark; an official of the Idaho Employment Security Agency, Mr. Bill Lesh; and the Idaho attorney general, Mr. Allen Shepard were so incensed by the handling of this case by Job Corps officials that they met jointly and determined to bring the matter to the attention of Mr. Shriver and other officials in Washington. The prosecuting attorney wrote Mr. Shriver in December and, at least until recently, had not even received the courtesy of a routine reply.

10. On the pleading of the Job Corps officials, the district judge withheld sentence on Jones and placed him on probation for 2 years with the condition that he serve 4 months in jail and then return to the Job Corps.

Mr. Speaker, this memorandum is written at the combined suggestions of certain persons who attended a meeting recently in the office of Mr. Sylvan Jeppesen, U.S. attorney. In attendance were Mr. Fred Kennedy, prosecuting attorney for Elmore County, Mr. L. E. Clapp, warden of the Idaho State Penitentiary, Mr. Mark Maxwell, vice chairman of the board of corrections, Mr. Al Roark, parole and probation officer, Mr. Bill Lesh of the employment security agency, Mr. Allen G. Shepard, attorney general of the State of Idaho, and his two assistants.

Mr. Jeppesen stated that he had been requested by Senator CHURCH to attend said meeting, which was called primarily at the instance of Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Clapp.

The discussion involved a recent criminal incident at the Job Corps camp at Mountain Home, Idaho. It was the concensus of those present at the meeting that the entire congressional delegation should be informed both as to the circumstances and the thinking of the group regarding corrective action which should be taken.

On or about November 15, 1965, a vicious fight took place in one of the dormitories of the Job Corps camp at Mountain Home. Said assault allegedly took place as a result of Truley Tillman, a corpsman, playing a radio in a manner disturbing to the other occupants of the dormitory. The dormitory leader, one Paul Dennis Jones, brutally beat Truley Tillman about the head and face. While sitting astride the prone body of Tillman, Jones produced a knife and slashed Tillman about the face and hands, and then plunged the knife into the abdomen of Tillman inflicting a wound of approximately 2½ inches in depth.

The matter was reported almost immediately to Mr. Kennedy as county prosecutor. Because of the question of Federal enclave, the Federal Bureau of Investigation had been called. An FBI investigator was dispatched to the scene that night, interrogated Jones and obtained from him a statement admitting participation in the assault. Mr. Kennedy was approached that night by officials of the Job Corps, who attempted to convince Mr. Kennedy that there should be no criminal proceedings filed against Jones and he should be released to the Corps for administrative action. No person in the Job Corps camp, either corpsmen or official, would sign the criminal complaint against Jones for assault with a deadly weapon, and Mr. Kennedy was, therefore, required to sign the complaint himself.

It was necessary to issue subpenas and require attendance of Job Corps witnesses in court. The Job Corps officials, through their Washington, D.C., office, hired Mr. Robert Rowett, an attorney at Mountain Home, to represent the accused at Federal expense.

At the hearing held therein, Jones entered a plea of guilty to assault with a deadly weapon, and as is usual in such cases, the district judge deferred imposing sentence pending presentence investigation.

At the hearing for sentencing, officials from the Job Corps camp were present. A telegram from the Job Corps headquarters in Washington, D.C., was submitted to the court, which requested that the judge place Jones on probation and affirmatively stated that if said Jones were placed on probation by the court he would be accepted by the Job Corps and returned to the Job Corps camp.

In the course of the presentence investigation, it was determined that Jones is a three-time loser on felony charges, having been convicted and served sentences in California State correctional institutions. The criminal record of Jones can be summarized as follows:

At the age of 16, he attempted to kill two persons by firing nine shots from a revolver. He was admitted to the California Fort Springs Boy's Camp. In 1962, he was convicted of auto theft and received a jail sentence and 3 years' probation. Later in 1962, he was convicted of auto theft and sentenced to an additional 2 years' probation. In 1963, he was adjudged a parole violator, convicted of another auto theft and sentenced to the Soledad Correctional Institution. In 1964, he was paroled and on September 8, 1965, was arrested for driving with a revoked or suspended driver's license, and served a total of 25 days in jail.

At the time of his induction into the Job Corps, he was, and still remains, a parolee of the California correctional system. Idaho, as are all States, is a member of the interstate compact on parole and probations. Under the terms of said compact, each State agrees that it will not permit one of its parolees or probationers to move to another State's jurisdiction without, in advance, informing the receiving State of such desire and making arrangements for the supervision of such parolee or probationer by the receiving State during the balance of parolee or probationer's time. No such notification was received by the State of Idaho, or its board of corrections from either the State of California or the Job Corps. We were informed that said Jones, while at the Job Corps camp, was made a supervisor of other corpsmen in three capacities; dormitory leader, wing leader, and squad leader which would indicate he had rather close supervision of other corpsmen.

Mr. Kennedy has further stated that he has received practically no cooperation from fellow Job Corpsmen witnesses in investigating or processing the defendant for what is obviously a serious crime in the felony category. This, in spite of the fact that the defendant was a three-time convicted felon and but for extremely fortunate circumstances, his latest victim would have died.

One of the eyewitnesses to the assault, another corpsman, called by Mr. Kennedy to testify under oath, refused to state that he had seen the assault with the knife, although standing within 3 feet of the scene. Mr. Kennedy states that he is convinced that this witness is guilty of outright perjury. The victim of the assault was so mistreated and

threatened by friends of Jones that he has now resigned from the Job Corps and has left the State of Idaho.

Jones was recently brought before the Third District Court in Boise for sentencing, at which time Job Corps' officials and his lawyer, Mr. Rowett, also appeared. The district judge, Hon. J. Ray Durtschi, withheld sentence on Jones and placed him on probation for 2 years, with the condition that he serve 4 months in jail, and then return to the Job Corps. A further condition was that he receive psychiatric treatment.

I am sure I reflect the consensus of the group in stating that the concept of the Job Corps and the philosophy which led to its establishment is laudable in every respect. Such provides an opportunity for underprivileged youth to be trained for work and obtain necessary education. We think it is obvious that a group of young people in the 16- to 21-age bracket, most of whom are lacking in education and in the opportunity to compete in our society, are perhaps the most highly impressionable group of persons who could be assembled. Many of them have already had minor brushes with the law. I cannot think of a greater tragedy than having such a group of young people exposed to what is obviously a vicious and mentally disturbed person. To compound the problem, such a person was placed in a position of authority and responsibility over these same highly impressionable corpsmen.

We feel from this incident can be drawn the obvious conclusion that the screening process of the Job Corps is at times, at least, a complete failure. We are informed that the officials at the local Job Corps camp are unable to, or have not determined how many, if any, of their corpsmen are on a present active status of parole or probation from other States. The State board of corrections is reasonably positive that such situations exist and in conformance with the interstate compact, are desirous of being informed of the existence of parolees and probationers from other States who are presently residing within Idaho. We feel this is particularly necessary since we are informed that the Job Corps has no interest in the supervision of parolees or probationers.

We also feel it pertinent to point out that the officials of the State of Idaho concerned with supervising probationers and parolees have had very fine cooperation with the armed services regarding such supervisory problems.

It is also the consensus of the group that the basic concept of the Job Corps, as announced to the public at large, was not to provide rehabilitation institutions for criminals. The public acceptance of the Job Corps locations was, we felt, based on the asserted purpose of the Job Corps as providing training and education for underprivileged young people who deserved an opportunity.

From my own personal standpoint, and while I may not reflect the consensus of the group, I must state that I am highly shocked and indignant at the use of Federal moneys to furnish legal counsel, bail, psychiatric evaluation and treatment, and so forth, to an accused, regardless of whether he be a Federal employee, State employee, or whatever.

As you know, our system of criminal justice in the State of Idaho, for many years has required the appointment of legal counsel for indigent defendants and the reports of our supreme court are replete with opinions stating that the failure to fully and fairly advise an accused of his right to legal counsel, and to furnish such counsel, constitutes the deprival of constitutional rights. I seriously question the existence of any statutory authorization for such expenditure of Federal funds. Such certainly has never been the case in regard to armed services personnel and I can see no difference between the furnishing of counsel to a Job Corpsman, Federal employee, and the furnishing of legal counsel to a mailman, a U.S. attorney, an elevator operator in a post office building, or a U.S. Senator, any one of whom could be charged with murder or an attempted murder.

We sincerely believe that these matters demand your attention and investigation if the Job Corps is to continue to have the public confidence and carry out the very laudable program for which it was designed.

I should add that Mr. Kennedy, some time ago, wrote to the Director of the program, Mr. Sargent Shriver, relative to the problems discussed herein, and has not, as yet, received the courtesy of a reply.

DIFFICULTIES WITH THE JOB CORPS PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the obvious result of this case is that enrollees at Mountain Home Job Corps camp believe the law of the jungle prevails and that even officials of the U.S. Government countenance assault with a deadly weapon.

Job Corps officials should be called to account for this episode. Do they believe they are teaching the young men at the Mountain Home camp constructive values by their actions in this case? What justification do they have for hiring an attorney with Federal taxpayers' money, especially when Idaho law requires that indigent defendants be furnished counsel by the State? Why do Job Corps officials want Jones back in the Job Corps under these circumstances? Do they plan to put him back in a position of leadership and authority over his fellow job corpsmen?

FAULTY PHILOSOPHY

This case, in capsule, demonstrates two damaging and dangerous things about the way the Job Corps program is now being administered.

First, the screening of enrollees is so incredibly haphazard that officials don't even know when enrollees are on parole for commission of major felonies.

Second, the philosophy of Job Corps officials is so ridiculously soft and confused that they will excuse almost any behavior by an enrollee, even when it jeopardizes the chance of other enrollees to succeed.

The case of Paul Dennis Jones in Idaho is not an isolated one. It is typical of official policy in the Job Corps. This kind of approach in handling tough young men who have committed serious crimes permeates the entire administration of Job Corps camps. It can be fatal to the program unless it is reversed by direct and immediate action.

GANG RULE

Two dropouts from Camp Kilmer recently declared that they would not have enrolled in the Job Corps if they had known what it was like. One of them commented "Many youths sent to court for a minor crime were given a choice between the Job Corps and reform school." A common statement among enrollees is, "If I go back, the Judge will put me in jail." Another enrollee said, "The dormitories are ruled by gangs."

Is it any wonder that Job Corps dormitories are often ruled by gangs when authorities deal so foolishly with felony crimes? Job Corps policy provides specifically:

> No dismissals from Job Corps can be made by centers without getting prior approval from Job Corps headquarters * * *. Under no circumstances, explicit or implicit, should a resignation be asked for or the opportunity to resign offered.

REALISM NEEDED

The Job Corps concept is sound, but it cannot be administered successfully by administrators who coddle and encourage lawbreakers and gang leaders. Unless we start getting some realism into the Job Corps program, the American people will rise in indignation and probably sweep out the good potential with the bad performance. That would be tragic for the many youngsters who can be helped by a good Job Corps program, as well as for our society as a whole.

EFFECT ON VIETNAM, COMBAT TROOP MORALE OF U.S. MEDICS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Under Secretary of Defense commented extensively and favorably to me concerning the morale effect on combat troops, of the type of care rendered by the U.S. medics in South Vietnam. I assured the Under Secretary that this had been true in all services and all wars and engagements since the days of Surg. Gen. Jonathan Letterman who established hospital trains, and a system of evacuation and medical care in its basic modern phases during the War Between the States. I pulled from my desk book references, "The History of the Medical Department, U.S. Army," volume 15, entitled "Personnel in World War II," and

referred to chapters on "morale" which under the old War Department setup was considered a vital function of G–1—or the Chief of Personnel—but is now forgotten in a computer age. Admittedly, I slipped in a remark about lack of such coordination, referral to, or acceptance of advice of the Chiefs of Technical Services, whether it was in matters of supply taken over by the computers of DSA—Defense Supply Agency—or class 2 control—command and professional assignment of people by the Surgeons General in all services, at all levels—except the theaters of operation.

There was a time when medical care in South Vietnam by so-called USCOM units was primarily among civilians directed by the White House and State Department, and lowered quality medical care to the level of the Far Eastern trained—and French trained—physicians working and operating in barrios and under nonmodern conditions; rather than elevating and training their type care to our standards of know-how, equipment, and technique. Toward this end, as early as January 1964, hearing records will indicate that I recommended to the Secretary of Defense that our military installations be beefed up and used for both direct care for our service casualties as well as training and demonstration units for the civilian for the physicians and their aids of South Vietnam. From the attached article, paraphrasing the Theater Surgeon Col. Spurgeon Neel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army, I am pleased to report that this has been done. I know many military units have been commended for lack of loss of life, including one in support of units northwest of Saigon which was commended for handling 128 battle casualties in one 24-hour battle without a single loss of life. In the field of evacuation we have recently recommended forward placement of the trained and ready tactical aeromedical evacuation squadrons in order to better maintain the highly developed, but ofttimes improvised rapid evacuation.

Physicians have always served with professional know-how and quickly acquired military acumen, where needed around the world in times of stress. Because their know-how on completion of training is geometrically progressive and greater than their forebearers in recent wars, I predict that the death rate from battle casualities—as well as sick and nonbattle injuries—will continue to improve. It is now less than 1 percent in South Vietnam. No wonder there is high morale among those fortunate enough to be evacuated.

This article, dateline Saigon, South Vietnam, is self-explanatory, and I commend it to all, not only as interesting reading concerning the entire medical departments, but as an accurate estimate of the situation which will improve the morale of the retirees concerning their own, as well as the Nation's youth, who are in this hapless situation:

CHIEF SURGEON A HAPPY MAN—SUPPLY OF U.S. MEDICS IN VIET IS TERMED "IN EXCELLENT SHAPE"

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Col. Spurgeon Neel is a happy man. He has the tools to do his job—save the lives of wounded United States and Vietnamese soldiers in Vietnam.

Neel, chief surgeon for the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam (MACV), feels that he has a more than adequate supply of necessities needed for healing—well trained, dedicated doctors and nurses and excellent medical supplies.

He is free, too, of the usual military redtape. His only boss here is Gen. William C. Westmoreland, U.S. Military Commander in Vietnam.

An ebullient, loquacious man, Neel has first call on anything in the U.S. Army Medical Corps.

The supply of doctors to treat wounded Americans is good, he says: "We are in excellent shape both qualitatively and quantitatively."

Military spokesmen estimate there are well over 300 Army doctors and more than 200 Army nurses in South Vietnam. The Air Force and Navy likely have 150 additional doctors and about 100 nurses.

In Vietnam Neel has two mobile Army surgical hospitals, three field hospitals and two evacuation hospitals. The Navy has its 3d Medical Battalion with C Company at Da Nang, the "Charley Med" that has taken care of so many wounded marines.

In addition, the Korean division has an evacuation hospital of 400 beds, 26 doctors, and 33 nurses.

Working with the medical people in Vietnam, but not under MACV control are six military hospitals in Japan, one on Okinawa and one at Clark Air Force Base Hospital in the Philippines.

Neel says he sometimes has an unusual problem: overreaction to his requests by authorities in the United States.

Some time ago he asked for a flight surgeon, and they sent out a man who had been instrumental in flight-surgeon training at Fort Rucker, Ala.

I was glad to have him, and he was enthusiastic about coming," Neel said, "but actually it would have been better if he had kept on training other flight surgeons at home."

Neel does have other problems, of course, mainly concerned with logistics. Although he has first priority in the Army Medical Corps, there is still the problem of getting supplies to their destinations at the proper time.

The death rate for soldiers arriving at forward hospitals in World War I was 8½ percent. By World War II this had dropped to 4½ percent, and only 2½ percent of the soldiers reaching forward hospitals in Korea died.

In Vietnam the ratio has been 1 percent or a trifle less.

Neel is proud of the low rate, but he realizes it could easily change if the Vietcong start throwing large masses of troops into battle or bring in heavy artillery or air attacks.

"Actually, we haven't been strained too much yet," Neel says. "Our buildup has been gradual enough that we could pretty well project our medical needs and keep up with them. It hasn't been like Korea, where we found ourselves smack in the middle of a war one Sunday."

Besides the first-rate personnel available to him, Neel believes two factors have been important in the reduced death rate: improved anesthetics and techniques and the ability to provide whole blood to surgeons near the fighting.

Amputations have been greatly reduced by improvements in vascular surgery and the fact that more surgeons can now perform such operations involving the blood vessels.

"In Korea at one time we had only one man in one hospital who was an expert at this," he says. "Now vascular surgery is performed at every military hospital. We also have plastic tubing now that we can use as 'spare parts' in replacing damaged arteries and veins."

Swift movement of wounded men from the battlefield improves the chance of survival. In Korea only 10 percent of the wounded men were taken out by helicopter. Here it's 90 percent.

The titles "field" and "evacuation" hospital mean little in Vietnam. The 85th Evacuation at Qui Nhon on the central coast, for example, handled many of the first cavalrymen wounded in the Ian Drang fighting, and by no means all of them were evacuated. And the 85th currently is treating about 300 serious malaria cases, most of whom will be returned to duty from the hospital.

Two of the six U.S. military hospitals in Japan handle most of the Vietnamese casualties that arrive in that country. They are Johnson Hospital and Camp Drake, both run by the Army and both recently renovated.

About 1,000 evacuees are in the facilities in Japan, but only 15 percent are men wounded in battle. The others are sick or were injured outside combat.

Only the less serious cases among evacuees are taken to Japan. They are men who are expected to be returned to duty. Serious cases or those, for example, requiring plastic surgery, are flown on to the United States.

U.S. medical authorities in Japan say their supplies and personnel are adequate.

The U.S. Army hospital on Okinawa has been expanded from 350 to 500 beds. The hospital has a sufficient staff, its administrators say.

One of the key out-country hospitals handling wounded is Clark Air Base Hospital near Manila. At Clark some casualties remain, but others, usually critical cases that can be moved, are quickly transferred to other military hospitals in the Pacific area, including Honolulu and Formosa. Some are sent directly to the United States.

There are no serious shortages at Clark, but during such major battles as Ian Drang the hospital was jammed, and doctors and nurses sometimes worked for 48 hours without sleep.

The most serious problem confronting Army doctors is wounded who require brain surgery. There are not many brain surgeons in the Army.

Some U.S. doctors are attached to South Vietnamese units, and many American physicians serve as advisers to the Vietnamese. U.S. medical personnel also hold clinics in every village the Army passes through, passing out medical supplies and treating everything from a scratch to surgery. Individual treatments, a spokesman says, average 20,000 to 30,000 a week.

TARIFF CUT OF 50 PERCENT UNJUSTIFIED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have had strong misgivings about the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and the 50-percent tariff reductions proposed under it. The tariff cuts would be across the board and very few items would be spared from the 50-percent cut.

The act itself in no sense called for such a drastic operation. This was superimposed on it later by the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

The act itself contemplated something very different. The legislation called

for very extensive and detailed hearings by both the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Committee for Trade Information. It called for the gathering of detailed information on the many tariff items, which is to say, the many products which would be subject to duty reductions. The act spelled out the type of pertinent information that was to be developed in the public hearings.

The hearings were indeed held—3 years ago, or from December 1962 through March 1963. Some 800 witnesses testified or sent in statements, including many Members of this House and the other body. The purpose was to gather full information for measuring the probable effect of tariff reductions on different products.

If a general tariff reduction across the board had been contemplated it would have been unthinkable for Congress to require such hearings or for the hearings actually to be held as they were held. It is obvious that the Congress had no intention of calling for a 50-percent cut across the board. Yet that, with minor exceptions, is precisely what was agreed to with the GATT representatives in a meeting held in May 1963, or nearly 3 years ago.

The agreement with GATT placed the Congress in a ludicrous light and made of the public hearings held by the Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee an unaccountable exercise in the waste of time and money. It was worse. It broke faith with accepted procedure and upset the trust placed in legislative enactments.

Mr. Speaker, these highhanded procedures and the flouting of the statute have been enough to condemn the whole American participation in the Geneva negotiations. Congress should call for a correction, and insist that the unquestionable intent of the law as reflected by the provisions I have mentioned be honored rather than brushed aside as so much chaff. If the Congress permits its laws to be thus interpreted at will by administrators there would be no need of legislating.

This is not all.

On the economic side a deep flaw in our trade statistics that has been producing deceptive effects about this country's competitive position in foreign trade, is coming to light. The public has been led to believe that our position is so strong that we have succeeded in ringing up export surpluses of $5 to $7 billion per year in recent years. This optimistic impression has been challenged in recent times. I myself challenged it in a statement on this floor last fall; and I am convinced that the United States is not in good shape in foreign markets, as measured by truly competitive exports.

The one item of manufactured goods in which our exports have prospered has been machinery and industrial equipment; and this is accounted for by the large outflow of capital from this country into production facilities in foreign countries, where labor costs are distinctly lower than here. In manufactured items other than machinery our share of world markets has been shrinking.

We have also increased our exports of farm products, but the increase is accounted for wholly, not by our competitive advantage, but by governmental assistance. Shipments under foreign aid, the food for peace program, et cetera, have lifted our farm exports to record levels, but the American taxpayer has made up the difference between our costs and foreign prices. Therefore the evidence does not support any notion of our competitive superiority.

If the proper corrections are made in our statistics we will find that our vaunted export surplus vanishes so far as it could be taken as evidence of our competitive standing in world markets.

This being the case it is not possible to justify any serious tariff reductions at the present time, much less one of 50 percent.

Since our machinery exports indicate a competitive advantage perhaps that item could withstand a duty reduction; but we should not jeopardize scores of other important products on the ground that our exports of machinery are booming.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution designed to correct the statistical practices complained of so that we may feel confident that the official statistics on which policy is based is sound rather than deceptive.

CONGRESS SHOULD BE GENEROUS IN RECOGNIZING ITS OBLIGATION TO SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. MIZE. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, in view of our consideration of legislation to provide education, training, and other readjustment benefits to the men and women of our Armed Forces, I think it is appropriate to call attention to a statement which I have filed with the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in behalf of the bill I have introduced, H.R. 12168, the Veterans' Educational Assistance Act of 1966.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHESTER MIZE TO VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE IN BEHALF OF H.R. 12168, THE VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966, FEBRUARY 7, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the United States has always been generous with its veterans. The Congress and the people have always recognized that compulsory military service demands sacrifices on the part of those called upon to serve their country in times of peace as well as in times of war. Young men and women must leave their jobs, interrupt their educations, and disrupt their family lives in order to fill positions essential to the national security.

In the past we have helped compensate for these sacrifices through federally sponsored programs. After World War II, it was the GI bill of rights; after the Korean conflict it was the Korean bill of rights. These were programs to help the veteran continue his education, retrain for his job, get his family into a home, or start a new business. They have cost billions of dollars, but we have accepted these costs as part of the price we have to pay to keep the Nation secure against the efforts of those who would destroy us or enslave us. It is interesting to note, however, that the billions we spent in these programs have returned additional billions to the economy from the better salaries of the better trained and the better educated veterans.

Since the expiration of the Korean GI bill in January 1955, our country has still had compulsory military training because there has never been a time when we didn't need the services of GI's to carry out defense duties around the globe. We've referred to these periods of service as cold war duties even though they have had the habit of heating up now and then in Berlin, Lebanon, Quemoy and Matsu, Cuba, southeast Asia, and the Dominican Republic.

Legislation has been introduced as a cold war bill of rights and has passed the Senate. This legislation has strong support among Members of the House of Representatives, as witness the number of bills which have come before this committee. It is generally accepted, although somewhat reluctantly by the administration, that the Nation provide readjustment benefits for our service men and women as long as we find it necessary to call them into the service of their country.

We differ as to the degree of this assistance, however. In the introduction of my bill, I have joined with my colleagues who feel that we should include all veterans who have had at least 6 months of military service from February 1, 1955, to the termination of their compulsory service. Those who become eligible on the basis of their service would earn education or training time at the rate of 1½ days for each day of military service. A limit of 36 months would be placed upon the total amount of education and training to which a veteran would be entitled. He would have to start his program within 3 years after discharge and would be required to complete it within 8 years after discharge.

Funds would be provided to each eligible veteran to help him pursue a program of education and training, full time or part time. The allowances could be used toward defraying the costs of subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment. Funds would also be available should the veteran choose a program of on-the-job training or on-the-farm training.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which I and several of my colleagues have introduced, does not differ in principle from the other bills which have been introduced. It recognizes the obligation we have to the men and women we call into the armed services. Our bill is more generous in many respects than the other bills, but certainly this is no time to be niggardly, especially in view of what our service personnel are being asked to face in Vietnam. I would hope that the generous provisions incorporated in H.R. 12168 would be ones which would prevail in the legislation adopted by the 89th Congress. Although generous, the provisions are reasonable, and are partial compensation to the few who have had to make sacrifices in defense of the many who can remain at home, stay on their jobs or continue their educations, enjoy their families and risk neither life nor limb in their pursuit of happiness.

HARVEST LOSSES RESULTING FROM TERMINATION OF BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. TEAGUE of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following summarization of a report by the University of California relating to harvest losses as a result of the termination of the bracero program.

The report may be summarized as follows: What does it all add up to? Just this. While gross revenues may have increased, net income dropped almost $140 million in high labor use crops. Most of this was caused by tremendous increases in production and harvest costs brought about by inefficient labor, high turnover, as well as wage increases.

The report follows:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA REPORT SUBMITTED TO STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE CONFIRMS GROWER HARVEST LOSSES

From the start of the U.S. Department of Labor's experiment to relocate city unemployed in seasonal farm jobs last year * * * agriculture warned that unless adequate supplies of labor were available when and where they were needed, there would be losses—losses not only to agriculture but to the entire economy.

Secretary Wirtz assured agriculture and the public that there would be no "rotting of crops in the fields" if agriculture cooperated with and adhered to his criteria. To the best of its ability agriculture did cooperate, in the face of constantly changing rules and demands by the Department of Labor. Only when it became apparent that continued cooperation would not produce needed workers, in spite of huge recruiting costs, did some industries, such as citrus, decide that they would try to solve their problems without any help from the Secretary of Labor. As one grower said, "If we're going to go broke, we're going to do it on our own terms."

As the season progressed, it soon was realized that this was a season without parallel in the memory of most growers. The weather cooperated with the Secretary to an extent beyond belief. The Department and its supporters began to minimize the losses that were being sustained. They said, "perhaps some crops were lost, but the price increases will more than compensate for any losses." As a result the public was lulled into believing the experiments were working.

Even the Governor got into the act and pointed to a new high in cash receipts—$3.7 billion—as proof that agriculture has survived the crisis without serious losses.

All along, growers had been cautioning that increased gross returns did not mean increases in net returns, that the Department of Labor's experiments were costing huge amounts of money, and that general statements should not be used to prove specific points. As one State board of agriculture member said, "The release of generalities is confusing the public, and infuriating the farmer."

Because of the claims and the counterclaims, the board of agriculture asked the University of California to survey the results of the 1965 harvest season in California. The result of this survey was presented to the board last week at the same time as a report on a survey conducted by the State department of agriculture. These two reports showed a reduction of $139.9 million in net income to a group of high-labor-use crops in California with $90 million of this directly due to increased production and harvesting costs.

The asparagus industry, as an example, where a longer fresh harvest season and sharply higher prices were cited as compensating growers for any losses of crop that might have occurred. The University of California survey showed, on the contrary, a reduction of $2.4 million in net income, much of it from the fact that growers abandoned several thousand acres in the middle of the season. The report said, "Generally growers may plow out more than a normal number of acres when (1) the weather is poor, (2) market prices are low, or (3) labor is in short supply." It continued to say that, "In 1965, the weather was good and the domestic and export market outlooks were excellent," but that "harvest labor costs increased approximately 46 percent." In other words, neither weather nor markets caused loss of crop or acreage reductions, only labor is left as the cause of the loss of crop and income to the grower.

The University of California survey further documented a $3.1 million increase in the cost of harvesting and hauling lemons and a $7.9 million reduction in net income to lemon growers and, it added, "growers failed to obtain the additional workers needed to prevent deterioration of quality," but the report said that it had made no attempt to measure the loss to growers from "fruit left on the trees too long," nor from "spoilage of mature fruit in storage and in transit" caused by the labor shortage and inefficient workers. So, complete as the report is, there were still additional losses directly caused by the shortage of qualified labor, and having a direct effect on the economy of California.

The report added that strawberry growers "did not keep fields properly picked to maintain quality" and that they "diverted large quantities of overmature and poorly picked berries to the processing outlets." It said growers were unable to take advantage of a reduction in crop which should normally mean a higher price because "a large proportion of the volume shipped to the fresh market was below normal quality," according to inspection records, and "increased imports from Mexico" which "reached an estimated 4.515 million pounds of fresh berries" in 1965, more than eight times the volume of fresh fruit shipped in 1960, and almost a million pounds more than 1964. Both the poor quality fruit picked by inexperienced help and the movement of the crop to Mexico are facts that agriculture maintained throughout the season and now are confirmed for all to see.

In commenting upon the tomato season, the one bright spot in the high labor use crops, the University of California researchers said, "The 1965 season was an unusual one for the California canning tomato industry." They added that "uncertainty about availability of harvest labor discouraged many growers from planting in early 1965. Late in the planting season the Secretary of Labor indicated that the tomato crop would not be lost because of lack of labor. Encouraged, growers increased their plantings late in the season."

The almost incredible good fortune which permitted this late crop to be harvested without loss brought forth this remark from the University of California economists: "The California tomato growing season is usually ended by the fall rains, which may come any time from mid-October on. In 1965, the rainy season did not begin until well into November. Late plantings of tomatoes matured and were available for harvest." The report also took recognition of the fact that "there were periods when labor shortages caused harvest losses in early tomatoes" primarily in the Merced area.

The report confirmed that labor shortages "caused harvest losses in asparagus, strawberries, brussels sprouts, and early tomatoes," and it said "local labor shortages for the 1965 deciduous and citrus fruit harvests caused harvest to lag behind the usual harvest pattern, resulting in some individual grower losses."

The survey did not attempt to place dollar values on these losses, but where records were shown, strawberries worth $4.1 million were grown and not harvested in addition to losses because of poor quality, and asparagus worth $1.8 million was unharvested in addition to 6,500 acres plowed out during the harvest season. Allied industry suffered nearly $4 million additional losses because of the reduced volume in just these two crops, the survey indicated, proving once again—agriculture was right when it said that the great social experiment was going to cost the economy of California millions of dollars.

STATE BOARD FAILS TO TAKE ACTION ON RESOLUTION SUPPORTING IMPERIAL VALLEY LANDOWNERS

The State board of agriculture failed to take a stand on a resolution opposing Department of Interior efforts to enforce 160-acre limitations in the Imperial Valley.

The decision was made after the board heard several witnesses who said the limitation should be maintained to encourage family farming. The chairman announced he was appointing a subcommittee of Ernest Hatch, Leo Giobetti, and J. J. Crossetti to study the matter.

Earlier the board had heard an Imperial Valley farmer and member of the board say that the threat of the limitation already had depreciated land values in the valley. He said efforts to impose the limitation were "trying to turn the clock back 100 years" and that they had "struck fear into the valley."

The resolution under consideration had been offered to the board by representatives of the Imperial Resources Associates at the previous meeting.

PROGRESS BEING MADE IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS UNDER RESPONSIBLE ADMINISTRATION OF GOV. RALPH M. PAIEWONSKY

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a speech of the Governor of the Virgin Islands.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of our colleagues have enjoyed travel in the Virgin Islands of the United States and have been impressed not alone with the jewel-like beauty of these islands, but also with the progress being made in them under the responsible administration of Gov. Ralph M. Paiewonsky.

Governor Paiewonsky has led the Virgin Islands in their forward march since April 5, 1961, when he first took office. On January 17, 1966, Governor Paiewonsky delivered his state of the territory message to the Seventh Legislature of the Virgin Islands in which he presented his legislative program for continued progress in the islands. I am sure that our colleagues would want to have the Governor's thought-provoking message available for future reference in connection with congressional responsibilities for the Virgin Islands. The message follows:

STATE OF THE TERRITORY MESSAGE OF GOV. RALPH M. PAIEWONSKY TO THE SEVENTH LEGISLATURE OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, REGULAR SESSION, JANUARY 17, 1966

Mr. President, honorable members of the seventh legislature, my fellow Virgin Islanders, it is almost 5 years since I took the oath

of office as Governor of the Virgin Islands, and many of the promises we made and the programs we pledged for our people then have been fulfilled or are in process of fulfillment. When I recall that inaugural day and remember the obstacles that confronted us, I marvel at the progress we have made, and I humbly thank God for giving us the strength and the purpose to have accomplished so much. We needed so many things—housing, help for the aged and infirm, upgrading of education and expanded educational facilities, promotion of tourism, and diversification of the economy. We needed zoning, planning, water, power, airport development, slum clearance, and harbor improvement, to name but a few.

We pledged to build a better place here in the Virgin Islands for ourselves and for today's children, as well as tomorrow's. We knew we had to move forcefully and quickly, recognizing that when the youngest child of the islands has grown to manhood, we will be judged by what we provided now for his health, his education, his chance for a better home, a better opportunity and a better life.

Now, almost 5 years later, we can see that these have been unprecedented and fruitful years—years of growth, of giant economic strides and social gains—and we gratefully acknowledge and pay tribute to the many people who have played a part in this eventful journey.

We have had help from a host of dedicated, hard-working, responsible members of our executive branch, our public servants.

We have had cooperation from a multitude of private citizens and interested officials of the Federal Government.

We have good fortune to be blessed with the natural beauty and benefits of a sunny clime, at a time when people have become travel wise and vacation conscious.

And we have had the advantage of President Johnson's Great Society program now being implemented here in the Virgin Islands in every possible way.

Most of all, we have the advantage of a responsible, forward-looking legislature and legislative program. You have recognized your duty to the people of the Virgin Islands and you have, through conscientious thought, exhaustive study and long hours of work, amassed a legislative record unsurpassed in Virgin Islands history. The far-reaching programs of this administration could never have been carried out without your support.

Gentlemen, as I see it, we are—you and I—partners for progress in the Virgin Islands. It is my job to report to you on the state of the territory, but it is the task of all of us to strive for the constant improvement of our islands. Because we all have done our part and continue to do so with unremitting energy and dedication, I can report to you today that the state of the territory continues to be excellent.

The state of the territory is excellent because we have been partners for economic progress. Local government revenues, including Internal Revenue matching funds, totaled almost $29 million in fiscal 1965 as compared with $24,800,000 in 1964, and the trend of increased revenues continued during the first half of fiscal 1966. Per capita income has exceeded $2,000, a new high for the islands and the highest in the Caribbean. Bank assets continue to soar, up 35 percent to over $90 million. Tourism and employment are at all-time highs and wage scales continue upward. Over half a million visitors came to our islands last year, spending $54 million, $6 million more than the previous year. We are building a sound, broad-based economy that continues to expand at unprecedented rates.

The state of the territory is excellent because we have been partners for progress in education. A total of 92 classrooms and 26 special facilities have been constructed in the past 4 years. Curriculum study and development, teacher training, and the teacher-pupil ratio are vastly improved. We are embarked on a program of preschool training and adult education. We have provided a teacher pay incentive plan and with Federal help are working on the dropout problem and apprenticeship training. We have graduated the first class of our College of the Virgin Islands, which continues to expand in number of students and courses offered.

Most important of all, we have embarked on a school construction program that is expected to provide an additional 113 classrooms by this fall, to be financed through funds from the highly successful recent bond issue program.

We also have been partners for progress in health and social welfare. There have been no epidemics in recent years and immunization programs continue to prevent the outbreak of communicable diseases. Our public health programs are being continually expanded and our hospital facilities improved. We have provided the community with a new youth-care center and a day-care center for preschool children. And we have, with Federal funds, begun work experience and training programs for persons unable to support themselves or their families.

And we have been partners for progress in housing. Thousands of Virgin Islanders have been relocated into safe and sanitary new apartments and homes through Federal and local programs. Five hundred additional low-rental units are in the planning and execution stage. The need for middle-income housing is also being met, with the first project of 128 units to be dedicated next month. Private construction continues to be encouraged and urban renewal programs planned. In all areas, public and private, we hope to continue to provide more than 1,000 housing units per year until all blight and substandard housing has been eliminated. More and more, we will avail ourselves of federally sponsored programs to provide the moneys necessary to complete this gigantic task.

The year just ended has been a year of many accomplishments, a memorable year in many ways.

In June we were honored by the visit of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, whose warmth and eloquence captured the hearts of us all. Her address at the first commencement exercise of the College of the Virgin Islands focused national attention on our educational endeavors.

In November, we welcomed the Vice President of the United States, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, to the dedication of our new water and power plant. Once again, the eyes of the Nation turned to the Virgin Islands and highlighted our progress in providing for our basic needs.

Throughout the year, distinguished visitors from the United States and other countries of the world have come here to see and enjoy our "showplace of democracy."

The year 1965 also saw the culmination of 4 years of effort to persuade the Congress to grant us the "2-to-1" customs advantage we needed for our tourism industry. The enactment of the special provision in our favor was recognition of the fact that most of every dollar spent here remains within our Nation's economy. It was a notable achievement for the islands.

This was the year in which jet service to St. Thomas, via St. Croix, was approved, and beginning on January 21, we will see an ever-increasing flow of direct flights to further enhance our tourism efforts. Allocations were approved by the Federal Aviation Agency for improvement of airport facilities on both St. Thomas and St. Croix, and plans are under consideration for a first-class jet airport on the east end of St. Thomas to provide for our future needs.

The year 1965 saw important steps taken in the transfer of the major responsibilities of the Virgin Islands Corporation to the territorial government. Power generating facilities on St. Croix and St. Thomas were turned over to the Virgin Islands Water and Power Authority. We assumed management responsibility for the Harry S. Truman Airport and the submarine base, and about 1,000 acres of Virgin Islands Corporation land on St. Croix was designated for transfer to the local government to be used for education, housing, and health facilities.

The year 1965 will be remembered as the year the islands celebrated their first bond issue. More than $5 million in bonds were successfully sold to help finance school construction and the acquisition of land and planning for two medical centers and water facilities.

We will remember it also as the time when we acted to conserve and develop our natural resources. A bill was passed to control the use of underground water and to establish a water resources commission. A pilot program already has been established on St. Croix to utilize the underground water there. Together with our plans for desalinization, we will be permanently assured of an adequate supply of potable water. We are proud to point out, also, that our new soil conservation bill has been described by officials of the Soil Conservation Service as a model law.

Farmers will recall 1965 as the year when relief from the prolonged drought came to them in the form of 134 tons of feed grain from the Federal Government and 400 tons from the local government.

This was the year in which delegates to the Virgin Islands Convention presented their recommendations for greater self-government to the Federal Government. Before the year ended, one of their recommendations, and a much needed one, to let legislators set their own salaries, was enacted by the Congress.

The year marked the beginning of an intensive beautification campaign with the goal of making the Virgin Islands the most beautiful in the Caribbean. With the help of a legislative appropriation and the cooperation of many private citizens, planting, painting, and cleanup already have begun.

This was the year when the islands industrial development program brought many new businesses and industries, among them a huge new oil refinery in St. Croix to add to the growing industrial complex there and provide the diversification and job opportunities that are needed for a continued broadbased, sound economy.

And it was the year that brought Federal approval and implementation of nine antipoverty programs for the Virgin Islands. They included a Neighborhood Youth Corps program, Head Start, a preschool training experience and an unskilled worker training program. Grants totaled $567,000 and applications are being reviewed for four additional programs totaling $566,000.

But though the year just past had many favorable highlights, it also focused attention on some major problems that still exist.

One of these is the problem of alien labor and the fact that our situation here is unique and different from similar problems that exist on the continent. Our objective is to provide employers with all the workers they need in this expanding economy but at the same time to see that qualified resident-citizens are given first preference. We must, also, remember that the worker, whether he be alien or citizen, needs a living wage and that by raising his standard of living, we raise the overall standard of living for the islands. To cope with the

problem we have created a separate Department of Labor and have held meetings between the U.S. Department of Labor and Department of Interior officials and employers here. I am confident that with thorough study, quiet reasoning and effective compromise we will arrive at a solution that will be satisfactory to all.

We are also facing a problem in those industries attracted here by the provisions of section 301 of the Tariff Act which gave the islands the opportunity to develop its own industry through the offering of certain tariff concessions. However, similar type industries in the United States enjoying the protection of a high tariff, have come to consider the 301 provision as unfair and have sought legislation in the Congress to abolish the privileges our firms enjoy. Though we are against the restraint of free trade, we realized a compromise was necessary if we were to save our woolen textile and watch assembly firms and the jobs of their employees. We needed to satisfy industries in the United States and the Congress and at the same time allow our firms the chance to fairly prosper. This has now been done in the form of statutory quota restrictions on goods produced here for export to the mainland. Though there are still problems to be resolved under the 301 section, we are hopeful that through discussion and understanding, we will arrive at a proper solution.

I have touched on only a few of the highlights of this past year and the years of this administration. The full and complete report of the departments and agencies of the executive branch, compiled as an annual report to the Secretary of the Interior for fiscal year 1965, is appended to this message so that you may have a more detailed picture of our progress for that period.

Now, let us put aside the past, successful as it has been, and let us look to the future, a future that holds even greater promise for us all. We have been partners for progress thus far. Now, together, we must redouble our efforts to complete the job that was begun 5 years ago.

In all of our planning, in all of our efforts we have stressed time and time again the need for excellence in every program, the importance of equality in every achievement. Our resolve in this pursuit of excellence continues strong.

Our President has pointed out that we are only at the beginning of the road to the Great Society. "Ahead now," he said, "is a summit where freedom from the wants of the body can fulfill the needs of the spirit."

Together, we must climb to that great height, together we must reach that summit.

In the coming year, I will propose many specific new programs and the continuance of many already underway. But I would also propose to you now, paraphrasing the words of President Johnson, these major goals of our own Great Society.

I propose that we continue our program of educational excellence to insure every Virgin Islands child the fullest development of his mind and skills.

I propose that we continue our attack on sickness and infirmity and strive to provide the most advanced medical care for our people.

I propose that we seek every means, explore every area to provide as quickly as possible the rest of the adequate housing these islands need.

I propose that we do all in our power to add to the beauty and cleanliness of our islands and the comfort and well-being of its inhabitants.

I propose that we make new efforts to control and prevent crime and to halt delinquency whenever it appears.

I propose that we honor and support the achievements of thought and the creation of art.

I propose that we make an all-out campaign against waste and inefficiency.

And I propose that we continue to be partners for progress in realizing these lofty aims.

More specifically, I believe we will be partners for progress in urging the Congress of the United States to grant us greater self-government. Our Virgin Islands Convention delegates have asked no more than we deserve, principally the election of our own Governor and Lieutenant Governor, the proper reapportionment of the legislative districts, representation in the Congress through a Delegate or Resident Commissioner, the right to vote for President and Vice President in national elections, and the abolishment of the Presidential veto over local laws. United, we must press for the adoption of these proposals.

I believe we will be partners for progress as we embark on a massive roadbuilding and street improvement program. In the past, large sums of our annual revenues were, of necessity, devoted to programs of home and school construction, health facility expansion and water and power needs. While we recognized the need for better roads, the funds were just not available. But now damage from the unusually heavy rains has added to the need and the program can no longer be put aside. Fortunately, increased Federal aid and our recent bond sale will help provide moneys for our housing, health, water and power expansion, thereby freeing some local moneys for other uses. I am going to ask that we spend $1 million in St. Thomas, $720,000 in St. Croix, and $225,000 in St. John for roadbuilding this year. Our gasoline tax revenues will provide another half million dollars for this purpose. We are going to use all means at our disposal, including private contractors where their competitive bids will save us money, to accomplish this task.

We know, too, that there have been complaints and problems in the collection of garbage and trash. This has been due primarily to a shortage of proper equipment and personnel, further handicapped by the fact that we are disposing of an amount of garbage equivalent to that of a city four times the size of our towns' population. Steps are being taken and considerable funds are being recommended in the new budget for necessary equipment so that we can look forward to marked improvement this year.

I believe we will be partners for progress in a continued attack on substandard housing and the furtherance of public housing, new middle income housing and urban renewal programs. With the help of the Federal Government we are going to continue to expand our public housing programs, acting to acquire additional land for this purpose on both St. Croix and St. Thomas. We are going to take a new look at our urban renewal programs with a view toward better utilization of acquired land for housing purposes, and we are going to plan and build two 221 D-3 middle income housing projects, one in Christiansted and another in Frederiksted, similar to the project now nearing completion on St. Thomas. We are going to ask you to improve mortgage financing to make it easier for our people to own their own homes. We will not rest in this endeavor until all Virgin Islanders have an opportunity to live in decent dwellings.

In addition to acquiring land for housing we must move to acquire the necessary private land for our proposed St. Thomas jet airport and to increase our holdings of public beach land for recreational purposes. And we must further strengthen and expand our recreational program and facilities.

This year, we must complete the detailed building plans and arrange for the financing of our two multimillion-dollar medical centers, designed to provide our Islands with modern and adequate medical facilities. Each center will include a 250-bed general hospital, a 60- to 75-bed wing for long-term, chronically ill patients and a new public health clinic. Plans also call for a school of nursing and a student nurses residence. The construction of these centers will be made possible from various sources including annual capital appropriations, through the sale of general obligation bonds, and Federal aid.

This year will also see the initiation of the college building program when the college library, the first building of our future campus, will be constructed. It will have an eventual capacity of 100,000 volumes. A women's residence hall for 80 students will also be built to be followed by a cultural center, men's residence hall and a classroom building.

The need for highly qualified Virgin Islands teachers impels us to be partners for progress in teacher training, in working out a program that will properly prepare a sufficient number of our high school graduates for a teaching career here in the Virgin Islands. We must act to achieve this end quickly but without sacrificing the high standards of educational excellence that have been a part of all of our programs in the field of education in the past 5 years.

In this regard, I'm sure we will also continue to support the fine work of the department of education in the fields of vocational training and rehabilitation, adult education, library improvement and curriculum development. One program in this latter category deserves our particular attention. We need to expand our Caribbean marine biology program in which our high school students are introduced to the wonders of the marine-life surrounding their islands. The experiment already has been proven a success in its initial program and could lead eventually to professional training in the science of marine biology and career opportunities for many of our youth.

We can look forward to two new facilities for our senior citizens. Moneys have been allocated for the construction of a new Queen Louise Home for the Aged that will double the size of the present facility. The other, a federally financed project to be constructed near the Paul M. Pearson Gardens apartments at Long Bay, will provide 84 units for the elderly. A delay in the start of this home, the first of its type to be built under public housing, has now been overcome and ground-breaking should take place in a few months.

Our newly created department of labor has undertaken an intensive recruiting program to induce skilled and trained Virgin Islanders and other American citizens now living on the mainland to come and make the Virgin Islands their home. The vast changes that have taken place here and the new opportunities available are expected to bring back many of our most talented Virgin Islanders.

We need to deal effectively with the flooding problem now being caused by the unusually heavy rains. To this end, we have requested implementation of a congressional resolution, permitting the Army's Corps of Engineers to design a flood control plan.

We take great pride in the Peace Corps' establishment of a permanent training center on St. Croix, the only one of its type, now training groups of up to 200 teachers a year. We believe so strongly in the aims and purposes of the Corps we will ask that a similar center be set up on St. Thomas and suggest that the facilities and services of the College of the Virgin Islands continue to be utilized in the training program.

We will also continue to press for authorization to form our own National Guard unit in keeping with the islands' growth and our belief that we are eligible for additional self-government.

We are going to ask for adoption of planning board recommendations for major im-

provements in the Christiansted area. These are to include a major harbor development together with a shoreline drive, ample parking, and beach and recreational areas. A bypass road for trucks and heavy vehicles to relieve the possibility of traffic congestion will also be necessary. These plans are well advanced and will soon be released for a pubic hearing and public discussion before final adoption and implementaton. Projects at Crown Bay and Long Bay on St. Thomas will also proceed once clear title to these submerged lands is obtained.

I believe we will be partners for progress in assisting farmers who want to take part in a new agricultural program. If we are to retain and improve this important sector of the economy we must help provide the machinery, tools, chemicals, marketing aid and advice necessary to carry out the new and diversified programs we envision. The responsibility for the expansion and readjustment of agriculture is ours and we plan to meet it.

We will press for the further transfer of lands and facilities that can be better utilized by the local government; land still held in St. Croix by the Virgin Islands Corporation, and the transfer of Bourne Field, the submarine base, and Crown Bay lands on St. Thomas. And we shall continue to plan for two new, complete government centers through our urban renewal program, one in the barracks yard area of St. Thomas and the other in the water gut area of Christiansted on St. Croix. They will be designed to centralize the executive branch departments, providing greater efficiency and economy.

My budget proposals, which will be submitted to you shortly, will call for total operating expenditures of $35,600,000, or about $6,200,000 more than total operating appropriations of the current fiscal year. Major increases amounting to close to $5,200,000 are in the department of education, the department of public works, the department of health, and the department of public safety. My capital budget proposal will be $6,750,000, major appropriations being recommended for power, for roads and streets, for utilities, and for airport improvements. We will anticipate local revenues of $29,500,000; revenues from new medicare program of $500,000; a carryover of $700,000 from this fiscal year, and Federal matching funds of $11,750,000, of which we shall earmark $5 million for educational improvement. The operating and capital budgets being submitted will total $42,350,000.

I am proud to point out once again that the Virgin Islands continues to be a leader in the field of human relations. The peace and harmony in which men of all races, creeds, and national origins live and work here together is a lesson for all the world to view. When minor civil rights incidents do occur, they are quickly resolved in a spirit of harmony and good will.

Finally, I believe we will be partners for progress in implementing President Johnson's new and continuing Great Society programs. We are aware that there will be additions, changes, and new opportunities for our islands under housing, economic opportunity, antipoverty, education, medicare, and cultural programs. I shall ask for your support in seeing that the Virgin Islands receives its share of Federal funds to be made available in these areas.

I have touched on only a few of the major areas of effort for the year ahead. Other important programs and improvements will be introduced for your approval throughout the session. Many of these are included in a list of proposed legislation appended to this message.

I would be less than frank with you if I did not admit that the road ahead will not be easy.

I would be less than honest with myself if I did not admit there will be many problems along the way.

But though we are concerned over the difficulties that lie ahead, we are fully confident of their final solution.

Though we are ever mindful of the lessons of the past, we will continue to look ahead to what the future will bring.

Though we are humble before God as His servant and the servant of the people of the Virgin Islands, we are proud of what we have done, of the record of this administration.

The cornerstone on which we began to build our island's Great Society was excellence. It will remain such in all our future endeavors.

Now we begin our joint efforts on behalf of this growing territory. As we venture into the year 1966 with high optimism and hope, I offer this prayer to guide you in your deliberations, written by Stephen Vincent Benet and a favorite of the late United Nations Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson:

"Lord, grant us a common faith that man shall know bread and peace—that he shall know justice and righteousness, freedom and security, an equal opportunity and an equal chance to do his best, not only in our own land but throughout the world. And in that faith, let us march toward the clean world our hands can make."

May God watch over you in your endeavors.

APPENDIX A—LIST OF IMPORTANT LEGISLATION TO BE RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR

1. Amendment to Altona community development law.
2. Amendment to watch production tax law.
3. Amendment to law for purchase of portion of Sara Hill for airport purposes.
4. Additional road fund appropriations.
5. Rules and regulations to implement building code.
6. Adoption of official zoning maps.
7. Amendments to zoning and subdivision laws and zoning and subdivision regulations.
8. Resolution urging the participation of the Virgin Islands in Federal-State unemployment insurance program.
9. Amendments to unemployment insurance law for participation in Federal-State program.
10. Amendments to unemployment insurance law to facilitate collections of delinquent contributions.
11. Purchase of land from the United States for home for the elderly.
12. Child abuse law.
13. Council of arts law.
14. Amendments to child labor law.
15. New medical fee bill.
16. Provision of additional funds for improvements to existing hospitals.
17. Teachers education and training law.
18. FAA grant offer, Alexander Hamilton Airport.
19. FAA grant offer, Harry S. Truman Airport.
20. Bribery of public officers.
21. Amendments to pay plan.
22. Mortgage financing and redemption of mortgages laws.
23. New housing programs.
24. Creation of new agency to manage airports.
25. Regulation of billboards.
26. Disposition of public records.
27. Amendment to the industrial incentive act.
28. Settling of claims.
29. Citizens advisory commission on aging.
30. New pharmacy code.
31. Participation in Caribbean Economic Development Agency.
32. Liberalization of workmen's compensation law to include firemen.
33. Control of temporary water containers.
34. Transfer of marshals to municipal court.
35. Survey and planning applications, urban renewal:
(a) Hill Street, Frederiksted.
(b) Gallows Bay, Christiansted.
(c) Ross Yard, St. Thomas.
36. Transfer of bureau of recreation to department of agriculture.
37. Transfer of veterinary services to the department of agriculture.
38. Amendments to banking law.

INDEPENDENCE OF SBA SUPPORTED IN STATEMENTS OF LEADERS

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, many of us are deeply disturbed over recurring rumors that there is a plan afoot to rob the Small Business Administration of its independence by making it a subordinate part of the Department of Commerce.

I feel that it is most important for us to recall at this time that SBA was established because small business needed a one-stop agency that could concentrate on the problems of small business. The Small Business Act itself is a declaration of independence of SBA.

It is also important to recall that during the debate on the establishment of SBA, President Johnson—then Senator Johnson, of course—said this:

> This bill would place the small business activities of the Government under two major Departments—Treasury and Commerce, and yet, practically all of us subscribe to the principle that a small business agency cannot be effective unless it is independent.

It is also important that we remember the comment of the late President Kennedy as a Senator on SBA:

> First, such an agency must be truly independent and not subject to the veto power of the Commerce and Treasury Departments. Experience has shown that such independence is necessary to give small business an effective voice in the Government.

Vice President HUMPHREY in a statement concerning SBA, made this comment:

> I say we are not going to have the friendship of small business if we allow the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury to have too much to say about the definite standards to be set with respect to small business, because I do not believe either one of them is particularly noteworthy as a champion of small business enterprise.

Over the years the leadership of this Nation has consistently felt that SBA must be independent if it is to meet the needs and help solve the problems of small business. The Department of Commerce is considered to be big-business oriented—and the small-business assistance program there would be a stepchild, hoping for crumbs from the big business table.

Mr. Speaker SBA should remain an independent agency.

HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. 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. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur very heartily in the comments of our chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House. This is, indeed, a very important decision we are facing. The small business agency can render a very fine functional service to our small businessmen of the country if it is able to retain its independence.

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

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. I also want to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, for his forceful statement here today and wish to join with him and with the gentleman from Indiana in their remarks in opposition to the merging of the small business agency with the Department of Commerce.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say in conclusion that this is not a new struggle. It is one that has been going on for a long time and even during the Eisenhower years there was this same effort made. I resisted it at that time and I resist it now.

LEGITIMATE PRIDE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the United States today has problems which it will be delighted to solve.

In dealing with problems, we usually assume that they are all the dark, dreary kind where the answers lie out in the unknown. But our at-home problems include the "happy" ones of labor shortages and inadequate plant facilities.

In commenting on this situation, the Christian Science Monitor declared that we can face our international problems "fortified on the home front by an almost fantastic rise in economic power and well-being."

It adds that "the American people can take deep and legitimate pride in the proof which they have given of what a free people in a free economy can do."

Many of my colleagues will want to turn their attention to some of our "happy" problems, with which we feel fully capable of dealing, and I, therefore, submit this article for inclusion in the RECORD:

UP, UP, UP

Heated by the Vietnamese war, 1966 may turn out to be one of America's most difficult years on the international scene since the end of World War II. But if it is, the United States will almost certainly face these international problems fortified on the homefront by an almost fantastic rise in economic power and well-being.

This fact is strongly underlined in President Johnson's yearly economic report to Congress. Indeed, this report indicates that, for the first time in many years, America's economic problems in 1966 may stem from too much success, too swift a rise in national well-being, rather than from too little. "We are approaching full use of our resources," the President said, "and this brings new problems."

Foremost among these problems is that of inflation. But not far behind are the happier problems of labor shortages, and inadequate plant facilities. For these latter are the kinds of problems which any land is delighted to be called upon to solve.

Never in the past two decades—not even during the Korean war—have more economic indexes been pointing skyward. Public demand and purchasing power, Government spending, military demands, public programs, business confidence, rising profits, mounting wages, industrial expansion, all these signs, and many others point up, up, up.

Clearly the administration, gratified over the present condition of the national economy, which derives in large measure from multiple private decisions, intends to open the economic throttle to the fullest point short of jumping the rails. This policy is, in fact, full employment without inflation.

This is a program to which every American will happily give his blessing, if it succeeds. But it is a program which calls for shrewd judgment and a steadfast eye on all the economic pressure gages. It calls for foreseeing, months in advance, the effect of every major economic move. It demands a hardheaded (and perhaps hardhearted) willingness to take stringent and unpopular countermeasures whenever the gage needle swings over the red line of the danger point. It may well mean choosing between cherished administration objectives if all cannot be achieved safely.

The President indicates that he will stand ready to propose new measures to cut the head of inflationary steam if this builds up too swiftly. He must. To do otherwise would be to jeopardize the economic progress won over recent years.

Meanwhile, the American people can take deep and legitimate pride in the proof which they have given of what a free people in a free economy can do.

DALE CUMMINGS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1966, it was my pleasure to donate a trophy to Dale Cummings, a high school senior at Berry Academy, a school in my district. Dale, during the period of 11 p.m., November 30, 1965, to 11:15 a.m., December 1, 1965, established a new world's record for situps. During this period, he performed the exercise 14,118 times. The previous record was 14,000 repetitions, set by an agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Florida. The following account of the events leading up to this feat was written by Garland Dickey, head of the physical education department at Berry College.

A PLACE TO STAND

It was centuries ago that one of the ablest Greek scholars informed his people that, given the proper place to stand on and a lever that was long enough, he could move the world. As a college professor and a member of the Governor's council on physical fitness, I have been concerned with the overabundance of publicity given to those youth who give themselves and their efforts to the various drives and publicity stunts that are signs of sick and weary society. It is my pleasure to show you and others an example of what the noble Greek had in mind.

This story has its beginning in far-off Formosa where Dale Cummings was stationed with his parents. His father was a member of the U.S. Armed Forces. It was there that Dale first entered school. His travels later took him to Hawaii for more schooling and finally led to Berry Academy near Rome, Ga., where he is presently a high school senior. It was at Berry that young Dale heard of a camp for young leaders in Michigan during summer vacation. He went to this camp where he met people from all over the Nation. They were to learn and to do for youth. One of the great inspirations was the appearance of Stan Musial from the President's Council on Youth Fitness. Dale talked to him and decided that he would lend his physical attributes to making a place in the world. He wanted to become a champion. He had done 150 situps and then 350 without too much discomfort.

He believed the world record to be a few hundred so he would go for this. It was indicated to him that the record was around 3,000 consecutive situps. Dale went into strenuous training and learned that the record might be 7,500. This still was not too far fetched if he really trained his body and mind to the task. While conditioning his body for the cross-country season he became more and more proficient at situps. To his dismay he learned that the world record was 14,000 set by an FBI agent in Florida. After doing 11,000 in practice Dale assured his trainers and coaches that the world record could be broken if he continued to work hard.

During the Thanksgiving holiday season he contacted the news media and others that he was ready. After securing his physical examination from the doctor and permission from his parents and coaches, the time was at hand. With the help of trainers and coaches, all final preparations were completed. The time chosen was from 11 p.m. on November 30 until 11 a.m. December 1. He knew how many situps needed to be done each hour to keep on schedule. He was able to do the number. Finally at 11:15 a.m., he became a man of the world when he established a new world record of 14,118 situps.

After a good steak and some rest Dale was up and around again. His purpose is to arouse youth to do the things that are acceptable. To go back to camp, and carry with him at least six other boys, and to spread the word that decency and dedicated, clean living do have a place in our society. Later he hopes to enroll at the University of Georgia and earn a degree in chemical engineering. It is our belief that, if this is what he wants, he will accomplish the same.

Modest as he is, Dale gives much of the credit to those high school classmates that helped with the training and the record-setting performance. He is proud to speak

for the 95 percent of the redblooded American youth that are often overlooked. He is now a world champion. Need we say more?

BLATNIK—"MR. WATER POLLUTION CONTROL"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and illustrious colleague, the Honorable JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota, today delivered an excellent address to leading scientists and executive officers of the major chemical industries here in the Nation's Capital at the Madison Hotel.

Our beloved colleague, Mr. BLATNIK, is known throughout the Nation as "Mr. Water Pollution Control." He was author of the original Federal water pollution bill in 1956. He has struggled unceasingly over the years for the passage of effective legislation which would diminish water pollution.

It was Mr. BLATNIK's dynamic leadership which resulted in the passage of the "Water Quality Act of 1965" by a unanimous vote of 396–0 in the House.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a great honor and inspiration for me to know and to serve on the Public Works Committee with my esteemed, dedicated, and courageous friend, the gentleman from Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I commend to you, to the Congress, and to the people of the country his timely and superb address:

WATER—MASTER OR SERVANT

(By Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK)

As we enter 1966 our respect for water is reaching an unprecedented height. One only need glance at the headlines last year to find:

"Northeast suffers worst drought in two centuries."

"Lake Erie called dying lake."

"Minnesota and Upper Mississippi lashed by floods."

These headlines call for one thing—action. Little did I realize as a growing boy throwing rocks in Lake Superior, which is still the world's largest body of fresh water, that in just a few quick decades water would be one of the leading domestic issues.

Though water is mentioned 800 times in the Bible, not since Noah's Ark has man had the respect for water that it is getting today. Whether water is acting as our servant that turns the vast turbines to produce the world's power or if it is acting as a master rampaging in a devastating flood, we come into 1966 with a great respect for water.

It is out of this respect for water and our dependency on it that we were forced to look at it as a national problem. Out of this need just 10 years ago in 1956 came the first Federal water pollution control law, of which I am proud to be the author.

Of course, the climate back in 1956 for water pollution control was about the same as it was last Wednesday in my hometown—39° below zero. We could have easily had our first meeting in a phone booth. Fortunately, we have come a long way from that first lonely meeting to the overwhelming and unanimous support of 396-to-0 passage of the Water Quality Act of 1965. I must admit that there were times during those 10 years that the going got a little rough. Up until 1956 I had always stuck by my high school chemistry definition of water as being two parts hydrogen and one part oxygen, but I soon learned after a meeting or so that it could be redefined as two parts politics and one part oxygen.

We have come a long way, but it is still unbelievable for a nation to have a report in 1966 that space flights to the moon are imminent and yet its life sustaining fluid called water on planet earth for the most part is unusable. Pollution's poisoning power has made itself the master of our waterways. To bring this water back in a usable form as our servant is the task we face today.

It is hard to realize that pollution is the master of our waterways when we live in a technological age that surpasses anything since the beginning of man. Ninety-five percent of all of the scientists who have lived in the history of the world are alive today. Imagine this. With this on our side, coupled with last year's gross national product of approximately $675 billion, imagine us going into 1966 with pollution as the absolute boss of our waterways. Imagine living in a land and in a time like last year when General Motors was the first corporation in the history of the world to make more than $2 billion in profits in 6 months. Our Federal budget last year allowed $50 billion for armaments and somehow we met that commitment. But when we ask for a mere $150 million for construction grants to help clean up our Nation's waters, only $130 million was appropriated. Why?

Well, my friends, this is where you in industry can really help. If we, and I emphasize we, are to overturn pollution as the boss of our waterways, we can't do it by going half way, nor by using halfhearted measures. It's a task of enormous dimensions. It takes total effort—not just industry—not just government, but everybody in an all-out crusade to regain the respect for water that is adequate to meet the challenge.

We can afford a full effort. We have the know-how. But it's going to take an army of workers like yourselves to arouse people into demanding action. Look what happened in New York. It took a drought for them to get the vicious message of the ruins of pollution, but they responded by passing a billion-dollar bond issue in hopes that in 6 years they can once again be served by clean water.

Like New York we must commit ourselves. To reverse pollution as the master of our streams is a matter not only of the highest priority, but also of the greatest national urgency. This long, tragic neglect and abuse of our natural resources requires a massive attack.

Fortune magazine vividly shows this abuse in its recent study of air pollution. According to it the annual amount of filth, dirt and other aerial garbage that we put in the air exceeds 133 million tons, which is more than the total annual tonnage of steel production in the United States. It goes on to say that the erosion and defacing of buildings caused by air pollution creates property damage of over $11 billion a year.

It's going to take money to reverse this. But so did the highway program. How many superhighways would we have tying America together in an endless chain of concrete if we had just sat back and said it cost too much. In a few short years we can go coast to coast without a stoplight. How was this done? By realizing it was a national project and by getting the Federal Government to pay on a 90-to-10 basis. This engineering marvel that is the world's best is nearing completion in spite of those who said it can't be done.

To show that it can be done in the field of water pollution abatement, I want to summarily point out the strides forward that the Federal Government made in the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Water Quality Act of 1965: As you know, the whole field of water pollution was upgraded and sort of "taken out of the basement," so to speak. We doubled the authorized funds to $1.2 million for a single project and to $4.8 million for joint projects, and as I pointed out previously, we succeeded in increasing the total authorization to $150 million per year only to get it cut back on actual appropriation to $130 million for the current fiscal year for construction grants. We were successful in adding $20 million a year for the next 4 years for grants for waste water research and development (demonstration projects for combined sewers).

HHFA (Public Law 89–117): (Now under new Cabinet head, Robert C. Weaver). This act includes authorization for 50 percent of project cost to local governing bodies to build public water and sewer facilities. The purpose of this act is to promote orderly urban development, especially in needed community facilities for low-income families. As of this date $100 million was appropriated under this act for this fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

Farmers Home Administration Amendments of 1965: Administered by the Department of Agriculture, grants for the construction of rural water and waste disposal systems will be available on a 50-percent matching grant basis. The grants are authorized to total $50 million annually for water and sewer facilities. It is expected that over 30,000 rural communities (less than 5,500 population) will qualify for this 50-percent matching grants. These grants are designed to serve a rural area and as such take up where other programs leave off, so as not to leave a gap between urban and rural programs. No grant will be made unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare certifies that the waste water carried by the proposed facility meets the appropriate water quality standards.

Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965: I was privileged to pilot this act through the House side, and I am proud to say that we got the Federal share up to 80 percent in the neediest areas for water and sewer facilities. Basic criteria for eligibility are substantial unemployment and/or low family income. As you know, this program combines the best features of accelerated public works and ARA and authorizes $500 million annually for 4 years for public works and development facility grants.

Water Resources Planning Act: This act establishes a water resources council made up of the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, Agriculture, Army, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The purpose of it is for maximum development of water resources by the coordinated planning of water supply needs by region. The act authorizes $5 million per year for 10 years to States for water resource planning, with emphasis on comprehensive development.

So you can see by this thumbnail report that the 89th Congress unleashed the horsepower of five separate Cabinet agencies to go to work to try and end the reign of water pollution. It was a busy session, but we have lots more to do.

In the future we must realistically face the rising cost of pollution abatement and concentrate on preventive measures rather than cleaning up the mess after we have polluted it. I hope we will continue our strong efforts to increase the Federal financial share of the fight for clean water. New York's bold step should push the Federal Government into a more realistic stride. We have several

bills before our committee now to increase the Federal share. Congressman McCarthy's bill would increase it to $750 million for fiscal year 1967. I also hope that industry can get a tax relief for its stepped up construction of waste facilities. As you know, this has been before the Congress a number of times.

Though we have disagreed on some issues, industry has been most cooperative and helpful, and we appreciate it.

Many of you here today have testified in front of our committee. We recognize your problems and salute the strides forward that you also are making. Just to mention a few—the National Council for Stream Improvement, which is a research organization, is spending over a million dollars in its five regional research centers over the country this year. This research group is supported totally by the paper and pulp industries. In its new $50 million California mill, Kimberly Clark spent over $2 million on its treatment plant alone. In other words, 4 percent of the total plant investment went for waste treatment. The soap and detergent industry spent well over a million dollars last year to minimize the role of detergents as a cause of water pollution. Another very unusual pacesetting example of industrial reuse of water is the Bethlehem Steel operation in Baltimore. They draw approximately 122 million gallons per day of treated sewage from the city of Baltimore's city disposal plant. Bethlehem treats it again and reuses it as industrial water. After its reuse, Bethlehem treats it and returns it to the bay in much better condition than it was received from the city disposal plant. An excellent example of industry's extensive research on water pollution is the many workshops and seminars that the Manufacturers Chemist Association have held this past year.

So in closing I just want to say thanks to our friends in industry for your support and suggestions. I value both. It is easy to talk to an industrial group such as yourselves because you know and appreciate that your economic future is inescapably tied to the rational and responsible use of our natural resources—especially water. For when you destroy water, you destroy the very base upon which industry depends.

Thank you.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE REPUBLICANS CHARGE ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM POSES TWIN THREATS OF INFLATION AND RECESSION

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, the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee issued a unanimous statement on the administration's economic policy at the opening of the committee's annual hearings on the Economic Report of the President on February 1.

The statement shows how the continuing expansionary policies of this administration are creating an acceleration of inflation that is very likely to be followed by a recession in 1967.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the statement be included in the Record at this point.

Joint Economic Committee Republicans Cite Dangers of Inflation, Warn of Possible Recession Next Year

(The following statement was released today by the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee at the opening of the committee's hearings on the 1966 Economic Report of the President.)

The administration's economic program exposes the American people to the twin dangers of serious inflation this year and a recession in 1967.

Recent increases in both consumer and wholesale prices, the greatest in many years, demonstrate that inflation already is a fact of life. The time to move against inflation is in its early stages.

The administration acknowledges the threat of inflation but refuses to concede that effective anti-inflationary measures are needed now. Its program is carefully contrived to give the appearance of restraint while carrying on the expansionary policies appropriate to an earlier period.

The administration has seriously underestimated planned budget expenditures for fiscal 1967; promised large cuts in spending which are not cuts at all, but sales of Government assets that will have little effect in curbing overall demand; proposed revenue adjustments that largely affect the timing of tax payments and which, by their very nature, will do little or nothing to restrain demand in the private sector; continued its critical attitude toward the Federal Reserve Board for its timely move toward monetary restraint last December.

The administration asks the private sector to hold the line while continuing to heat up the economy itself. To enforce "responsible restraint" by the private sector, it engages in implicit or explicit price and wage fixing and other forms of harmful interference with the workings of our economic system. The results of these policies will sap private economic initiative and inventiveness, impair efficiency and retard the Nation's long-term rate of growth.

In the absence of appropriate administration policies, speculative excesses will continue to mount and an inflationary psychology, already taking hold among our people, will dominate economic decisionmaking in the year ahead. A recession next year is a likely reaction to present inflationary excesses. The tendencies toward recession will be strengthened since failure to take action to halt inflation now will force the administration to slam on the fiscal and monetary brakes later this year.

The administration's inflationary economic policy will have other serious consequences as well. The continuance of this policy can severely harm that segment of our population least able to sustain economic injury, including the poor, social security beneficiaries and other pensioners; intensify capital outflows from the United States, reduce further our already shrinking trade surplus and drastically worsen our balance-of-payments position; result in a breakdown of delicate international discussions on monetary reform and threaten the successful conclusion of the Kennedy round of trade negotiations.

The relevant choice is not between guns and butter. Our private enterprise system is flexible and inventive enough to provide both in an atmosphere of confidence fostered by wise and creative Government policies. The critical issue today is between inflation and stable growth.

Rapidly increasing civilian, military and Government demands are beginning to strain capacity in a number of industries and to create shortages of professional and skilled manpower. As pressure mounts on the reservoir of employables and idle facilities, an opportunity is needed to make adjustments. The pace of advance should be maintained but not accelerated until the adjustments take hold. This requires either an adjustment of the tax structure, some reduction in Federal expenditures, a less easy monetary policy or some combination of these actions.

The most certain way for the administration to protect the gains of the past and to insure social and economic gains in the future is by promoting a balanced and sustainable expansion without inflation.

U.S. WORLD FOOD STUDY AND COORDINATING COMMISSION

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, a strong and prosperous U.S. agriculture, vital to this Nation in peace and indispensable in war, holds the key to unlock the chains of hunger, poverty, and misery for many in the world.

The American farmer has become a tremendously important factor in meeting the growing world food problem. Because so much depends on him—the security of our country and perhaps world peace as well—there is an urgent need for the immediate establishment of a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission, as recommended by the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture last October. This commission would make the farmer a full partner in planning a world food program.

There are so many questions which must be answered concerning U.S. involvement in the world food crisis; questions such as effects on agriculture in recipient countries, on world prices and markets, on U.S. farm prices, on farm exports for dollars, on commercial shipping, and countless others which such a Commission would explore.

A primary responsibility of the Commission would be that of determining just how American agriculture could serve as a contributor to the solution of the world food problem, and at the same time be assured of adequate compensation for its contribution.

It is possible that under the administration's highly restrictive and complex farm programs and policies—which include CCC dumping to hold farm prices down—the farmer could be further hurt rather than helped by increasing his production to feed the hungry world. We could have a situation where everyone—manufacturer, dealer, shipper—is paid except the farmer.

Such a turn of events would be disastrous, both for American security and for world peace. The establishment of a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission will be a major step toward preventing such an eventuality.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday I released a statement on this subject as chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture. I ask that my statement be included in the Record at this point.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN ODIN LANGEN, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURE, FEBRUARY 4, 1966

Food is important. Public awareness of this fact has been appreciably heightened by the increased attention being brought to bear on the problem of the world food deficit. Because food is important, the man who produces it is also important. The real tragedy of agriculture all over the world is that this fact quite often isn't recognized until it is too late—until the pressing need for food takes precedence over all other problems.

FOOD STUDY COMMISSION NEEDED

The American farmer has become a tremendously important factor in meeting the growing world food problem, because he is the only producer in the world who stands technically capable of greatly expanding his production almost overnight. Because so much depends on him—the security of our country and perhaps world peace as well—there is an urgent need for the immediate establishment of a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission, as recommended by the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture—a commission which would make the farmer a full partner in planning a world food program.

There are so many unanswered questions, so many variables, so many unknown factors involved in the world food problem and the U.S. response to it, that U.S. agriculture could be seriously harmed, and this Nation could find itself in deep trouble if a concentrated planning effort is not soon made.

FARM RETURNS INEQUITABLE

For instance, in spite of his key worldwide position, and in spite of the significance of his contribution to the strength of this Nation, the U.S. farmer is today faced with an economic situation which is both precarious and inequitable in comparison with the rest of the U.S. economy.

Perhaps the most accurate indicator of the farmer's financial situation is the fact that his per capita disposable income averages little more than half that of the rest of the Nation.

GOVERNMENT LOWERS PRICES

Recent years have seen a gradual and steady weakening of the farm marketplace. Government farm programs have been deliberately aimed at bringing farm market prices down. Heavy sales of CCC-owned commodities to lower the prices which the farmer may receive for his crops are an integral part of this policy, as was frankly admitted by the Secretary of Agriculture last year.

The net result of all this is that the farmer is not receiving an equitable return for his capital and labor, and under present policies and programs is not likely to do so in the near future.

ANSWER IN FOOD CRISIS?

There is much current hope and speculation, however, that the answer to the farmer's problems lies in the growing world food crisis. All who have a stake in American agriculture—railroads, truckers, shipping interests, manufacturers of farm machinery, oil companies, fertilizer producers, bankers, grain dealers—see the possibility of major financial benefits if farmers are asked to increase their production in an all-out effort to feed the hungry world.

But what of the U.S. farmer? Would he receive a fair return for his contribution to a world food program? Who would pay for that increased production? Would the farmer be allowed to seek a fair price in the marketplace? Or would he be asked to produce for the good of the cause? Under our present wheat programs, for example, an increase in production actually means a lower return per bushel.

COULD FARMER BE HURT?

In fact, there is a serious question as to what might be the result if farmers are asked to increase their production under the restrictions of our highly complex Federal farm programs—programs based on the concept of lowering production and penalizing noncompliance through strict price control. It is certainly not beyond the realm of possibility that we might find ourselves in a situation where every other segment of the economy would benefit from the farmer's increased production, while the farmer himself would be penalized. Such a turn of events would be disastrous, both for American security and for world peace.

This is the kind of question that must be fully explored before we move into any kind of world food program. It is the kind of question for which the U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission would be charged with finding an answer.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

Countless other questions must be answered as well. For example, how often have U.S. concessional exports of agricultural commodities ended up in direct competition with U.S. agricultural exports for dollars? Would U.S. efforts to meet world food needs curtail or hamper U.S. farm exports for hard currency? Would commercial shipping facilities be adequate to continue the present volume of U.S. farm exports for dollars, and supply increased food aid as well? Should the American farmer produce for world markets at a lower price than for American consumers? How would an expanded world food program affect the world market, and consequently, the export price to the U.S. farmer? In case of war, could the United States feed itself and the hungry world, too? Would additional U.S. food assistance serve to aggravate rather than alleviate the world food problem by causing recipient countries to further neglect their own agriculture? Shall we ship food to Communist nations, only to have them give it to a third nation, and take credit for the gift themselves?

IMPORTANT TO FARMER

The U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission recommended by the task force is expressly designed to search out the answers to just such questions. The purpose of the proposed Commission would be to provide us with the solid, factual base of coordinated information which we must have before we can determine what our response to the world food problem should be. It would provide us with the answers to the vital questions concerning farm income, and would be responsible for determining just how American agriculture could serve as a contributor to the solution of the world food problem, and at the same time be assured of adequate compensation for its contribution to this effort.

The tremendous importance of such a Commission and its study to the American farmer cannot be over emphasized.

ADVISORY GROUP

It is encouraging to note that the President's newly appointed Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber is taking notice of these problems. However, the fact that the major structural deficiencies of the Commission—especially the lack of agricultural representation—will prevent it from doing an effective job for American agriculture further emphasizes the need for a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission as recommended by the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture.

PUBLIC LAW 480

As a part of its planning for the world food crisis, the World Food Study Commission would be required to evaluate the past operations of the Public Law 480 program which expires this year, with particular reference to agricultural production and utilization in recipient countries, effects on U.S. agriculture, and the future development and operation of such programs. Clearly, the Commissions findings are needed for the coming congressional consideration of Public Law 480.

NO "HIT OR MISS" APPROACH

A strong and prosperous U.S. agriculture, vital in peace and indispensable in war, holds the key to unlock the chains of hunger, poverty, and misery for many in the world. The American farmer must not be abandoned to a "hit or miss" approach to the world food problem which does not take his economic position squarely into consideration. He must be fairly and equitably rewarded for his efforts, for his bankruptcy could spell disaster to the United States and the world. The establishment of a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission can be a major step toward preventing such an eventuality.

OUR STRANGE FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] 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. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many Americans are as confused about the course the administration is following in foreign policy as I am. On the one hand, we have a report this morning that we now have more than 200,000 Americans fighting communism in Vietnam. We still have 50,000 American troops lined up face to face with the Communists in Korea. We have troops and we are spending money to protect West Germany and Europe against communism.

Then, in true "Alice in Wonderland" fashion, we are going to contribute some $2 million to help train experts and teachers in science and engineering in Castro's Communist Cuba. I refer to the U.N. Special Fund, to which the United States contributes more than 40 percent. Without objection from the U.S. delegates the fund will appropriate around $2 million in technical assistance to Havana University's Department of Engineering.

Mr. Speaker, I think the President, or at least those who support such stupidity, should give us an explanation for such a policy.

I would like to include as a part of these remarks, an article from the February 3 edition of the Washington Daily News, written by Virginia Prewett, "How Our Taxes Will Help Castro."

HOW OUR TAXES WILL HELP CASTRO

(By Virginia Prewett)

Through the strange workings of the U.S. diplomatic bureaucracy, Communist Cuba is in line to get substantial help from the U.S. taxpayer in developing its subversion-bent technocracy.

On January 17, the governing council of the U.N. Special Fund approved a project that will give around $2 million in technical assistance to Havana University's engineering faculty. Unless some action is taken to stop it, 40 percent of this help will come out

of U.S. taxpayer funds voted for U.N. purposes.

Ambassador James Roosevelt, the U.S. representative on the governing council, has voiced mild opposition to the project, but nevertheless he voted for it without attaching a rider saying no U.S. funds were to be used on this one program.

STILL A MYSTERY

Why he didn't remains a mystery. It is quite normal for a member of the Special Fund's council to attach such a condition.

For instance, Russia makes a proviso denying Russian funds to projects that assist South Korea and South Vietnam.

The project now goes to UNESCO for execution and unless the United States steps in to request otherwise, U.S. money will indeed help the Castro regime, which is openly dedicated to fighting the United States through promoting armed revolutions in Latin America.

Two years ago, when the Special Fund governing council approved a project giving Cuba technical assistance for its agriculture, a loud outcry arose in the U.S. press even though the U.S. representative attached to that project the proviso that no U.S. money was to be used.

Under the terms of the Special Fund project, Havana University will get some $2 million to help in hiring experts from all over the world to prepare teachers who will train young Cubans in industrial engineering. Some needed equipment will also be bought.

DOUBLE BENEFIT

UNESCO will find and hire the technicians, but they must be acceptable to Havana. So we may easily see U.S. taxpayer funds giving the Communist world a double benefit. For the experts to be hired will most likely come from Russia and other Iron Curtain countries.

Any assistance to Havana University, especially technical assistance, is direct aid to the central dynamo of the Cuban regime.

Castro officials have specifically declared that students who attend the technical faculties go there not only for technical studies, but to become perfected in Marxist-Leninism.

THE NEW GI BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] 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. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly urged, supported and voted for the new GI bill of rights—H.R. 12410.

This bill authorizes a program of education and training for veterans of military service discharged after January 31, 1955.

The serviceman has met his responsibilities to the Nation. It is the Nation's responsibility to prepare the serviceman returning from service to take his place in civilian life.

I only regret that the benefits of this bill do not come up to those of the Korean war bill. I supported such increased benefits. The administration opposed them and made clear that any attempt to raise benefits would end chances for Presidential approval of the legislation.

ANALYSIS

Education: Provides a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving in the Armed Forces, discharged after January 31, 1955. College-level and below-college-level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools is provided. Part-time training is permitted. Eligibility accrues at the rate of 1 month of training for 1 month of service, not to exceed 36 months. Persons serving on active duty for training do not accrue eligibility. The education and training allowances provided are as follows:

Type of program	No dependents	1 dependent	2 or more dependents
Institutional:			
Full time	$100	$125	$150
Three-quarter time	75	95	115
Half time	50	65	75
Cooperative	80	100	120

Fees and tuition are paid for less than half-time training. Education must be completed within 8 years from the date of discharge or 8 years from the effective date of the act, whichever is later. Training is provided for active-duty members of the Armed Forces who have served at least 2 years, a portion of which occurred after January 31, 1955. These active-duty members may receive payments for fees and tuition. Administrative provisions of the GI bill for veterans of the Korean conflict and the war orphans' training program are applicable to this proposed program. Schools will be approved by State approval agencies of the various States, and these agencies will be responsible for extending supervision to approved schools.

Guaranteed and direct home loans: Benefits of both the guaranteed and the direct home loan programs are extended to veterans discharged after January 31, 1955. The guarantee of a loan by a private lender in the amount of $7,500 is extended to this group and, in areas established as direct loan areas where guaranteed financing has not generally been available, a maximum direct loan of $17,500 is authorized. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to regulate interest rates, consistent with the ceiling established for Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. A fund is established for the Administrator to offset losses under this program, by requiring the veteran to pay 0.05 percent of his loan at closing.

Non-service-connected medical care: At the present time, veterans serving after January 31, 1955, are eligible for medical care in Veterans' Administration facilities only for service-connected disabilities. This group is made eligible under the provisions of this bill for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities on the same basis as war veterans. Eligibility for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities is based on availability of a bed and the signing of a statement of inability to pay for treatment elsewhere, as is required of veterans of earlier conflicts.

Preference in Federal employment: Preference in employment in Federal service is extended to the group of veterans discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as is currently applicable to war veterans. This benefit is not extended to those on active duty for training.

Presumption of service connection of chronic and tropical diseases: This presumption of service connection of numerous chronic and tropical diseases, as listed in section 301, title 38, United States Code, now applicable to war veterans, is extended to those veterans with service after January 31, 1955.

Burial flags: The bill will permit the Veterans' Administration to furnish a flag for draping the casket of deceased veterans of service after January 31, 1955, as is now provided war veterans.

Job counseling and job placement assistance: Places veterans discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as veterans of earlier conflicts for assistance through the Department of Labor in job placement and counseling.

Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief: Amends the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act by increasing protection for individuals who are renting homes when called to service from $80 monthly rental to $150 monthly rental.

HORTON BILL PROVIDES OVERTIME PAY FOR POSTAL SUBSTITUTES FOR WORK IN EXCESS OF 8 HOURS A DAY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] 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. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last September 30, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 10281, the Government Employees Salary Comparability Act of 1965 by an overwhelming majority, 370 to 7. It was a good bill. It provided increased pay for Government workers, including postal workers, and contained a number of other provisions beneficial to postal workers.

Most of its provisions were retained in the bill after passage by the Senate and as it was finally approved by the President on October 29, 1965 as Public Law 89–301. But the Senate made one change in the House bill which was retained in the final version as passed and which is distinctly unfair and must be promptly rectified.

In the bill as it passed the House, substitute employees in the Post Office Department were entitled to overtime pay for work—

(A) in excess of 8 hours a day or (B) in excess of 40 hours a week.

As the bill passed the Senate and was finally approved, the provision for overtime for substitute postal employees was limited to overtime pay for work in excess of 40 hours a week. The provision for overtime after 8 hours a day was eliminated.

It is this latter provision which would be restored by the bill I am introducing today. It is in the interests of both fairness and efficiency that substitute employees of the post office should be paid overtime not just for work in excess of 40 hours a week, but also for any work in excess of 8 hours in any one day.

Regular employees paid on an hourly rate already are granted overtime in excess of 8 hours a day. In fairness substitute employees should receive no less. It is the substitute employees who are called upon in emergencies and often on little notice and who, without the protection of this bill, can be called upon to work 12 consecutive hours in 1 day and again on 2 more days during the same week without getting overtime.

My bill would not only put substitute employees on the same footing as regular hourly employees. It would also put

the Post Office Department on the same basis as industry generally. Our substitute mail carriers and other postal workers should not be made to suffer a second-class status. They deserve the same consideration as other postal employees because of the uncertainties of their employment and the long hours they are likely to work.

I therefore urge prompt consideration and adoption of my bill.

LOSSES SUFFERED IN WHITE ASPARAGUS INDUSTRY DUE TO INADEQUATE AGRICULTURAL LABOR

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able, conscientious, and knowledgeable Members of this House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] has recently completed a thorough and comprehensive study concerning the effect of the termination of the bracero program on various crops grown in his district.

His February 3, 1966, report concerns white asparagus, only one of many commodities affected by Public Law 78, Public Law 414, and the many executive decisions and regulations of the Secretary of Labor regarding supplemental labor.

Other crops, and the growers, workers and consumers involved, were also adversely affected. I ask unanimous consent to include the report of Mr. BALDWIN so that Members of Congress will have a true and accurate report of the conditions of agriculture and consequences of the supplemental labor experiments of the Secretary of Labor.

REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, JOHN F. BALDWIN, FEBRUARY 3, 1966

DEAR FRIENDS: There has been much discussion in California as to the specific impact of the termination of the Mexican national or bracero program on the various crops for which such supplemental labor had been formerly used. Since the program terminated on December 31, 1964, there has now been a full crop year since its termination, so it is possible to make some specific comparisons. Perhaps the crop that has been most exclusively a Delta crop, and which formerly used many bracero supplemental laborers, was the asparagus crop. California produces 100 percent of the white asparagus crop grown in the United States, and this is grown exclusively in San Joaquin, Contra Costa, Yolo, and Sacramento Counties. In fact, these 4 counties grow 80 percent of the world production of white asparagus.

White asparagus has been a major export item and has been an important part of our foreign market trade. From 1960 to 1964 canned white asparagus in California averaged approximately 2.4 million cases. During the same period the percentage of the white asparagus pack of the total asparagus pack in California averaged 63.5 percent. During the period 1959 to 1964 the number of cases of asparagus exported by the United States increased from 1,007,995 to 2,058,150, and their dollar export value increased from $5,785,090 to $15,571,300. In 1963 and 1964 U.S. exported canned asparagus represented more than 50 percent of all export vegetable items from the United States. In these same 2 years California white asparagus represented approximately 98 percent of our total U.S. asparagus exports (the remaining 2 percent was green asparagus). California white asparagus exports from 1960 to 1964 averaged approximately 1.9 million cases.

Although the specific Mexican national or bracero law expired on December 31, 1964, the Secretary of Labor still has authority under the general immigration law to issue permits for supplemental foreign labor to come into this country to assist in harvesting any crop where the Secretary makes a determination that the supply of domestic labor ready and willing to do that type of work is not adequate and that prevailing wages in the area will be paid. The Secretary has repeatedly exercised this authority on behalf of the State of Florida and has allowed many people from the West Indies to come into Florida to help harvest crops in that State at substantially lower wages than are paid in California. However, he discriminated against California by refusing to do the same for our State. When he has allowed a few to be admitted, they have been too few and too late.

What happened in California in 1965 because of lack of labor willing to harvest asparagus? The 1965 California white asparagus pack was reduced to 1,269,000 cases, a reduction of 52.7 percent. This was down from 2,659,000 cases in 1964. The foreign trade demand for white asparagus in 1965 was greater than in any previous year. Asparagus acreage which was originally planned for harvest in 1965 was sufficient to more than adequately serve this foreign demand. However, when Public Law 78 terminated under which braceros could be specifically admitted to this country, 16,243 acres of asparagus was plowed up by farmers who felt that it would be impossible to get adequate labor to harvest the crop. In addition, during the year 1965 an estimated 8,423 acres was plowed up by farmers who tried but found it impossible to get adequate competent labor to harvest the fields. Unharvested asparagus losses were estimated at $6.6 million. It is estimated that if this asparagus could have been harvested, at least 50 or 55 percent of this lost value would have been paid in wages to labor. Half of our foreign market export trade was lost because we could not fill the orders. The productivity of the domestic labor used in the asparagus fields fell off substantially, because much of it was not experienced and some not conscientious. Wage rates in picking asparagus went up substantially, far in excess of the administration's so-called maximum guidelines under which a 3.2 percent increase in wages and prices has been set as a maximum. Hundreds of jobs of cannery workers in Contra Costa and adjoining counties were either terminated or greatly reduced from a time standpoint. Scores of truckers lost their jobs because there was no asparagus to haul. Some asparagus farmers went bankrupt. The price of asparagus in grocery stores skyrocketed.

Here are a few of the results of the administration's unyielding policy against providing adequately for the harvest labor requirements of the California asparagus farmer:

1. California white asparagus lost half of its export market in 1 year because orders couldn't be filled, although it had taken many painstaking years to build up this market.

2. This was a serious, adverse blow to our U.S. balance of payments.

3. At least one-fourth of our total Delta asparagus was plowed up, at staggering losses to growers, as this is normally a 5-year crop.

4. Harvest productivity per man-hour sunk substantially.

5. Prices of fresh and canned asparagus in grocery stores skyrocketed and substantially broke the administration's so-called maximum guidelines of 3.2 percent. This penalized the housewife. Nevertheless, you didn't hear the administration make the usual threats of retaliatory action which it did with proposed steel, copper, and aluminum price increases. The administration must have had a guilty conscience since it was primarily responsible for the increases.

6. The number of illegal Mexican "wetbacks" who came into the United States completely illegally to obtain temporary farm jobs doubled during the year.

7. In the meantime, the administration repeatedly discriminated against California and in favor of Florida by being more liberal in allowing West Indians to come into Florida to work in harvest fields at rates substantially lower than those it set for California.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, having followed for some months the question of free world shipping to North Vietnam and reported from time to time to my colleagues, I should like to take this opportunity to present a status report concerning activities during the past year.

In 1965 there were more free world ships than Communist ships engaged in carrying goods to and from North Vietnam. Unfortunately, I cannot disclose the exact figures of this traffic, because they are classified, but I invite any and every interested Member to examine them closely. I know there are many who are concerned about this phase of the war and already have expressed themselves this session.

Before presenting what information I can about the nature and extension of free world shipping into North Vietnam, I am aware that some may justifiably wonder why any of this information should be classified. It certainly is no secret to Ho Chi Minh. One reason, I am told, is that to reveal such data might place in jeopardy our own sources of information. No one, of course, wishes to hamper our intelligence network. However, I am satisfied that a great deal more of this information can and should be made public. When American boys are dying from North Vietnamese bullets, the American people have a right to adequate information about who is aiding the enemy. As it stands now, and as it stood throughout 1965, the American people simply have not been told the whole truth about the shocking support being given by free world ships to a nation blatantly engaged in Communist aggression and subversion.

The unclassified data that is made available to me by the Department of Defense indicates that while there has been some reduction in the volume of this trade in 1965 over that of 1964, a disturbing amount persists. At this point in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to include an itemization by month of arrivals of free world ships in North Vietnam during 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MINISH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHART A.—*Free world ships arriving North Vietnam*

JANUARY 1965

Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived
Aiolos II	Lebanese	7,256	Jan. 26
Cardross	British	2,314	Jan. 29
Elbow River	do	5,179	Jan. 7
Golden Zeta	do	4,474	Do.
Hakuyo Maru	Japanese	6,430	Jan. 9
Jinsan	British	1,261	Jan. 1
Do	do	1,261	Jan. 10
Do	do	1,261	Jan. 17
Do	do	1,261	Jan. 25
Langford	do	2,865	Jan. 1
Panagos	Lebanese	7,133	Jan. 28
Saronis	Greek	7,271	Jan. 25
Santa Granda	British	7,229	Jan. 21
Wakasa Bay	do	7,040	Jan. 16

FEBRUARY 1965

Bidford	British	2,865	Feb. 5
Cardamilitis	Greek	7,163	Feb. 7
Cardross	British	2,314	Feb. 15
Dartford	do	2,739	Feb. 7
Elbow River	do	5,179	Feb. 17
Fortune Wind	do	3,376	Feb. 15
Jinsan	do	1,261	Feb. 1
Do	do	1,261	Feb. 14
Do	do	1,261	Feb. 23
Do	do	1,261	Feb. 28
Longford	do	2,865	Feb. 23
Meiwa Maru	Japanese	4,975	Feb. 15
Newglade	British	7,368	Feb. 11
Rochford	do	3,324	Feb. 20
Stanwear	do	8,108	Feb. 23
Syros	Greek	7,176	Feb. 7
Wakasa Bay	British	7,040	Feb. 23
Wishford	do	3,464	Feb. 27

MARCH 1965

Bidford	British	2,865	Mar. 5
Cardross	do	2,314	Mar. 4
Dukat	Norwegian	1,401	Mar. 2
Do	do	1,401	Mar. 15
Elbow River	British	5,179	Mar. 4
Golden Alpha	do	5,031	Mar. 7
Hollands Diep	Dutch	9,631	Mar. 31
Longford	British	2,865	Mar. 27
Nissos Paros	Greek	1,953	Mar. 4
Rahiotis	do	7,138	Mar. 23
Sambas	Dutch	1,874	Mar. 14
Do	do	1,874	Mar. 25
Santa Granda	British	7,229	Mar. 27
San Spyridon	Lebanese	7,260	Mar. 13

APRIL 1965

Grecian Isles	Greek	9,173	Apr. 23
Mui Heng	Norwegian	1,398	Apr. 29
Santa Granda	British	7,229	Apr. —
Sletfjord	Norwegian	1,705	Apr. 4
Do	do	1,705	Apr. 13

MAY 1965

Antarctica	British	8,785	May 21
Cardross	do	2,313	May 5
Do	do	2,313	May 29
Fortune Wind	do	3,376	May 6
Gisna	Norwegian	6,030	May 5
Do	do	6,030	May 29
Herborg	do	3,312	May 21
Irena	Greek	7,232	Do.
Kawana	British	7,308	May 27
Nancy Dee	do	6,547	May 31
Nymfea	Greek	7,276	May 1
Phoevos	do	9,949	May 16
Shirley Christine	British	6,724	May 30
Sletfjord	Norwegian	1,705	May 6
Yanxilas	Lebanese	10,051	May 3

JUNE 1965

Avisfaith	British	7,868	June 7
Alkon	Greek	7,150	June 6
Cardross	British	2,313	June 28
Helena	Norwegian	2,529	June 21
Kyvernitis	Greek	9,360	June 1
Newheath	British	5,891	June 13
Newmoat	do	7,151	June 29
Phoenician Dawn	do	8,708	June 13
Strovili	Greek	7,181	June 5

CHART A.—*Free world ships arriving North Vietnam*—Continued

JULY 1965

Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived
Agios Therapon	Greek	5,617	July 11
Agenor	do	7,139	July 6
Ardrossmore	British	5,820	July 24
Alkon	Greek	7,150	July —
Fortune Wind	British	3,376	July 6
Hellas	Greek	7,176	July 11
Herborg	Norwegian	3,321	July 9
Shienfoon	British	7,127	July 1
Shirley Christine	do	6,724	Do.

AUGUST 1965

Amalia	Maltese	7,304	Aug. 28
Helena	Norway	2,529	Aug. 8
Herborg	do	3,321	Aug. 2
Do	do	3,321	Aug. 28
Willowpool	British	8,972	Aug. 30

SEPTEMBER 1965

Fortune Wind	British	3,376	Sept. 27
Helena	Norwegian	2,529	Sept. 4
Herborg	do	3,321	Sept. 22
Jesselton Bay	British	7,189	Sept. 7
Stanwear	do	8,108	Sept. 23

OCTOBER 1965

Acme	Cyprus	7,159	Oct. 16
Ardrossmore	British	5,820	Oct. 14
Bidford	do	2,865	Oct. —
Helena	Norwegian	2,529	Oct. 22
Herborg	do	3,321	Oct. 15
Kingford	British	2,911	Oct. 19
Santa Granda	do	7,229	Oct. —

CHART A.—*Free world ships arriving North Vietnam*—Continued

NOVEMBER 1965

Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived
Ardrossmore	British	5,820	Nov. 26
Dartford	do	2,739	Nov. 17
Fortune Wind	do	3,376	Nov. 26
Herborg	Norwegian	3,321	Nov. 9
Ho Fung	British	7,121	Nov. 10
Jollity	do	8,650	Do.
Kanaris	Greek	7,240	Nov. —
Longford	British	2,865	Nov. 2
Starford	do	3,464	Nov. 12

DECEMBER 1965

Aktor	Cyprus	6,993	Dec. 12
Isabel Erica	British	7,105	Dec. 11
Kanaris	Greek	7,240	Do.
Newheath	British	6,743	Dec. 2
Wakasa Bay	do	7,040	Dec. 12

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as I reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 22, 1965, during 1964 a total of 401 free world ships arrived in North Vietnam. According to the unclassified figures there were 119 free world ship arrivals in North Vietnam in 1965. Of this 119 figure 107 involved ships flying the flags of NATO countries.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to insert a chart presenting a monthly breakdown by country of free world ships arriving in North Vietnam during 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHART B.—*Free world ships arriving North Vietnam in 1965*

Month	United Kingdom	Japan	Greece	Norway	Netherlands	Lebanon	Malta	Panama	Cyprus	Total
January	10	1	1			2				14
February	15	1	2							18
March	6		2	2	3	1		1		15
April	1		1	3						5
May	7		4	4		1				16
June	5		3	1		1				10
July	4		4	1						9
August	1			2			1		1	5
September	4			2						6
October	4			2					1	7
November	7		1	1						9
December	3		1						1	5
Total	67	2	19	18	3	5	1	1	3	119

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as the monthly unclassified figures are undoubtedly meant to suggest, some progress has been made in reducing this trade but unfortunately that success is not as marked as the unclassified figures would have us believe. I can tell you that the true figure is more than double what we are being told; and that amounts, as I said before, to more arrivals by free world ships than by Communist ships during 1965.

NONSTRATEGIC GOODS ARE VITAL

Just what is the nature of this trade? First of all it is true that the great majority of these free world ships are under charter to Communist countries—Communist China, Soviet Union, Rumania, East Germany, Cuba and others—that is these free world ships are mostly carrying Communist goods to and from North Vietnam. Some have argued that this somehow removes the foul odor about this traffic. I disagree. Any goods or export profits that Ho Chi Minh needs badly enough to hire free world vessels cannot but help Hanoi's overall war effort. I say we should not concede our enemy one extra spool of thread. Considerably more economic pressure can and should be applied to Hanoi.

Similarly, some in our Government have offered us the assurance that no strategic goods have been carried by any of these free world vessels. Again the fragrance of this trade to my way of thinking has not been much sweetened. First of all, although further information may exist with others in our Government, the classified reports I receive from the Department of Defense indi-

cate that we do not have complete knowledge as to the nature of these cargoes. Second, even if free world ships carry only nonstrategic goods they in effect release Communist vessels for the transportation of more war goods. The ultimate effect is the same. The seaborne source of the supply lines into Hanoi and down to the South is kept open without hindrance. Did we not recently read of members of a crew of a Cuban freighter who jumped ship when they learned they had been ordered to carry weapons from China to North Vietnam when previously their ship had been engaged in so-called nonstrategic traffic?

Mr. Speaker, the stubborn fact remains—North Vietnam is on all-out war economy. Why should free world ships contribute in any way to such an economy whether by carrying goods to or from North Vietnam? I say so long as there is still one free world ship docking at Haiphong we should not relent in our effort to stop this aid and comfort to the enemy.

SOME PROGRESS NOTED

As I indicated earlier some progress has been made toward drying up the enemy's seaborne source of supply. I was gratified to learn that a number of governments have taken steps to remove their flag vessels from this trade.

However, even though some countries have apparently removed their vessels from this trade, it does not necessarily mean that goods from these countries do not find their way to North Vietnam. Let us look again at the unclassified information concerning data for just 1 month. At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert a chart indicating the origin of cargoes of the five free world ships arriving in North Vietnam during December 1965:

Name	Flag	Cargo origin	North Vietnam port	Date
Aktor	Cyprus	Belgium	Haiphong	Dec. 12
Isabel Erica	British	Hong Kong	Port Campha	Dec. 11
Kanaris	Greek	Communist China	Haiphong	Do.
Newheath	British	Japan	Port Campha	Dec. 12
Wakasa Bay	do	do	do	Do.

All five of these free world ships were under charter to Communist Governments. Four of these ships loaded cargoes in free world ports: one in Belgium, one in Hong Kong, and two in Japan. It is evident, I submit, that what progress has been made in shutting off free world assistance to Hanoi, while encouraging, is still gravely insufficient.

There is another glaring instance of the need for greater cooperation from our friends. Of the 119 free world ship arrivals in North Vietnam during 1965, 67 were vessels registered under the flag of the United Kingdom. British officials argue that most of these vessels are under lease to Hong Kong shipping concerns and that they are powerless to interfere with this traffic in the absence of a formal declaration of war. However correct this explanation may be, it clearly does nothing to ameliorate the situation. I for one am not satisfied that ways could not be found. Obviously the British Government has found ways to shut off trade with Rhodesia. For instance, any British national who carries or who supplies certain goods to Rhodesia now faces 6 months in prison or a $1,400 fine or both. I know of no comparable action taken with those trading with North Vietnam. The British should hardly need reminding that our own Government has given extensive support to the embargo on Rhodesia in a number of ways. We now, for instance, require special export licenses, which, it is reported, the Department of Commerce will not grant in any case, to carry oil and certain other commodities to Rhodesia. It is not my purpose to raise the question of the wisdom of our policy toward Rhodesia, but I would express the hope that in view of what has taken place the British Government would reexamine its policy of "hands off" British-flag vessels trading with North Vietnam.

CUBAN AND NORTH VIETNAMESE TRADE: A DOUBLE STANDARD?

If the attitude of the British Government leaves something to be desired, so does, in my opinion, the attitude of our own Government. It has been the policy and continues to be the policy of the present administration to in effect exempt ships engaged in North Vietnamese trade from the penalties and restrictions imposed upon ships which engage in Cuban trade. Why should we be more considerate of Ho Chi Minh than Castro?

My colleagues will no doubt recall the partially successful efforts made in the last session to prohibit funds under the foreign aid program from going to any country whose merchant ships trade with North Vietnam. What was sought was simply the addition of the words "or to North Vietnam" to the already existing prohibition concerning those who trade with Cuba. By the narrow margin of 174 to 164 the administration succeeded in weakening this prohibition with regard to North Vietnam with a proviso permitting the President, if he determines it in the national interest, to continue foreign aid to countries with flag vessels carrying North Vietnamese trade.

Frankly, I cannot comprehend how it would be in our national interest to permit in any way free world trade with the Hanoi regime. To date I know of no communication from the President to the Congress indicating that such aid will be continued to any nation whose vessels continue to trade with North Vietnam. But neither have we received any indication that any foreign aid funds have been cut off to any such country.

According to the President's report to Congress on the foreign aid assistance program for fiscal year 1965, which, of course, includes the first 6 months of calendar 1965, the following countries which appear in the above list of ships arriving in North Vietnamese ports during 1965 have received, for instance, military assistance alone in these amounts:

The Netherlands	$1,105,000
Norway	35,051,000
Greece	63,061,000
Lebanon	106,000
Japan	18,531,000
Panama	220,000

The figures for fiscal year 1966, I am told, are classified. As I already mentioned some of these governments have taken steps to withdraw their ships from such trade but there are still countries who apparently have not.

The concern of Congress over this trade has not been without its effect. A recent State Department statement revealed:

> In making diplomatic representations, the executive branch is mindful of the provisions of the recent amendments to foreign assistance legislation which call for the denial of economic and military aid to countries that do not take appropriate steps to remove their ships from the North Vietnam trade. We have notified all affected governments of these legislative provisions, and have continued to press them to obtain maximum cooperation from those very few countries still having ships in trade.

The "no trade or no aid" provision enacted last session clearly indicates the positive role congressional action has played in foreign relations. The State Department's hand was obviously substantially strengthened in dealing with these countries as a result of Congress' determination last year.

NORTH VIETNAM TRADERS IN U.S. PORTS

Unfortunately there is another way in which the policy of the executive branch in effect discriminates in favor of trade in North Vietnam. On February 6, 1963, National Security Action Memorandum No. 220 was issued by the National Security Council, which prohibited any vessel which has arrived in Cuba since January 1, 1963, from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes from the United States. According to Report No. 66 issued by the Maritime Administration, 244 free world and Polish-flag ships have made a total of 1,024 trips to Cuba from January 1, 1962, through December 13, 1965. None of these 244 ships are permitted to carry U.S. Government-financed cargoes out of U.S. ports. Close examination revealed that 17 free world vessels which have called at North Vietnamese ports in 1965 appear on this so-called Cuban blacklist and therefore are prohibited from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes, not because of their trade with North Vietnam, but because they have also called at Cuban ports. At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a chart giving the names of these 17 ships.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHART C.—*Free world ships prohibited from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes because of trade with Cuba which called at North Vietnamese ports in 1965*

Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived
Amalia	Maltese	7,304	Aug. 28
Antarctica	British	8,785	May 21
Avisfaith	do	7,868	June 7
Ho Fung	do	7,121	Nov. 10
Jollity	do	8,650	Nov. 12
Nancy Dee	do	6,547	May 31
Newglade	do	7,368	Feb. 11
Newmoat	do	7,151	June 29
Phoenician Dawn	do	8,708	June 13
Santa Granda	do	7,229	Jan. 21
			Mar. 27
			Apr. —
			Oct. —
Shienfoon	do	7,127	July 1
Stanwear	do	8,108	Feb. 23
			Sept. 23
Aiolos II	Lebanese	7,256	Jan. 26
Panagos	do	7,133	Jan. 28
San Spyridon	do	7,260	Mar. 13
Agios Therapon	Greek	5,617	July 11
Acme	Cyprus	7,159	Oct. 16

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, these 17 ships could carry U.S. Government-financed cargoes except for the fact that they had been in Cuba. There is in fact an example of a vessel which was in North Vietnam on January 25, 1965, which, under charter to the Government of India, loaded at Port Arthur, Tex., on July 21, 1965, a food-for-peace cargo of 10,210 long tons of wheat bound for India as authorized under title I, Public Law 480. This vessel, the Greek flag ship, *Saronis*, could not have been hired to carry such a cargo had it ever been in Cuba in the last 3 years. No one, of course, wants to impede the flow of food to a hungry people. This is not necessary, but what is necessary, as I view it, is that the policy of our Government should not be one of awarding public business to vessels which have carried goods for our enemy.

I feel very strongly that we should, moreover, prohibit ships which trade with North Vietnam from not only carrying Government-financed cargoes but from doing any business at all in U.S. ports. I have joined in sponsoring legislation to that effect and I urge my colleagues to consider doing the same. The reason for this is made plain by the fact that this same Greek vessel, *Saronis*, was again in a U.S. port, Newport News, Va., on December 21, 1965, when it sailed with a cargo of coal bound for Brazil. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my bill, H.R. 9946, be placed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

H.R. 9946

A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. 883), is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 27." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) No article shall be transported in commerce aboard vessels of any foreign shipping interest which allows vessels owned or controlled by such interests to be used, on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, in trade with Communist-dominated North Vietnam.

"(c) As used in subsection (b) of this section, the term 'commerce' means commerce between a point in any State or possession of the United States (including the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) and any point outside thereof or between points in the same State or possession of the United States (including the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) through any point outside thereof.

"(d) As used in subsection (b) of this section, the term 'shipping interest' means any individual, company, or group of companies which has any ownership interest in any ship engaged in such trade.

"(e) As used in subsection (b) of this section, the term 'controlled' means control of movements of a vessel by virtue of ownership interests; agency agreements; charter hire; or otherwise.

"(f) Whoever willfully violates subsection (b) of this section shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(g) The President shall issue such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of subsection (b) of this section."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to insert a list of free world ships which have called at U.S. ports after having been in North Vietnam during 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHART D.—*Free world ships in North Vietnamese and United States ports*

Name	Flag	Gross tonnage	In North Vietnam	In United States
Hellas	Greek	7,176	June 1, 1964	
			July 11, 1964	
			Oct. 9, 1964	
			Oct. 29, 1964	
				Mar. 10, 1965, New York, 7,555 long tons of bulk steel scrap for United Arab Republic.
			July 11, 1965	
Hollands Diep	Dutch	9,631	Mar. 31, 1965	June 23, 1965, San Francisco-Oakland. Loaded 13,000 long tons of petroleum coke for Japan.
				Aug. 19, 1965, Stockton, Calif. Loaded 11,000 long tons of safflower seed for Japan.
Saronis	Greek	7,271	Jan. 25, 1965	July 20, 1965, Port Arthur, Tex. Loaded 10,210 long tons of wheat for India (food for peace, title 1, Public Law 480).
				Dec. 21, 1965, Newport News, Va. Loaded coal for Brazil.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be at least two immediate courses of action open which can clearly set the record straight with regard to our Government's attitude with regard to free world ships in North Vietnam. First, the executive branch possesses the authority to establish a so-called black list with respect to North Vietnam as now exists with respect to Cuban trade. This, as I pointed out, would affect only Government-financed cargoes.

It is worth noting that the requirement was also established that in order for a ship to be removed from the so-called Cuban "black list," it is necessary for its owners to pledge that none of the other vessels it controls will engage in the future in Cuban trade. Secondly, Congress, I believe should broaden this prohibition to include all business in U.S. ports both public and private not only with respect to specific vessels which have been in North Vietnamese ports but with respect to the vessels of any shipping interest which allows any one of its ships to profit from trade with the Hanoi regime.

These two courses of action may not be sufficient to completely put a stop to free world traffic in North Vietnam. Other steps may be necessary such as the mining or blockading of the harbors. Nevertheless these two courses of action would serve to make clear what in the past has been unclear; to give Ho Chi Minh unequivocal notice of our determination not to support or tolerate in any fashion any form of free world assistance which contributes to his policy of aggression and subversion.

In the face of the totally negative response to recent efforts to bring the conflict to the conference table, we can only surmise that the Hanoi regime continues to believe that the United States will eventually grow weary under the conditions of a long, limited struggle; and that a Communist victory in South Vietnam is possible.

It seems to me that by failing to eliminate all forms of aid and comfort from the free world to North Vietnam we have presented to Ho Chi Minh an obviously contradictory position which, I believe, can and has contributed to Hanoi's rapid escalation of the war in the expectation of total victory. Until our Government takes a clearer public stand with regard to such free world assistance, our efforts to convince the Hanoi regime of American determination to resist the spread of communism cannot help but be damaged.

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, I yield briefly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on this classification question I just wonder why the North Vietnamese know what ships are going to Haiphong, I wonder why the Chinese know what ships are going to Haiphong, and I wonder why the Soviet Union knows what ships are going to Haiphong and why the American people

should not know what ships are going into Haiphong.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I cannot answer the gentleman's question, but I appreciate him raising it again. I mentioned earlier in my remarks that I saw no reason for this classification and that the administration is not telling the citizens of our country the whole truth. I believe it is well that this information should be made available. I appreciate the gentleman underscoring my point.

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague from Michigan for his concise and very objective presentation here today on a very serious matter. I have joined with him several years now in an effort to prevent foreign aid to our allies who are shipping goods and using their ships to bring goods to North Vietnam. I cannot understand for the life of me how countries like the United Kingdom, which I understand from the gentleman's presentation here today is one of the biggest users of their ships to bring goods into North Vietnam, can continue doing this in view of the fact that we have been such great friends of the United Kingdom.

We were the first country to come to their aid when they ran into difficulty with Rhodesia. We immediately broke off relationships with Rhodesia. We immediately stopped bringing goods into Rhodesia because of the difficulties that the United Kingdom was having there.

I cannot understand for the life of me why a country like Greece continues to bring goods into North Vietnam. If it was not for the Truman plan and our foreign aid, Greece would have fallen into Communist hands many years ago.

We have been a great ally of the Greeks down through the years. We have helped them tremendously with billions of dollars of foreign aid. Yet they persist in bringing goods into North Vietnam, knowing that these goods will be used against our soldiers over there in the conflict at the present time.

I think that the gentleman's crusade and the arguments that he has presented here on the floor, time and time again, have done much to stop many of these countries from continuing this practice. I am pleased to report to him the evidence, as it has been brought before my committee, indicates that the Greek Government is presenting a bill before its Parliament to pass a resolution to stop the ships from going to North Vietnam.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would like to thank the gentleman for his generous remarks, and I would also like to take this occasion to acknowledge the invaluable assistance that he has been during this past year in helping to amend the foreign aid bill, to put some limitations on this problem, some teeth into it.

This is something that is going to require the combined effort of all of us here on both sides of the aisle, and my colleague from Massachusetts has been an invaluable help. I look forward to his assistance in the future.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman very much.

THE SERIOUS JOHNSON-McNAMARA MISCALCULATION CONCERNING NORTH VIETNAMESE AIR STRIKE TARGETS AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MINISH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last Monday I mentioned to the House two significant failures in the management of the war. These were: First, the failure of our bombing of North Vietnamese targets during the period from February through most of December 1965, to accomplish either the objective of slowing down infiltration of North Vietnamese military units to the south, or the objective of raising to Hanoi the price for its aggressions to an amount it is unwilling to pay for continuing them; and second, the failure of the 5-week-and-2-day bombing respite to lure Ho Chi Minh anywhere near a negotiating table.

The responsibility for these failures cannot be placed on U.S. military commanders. They are not running the war. It is being run by civilians in Washington, principally President Johnson and Secretary McNamara and their semi-anonymous advisers, most of whom also are civilians untrained to run a war.

Air action over North Vietnam now has resumed. It is the duty of these people frankly to admit that their past choice of ammunition—TNT bombs—and severe limitation on targets just did not produce appreciable results. These Washington war managers seriously miscalculated. They should not perpetuate their mistake. It is likely only to bring renewed frustration. Instead they should give intelligent thought to the discovery of what additional or alternate targets could be more meaningful to the North Vietnamese and apply some creative imagination to determine what ammunition will best damage them. Last Monday I predicted that "both the targets and the ammunition may turn out to be quite unconventional."

The prediction was based on the fact that North Vietnam is a backward, underdeveloped country with a primitive "rice and fish" economy. Unlike the Germany of World War II it cannot be bombed to submission by blowing to fragments a complex, highly integrated industrial economy. Those who place so much stress on "bombing Hanoi and Haiphong to win the war" largely fail to see this distinction. Similarly, North Vietnam's transportation is so primitive it is little wonder that despite United States bombing of roads and rails the infiltration rate of men and supplies from north to south has increased manyfold. Bomb damage easily had been sidestepped by a simple switch in North Vietnamese freightloading practices—from wheels to the backs of men.

My prediction of unconventional targets and unconventional ammunition also was based on the fact that "the cultural level of North Vietnam is undoubtedly one of the lowest imaginable Eighty percent of the population is illiterate, ignorant to an incredible degree, and subject to the most extraordinary superstitions."—Statement in 1962 by the leftist French historian Gerard Tongas who lived many years in Hanoi until 1960. Some rather interesting and possibly very effective alternatives to our present kind of air strikes in the north open up if we recognize it as "a land where gods, devils, and animistic spirits of inanimate objects are subliminal neighbors during daylight and lurk almost tangibly among the darker patches of night"—American Security Council Washington Report, August 31, 1965. These alternatives—which obviously fall into the category of psychological warfare—involve no killing, no maiming, no physical destruction. In terms of violence they will deescalate rather than escalate the war. But in terms of results they well may be decisive.

Raising the price to Hanoi for continuing its aggressions to the prohibitive level by psywar tactics requires actions to create enough misery, anxiety, wretchedness and distress in the minds of the North Vietnamese people to induce an intense general annoyance with the war. Even a Communist dictatorship cannot long pursue policies so unpopular they bring into being sweeping national disorganization, disturbance, and discontent. Considering the cultural level of the population and its fearful awe of superstitious omens, the task of depopularizing Ho Chi Minh's policy of aggression should be well within the capability of American ingenuity.

The few examples of many possible actions along these lines which I am about to cite are for illustrative purposes and need not be taken as specific recommendations before they are determined to meet all the requirements of psychological warfare operations. They are based on a study of North Vietnamese customs and superstitions made for me by the Library of Congress.

Example: North Vietnam's Red River Delta is the nation's rice bowl. Flooding is controlled by damming upstream and subsequent release of water to rice paddies. Bombing the dams has been rejected because a flood would drown thousands and many more would perish later by starvation from loss of the rice crop. As a nonexplosive alternative many tons of harmless soluble dye might be dropped upstream. A single B-52 is capable of delivering in excess of 27 tons of dye. Consider adding an ingredient which also is harmless but creates an obnoxiously offensive odor. The dye and the odor will be picked up by the growing rice.

North Vietnamese eat rice every day at every meal. The need to eat this kind of unsightly, unappetizing but harmless and nutritious mess day after day after day could become a dear price to pay for Hanoi's transgressions. It also will deprive the North of its principal export

commodity helping to pay the cost of the war.

During their campaigns in East Java in 1946 and 1947 the Dutch dropped harmless soluble dyes in rice paddies. It caused panic among the native people who believed it to be a manifestation of divine wrath. Effort should be made to assure that a portion of the country's rice crop remains normal. This will generate black market woes and instant hostility toward any government official who attempts to allocate palatable rice, or to collect it for export.

Example: Along with their superstitious nature the people of Vietnam, North and South, have a long, deep-rooted dislike for the Chinese. These facts of their life should be exploited to the fullest, for instance:

To an oriental there is nothing lower than a running dog. Cheap plastic toy models of Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung joined in the shape of running dogs could be airdropped in large quantity.

In Vietnam the ace of spades is considered as deadly an omen as it is in Sicily. Hundreds of thousands of plastic ace of spades playing cards could be dropped throughout the country. Pictures of the two above-mentioned culprits might also be added to the cards.

Seeing a woman on first leaving one's dwelling in the morning is a certain sign in Vietnam the day will be one of misfortune, therefore rain plastic models of women from the sky during the night to be found as a morning greeting.

On hearing an owl cry "thrice in the night" North Vietnamese flatly expect death in the immediate family. The experience generally results in the strongest sense of dread. Cheap air drop devices which simulate three hoots of an owl should be easy to design.

Except for the owl device all bad-luck air drop items should be constructed to make a distinctive, audible sound as they fall through the air to add the distress of an advance harbinger that bad luck is on its way. The use of plastic for these objectionable symbols rather than paper is desirable because they are just that much harder to get rid of. Air drops of good-luck symbols bearing identification with the Republic of South Vietnam should occasionally be made both for the obvious reason and because they might induce a Pavlovian reaction. It is to be recalled that the Russian psychologist, Pavlov, induced in dogs a state of total disorganization by alternating acts of ill-usage and kindness. Although airdrop items only have been used as illustrations here, radio and all other media, of course, play a role in the conduct of psychological war.

Cutting down the infiltration rate also should be examined in terms of the examples just given. The routes used, loosely described as the Ho Chi Minh Trail, have their beginnings in North Vietnam, traverse several areas of Laos and Cambodia and have multiple entrance points into South Vietnam. Much of the trail is screened by dense tropical forests making ground movement very difficult to detect. A high proportion of the bombs we drop along it blow up trees and bushes instead of Vietcong and their supplies. It is clear that the more superstitious dread we can cause the enemy to associate with this communication line, the more difficult will be his progress along it.

Example: On hillsides visible while marching southward defoliate the shape of the unlucky ace of spades.

Example: Skywrite this and other omens of misfortune and death when Vietcong are estimated to be in locations where they will see them.

Example: Spike the Ho Chi Minh trail with various devices emitting sounds, odors, or other manifestations of doom, death, or displeasure on the part of the spirit world with the goings on. Sowing by air of chemically treated seeds which grow rapidly into bizarre and ominous plant forms should be investigated.

In closing I have a few words for so-called defense intellectuals and assorted sophisticates who will deride and ridicule these suggestions. In war it is as dangerous to overestimate your enemy as it is to underestimate him. If we are going to continue these air operations over North Vietnam which are costly in airmen's lives and aircraft, then we had better take another tack and start getting some effectiveness out of them more equivalent to their cost. This is not a conventional war; it is an unconventional war. Some, but not all, of the strategy and tactics of conventional war can be adapted to unconventional war.

Primarily, an unconventional war requires unconventional strategy and tactics. Psychological warfare is as old as mankind: the assault on the mind is as ancient as the roared battle cry, as historically familiar as the rebel yell, and as modern as the sophisticated techniques of World War II. Its possibilities today are manifold for defeating wars of liberation strategy and guerrilla tactics.

Lastly, I have a word for the wiseacres who think they are being cute by shooting supposedly funny wisecracks from the hip whenever their pseudointellectualism is exposed to an idea they are incapable of understanding and comprehending. Let them recall that the Vietnam roll of dead and maimed Americans grows longer every day. Instead of trying to be funny, they should themselves be trying to figure out ways to speed the war's successful conclusion. And, in the unlikely event they happen to come up with an idea, even if it is an unconventional one, they should have the guts to get up and suggest it.

PROBE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of the courts to oust Federal Judge Stephen Chandler, of Oklahoma, raises serious questions that should be the subject of an immediate congressional investigation. In the first place, this is clearly an invasion of the rights of the Congress, for it is only the Congress that has the constitutional authority to remove a Federal judge by impeachment.

If Judge Chandler is to be impeached, it should be done by the Congress, and only after a full investigation of all the facts surrounding the action by the circuit court of appeals. I believe that this is particularly important in the light of the secret hearings in the 10th circuit that was used as a basis for forcing Judge Chandler to stop holding court.

Moreover, the public is entitled to know what powers have been delegated to or usurped by judicial councils to strip judges of their duties and responsibilities leaving them merely with titles and salaries, as in the case of Judge Chandler.

If Judge Chandler is to be removed, it should be only after thorough and open hearings in the proper forum—the U.S. Congress. Then there will be the full opportunity to explore all the evidence surrounding the Chandler controversy, including his charges that there are corrupt Federal district court judges and corrupt circuit court judges involved in a conspiracy against him.

There are those who contend that Judge Chandler's allegations of corruption in the Federal judiciary represent such rash and unbelievable comments that they demonstrate a lack of stability. I suggest that before anyone jumps to a hurried conclusion that Judge Chandler has made irresponsible charges, that they examine the record more thoroughly than it has been examined at this stage.

In the first place, it is not inconceivable that there is some corruption in the Federal judiciary. There has been in the past, and the great power lodged in our Federal judges certainly makes them a likely target for the corrupters. It is possible that Judge Chandler is right.

The allegations by Judge Chandler deserve a most careful examination in the light of his past performance as a Federal judge, and his past record in the American Bar Association where he has been a recognized champion of judicial reform.

However, there is one other fact that makes it even more apparent why the allegations Judge Chandler has made about judicial corruption should be given serious examination. This is not the first time that Judge Chandler has charged corruption in the courts, and in the first instance there is now a clear record showing that he was right.

There was gross corruption in the Oklahoma Supreme Court, and there was no effective action against those corrupt judges until Judge Chandler came to Washington and forced the issue by calling it to the attention of the Criminal Division in the Justice Department. Since then there have been convictions and ousters from the Oklahoma Supreme Court.

It could be quite significant that Judge Chandler was highly regarded in judicial circles and in American Bar Association circles until after he blew the whistle on the corrupt judges on the

Oklahoma Supreme Court. When Judge Chandler contended that some of the same type of corruption existed in the Federal district court and in the Federal circuit court of appeals, he suddenly became the target of a wide range of attacks.

In the light of his background and the substance of his charges about the Oklahoma Supreme Court, Judge Chandler is certainly entitled to a full hearing. If what he states is true, then it would appear that the entire judicial system in that area could stand an investigation. Judge Chandler should not be required to go out and do the entire investigation by himself, and no single Congressman or Senator should have to take on this job. It is a job that should be undertaken by the proper committee of Congress, or by a special committee. This is important, both from a standpoint of fairness to Judge Chandler, and from the standpoint of doing our duty relative to this encroachment on the powers of Congress.

A complaint filed in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit recently demonstrates that the action of the 10th circuit in the Chandler case has set a precedent that can cause major problems.

A Mr. Sherman H. Skolnick has filed a complaint with the Seventh Circuit asking for action against Federal Judge Joseph Samuel Perry, of Chicago on grounds of misconduct.

I do not know the merits of this complaint, but it demonstrates that there is acute need for clarification of the role of the circuit court and the Congress in these matters.

If the 10th circuit is operating properly in barring Judge Chandler from activities as a Federal judge, then the seventh circuit could properly take action in the complaint filed against Judge Perry in Chicago. In the Chicago case, there is a specific public complaint filed by Mr. Skolnick. If the evidence supports the allegations, this also is something that should be the subject of the attention of Congress.

It is my suggestion that there be a special committee established to make a thorough investigation of all of the charges of judicial corruption, and the procedures being used that appear now to be an arrogant infringement upon the rights of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as an extension of my remarks, I submit herewith the complaint filed by Mr. Skolnick in the U.S. Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit:

[In the U.S. Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit]

IN THE MATTER OF SHERMAN H. SKOLNICK, PARTY-COMPLAINANT, COMPLAINING OF THE MISCONDUCT OF U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOSEPH SAMUEL PERRY, RESPONDENT

NOTICE

To: Honorable Joseph Samuel Perry, 219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., respondent; Honorable Seventh Circuit Justice Tom C. Clark, Supreme Court Building, Washington, D.C.; House of Representatives Judiciary Committee, 2137 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.; Senate Judiciary Committee, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Please take notice, that on January 24, 1966, I filed with the Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit, Motion of Sherman H. Skolnick together with this Notice and Affidavit below. A copy of said motion is attached hereto and herewith served upon you together with this Notice and Affidavit below:

"State of Illinois, County of Cook, affidavit.

"Sherman H. Skolnick, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

"1. That he is the party-complainant, pro se, in this cause; that he has read the enclosed Motion by him subscribed and that the allegations of fact therein contained are true and correct to the personal knowledge of this affiant.

"2. That he served the within Notice together with this Affidavit and a copy of his Motion, by sending the same to those above named, by enclosing copies of the same in duly addressed, stamped, and sealed envelopes with first class postage prepaid, and depositing in the U.S. Mail Box in front of 2311 East 95th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60617, the 24th day of January, 1966.

"SHERMAN H. SKOLNICK.

"Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 24th day of January, A.D. 1966.

———,
"Notary Public."

MOTION FOR IMMEDIATE CONVENING OF SEVENTH CIRCUIT JUDICIAL COUNCIL, TO HEAR SHERMAN H. SKOLNICK COMPLAINING OF THE MISCONDUCT OF U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOSEPH SAMUEL PERRY

Now comes Sherman H. Skolnick, pro se, party-complainant in the above entitled matter, and moves as follows:

(A) That Chief Judge of the Seventh Circuit, Honorable John S. Hastings, or that Honorable Seventh Circuit Justice Tom C. Clark, upon disqualification of said Chief Judge, immediately convene, pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. Sec. 332, in Chicago, Illinois, or such other place, a council of the circuit judges for the Seventh Circuit, in active service, to hear Sherman H. Skolnick, party-complainant, complaining of the misconduct of United States District Court Judge Joseph Samuel Perry;

(B) That after said Judicial Council of the Seventh Circuit has heard Sherman H. Skolnick, and heard evidence offered by him, that said District Judge Joseph Samuel Perry be ordered to take no action whatsoever in any court case, and particularly so in cases arising under 42 U.S.C.A. Sec. 1981 et seq., known as the Civil Rights Acts of 1871.

(C) That other and further supervisory measures be taken by the Judicial Council of the Seventh Circuit in respect to the misconduct of said Judge Perry and his present inability and unwillingness to discharge the duties of his office.

(D) That Honorable John S. Hastings disqualify himself in this matter because of his discrimination against Sherman H. Skolnick as hereinafter stated.

In support of this motion, Sherman H. Skolnick states:

1. District Judge Joseph Samuel Perry has discriminated against Sherman H. Skolnick, a citizen of the Jewish faith and race, a minority group, and has discriminated against him as an individual, as follows:

(a) On September 24, 1962, in the case of *Sherman H. Skolnick, plaintiff,* v. *Otto Spolar, et al., defendants,* U.S. District Court, N.D. Ill. E.D., No. 62 C 1161, the said Judge Perry refused to allow the attorney retained by Sherman H. Skolnick to represent him, to be heard, and to speak on behalf of Sherman H. Skolnick.

Said case was a Civil Rights suit seeking civil damages against a state court bailiff and others acting in combination with him, in excluding Jews and Negroes from jury service and for tampering with a state court jury.

A short time after the said September 24, 1962, as a reprisal against the person retained by Sherman H. Skolnick as his attorney, the said Judge Perry excluded said attorney from his courtroom by threats, insults, and abuse, entirely without cause, when said attorney came to present some papers in another matter then pending.

Judge Joseph Samuel Perry, entirely without cause, said: "Mr. Marshall, take this gentleman out if he doesn't go out". See, *Sarelas* v. *Porikos, et al.,* U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, No. 14011, Appendix page 118.

(b) On July 2, 1964, Judge Perry further discriminated against citizen Sherman H. Skolnick when he came to present, pro se, his Affidavit of Bias and Prejudice supported by Exhibit and Certificate of Sherman H. Skolnick, in the case of *Skolnick* v. *Hallett et al.,* U.S. District Court, N.D. Ill E.D. No. 64 C 1084. On said date, Judge Perry stated in the presence of Sherman H. Skolnick, a paraplegic invalid in a wheelchair, and said statement being entirely without cause: "Mr. Marshall, see that this man leaves." See, *Skolnick* v. *Hallett et al.,* U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, No. 14779, Appendix page 43. Also, certified Supreme Court record in *Sherman H. Skolnick, petitioner,* v. *John S. Hastings et al.,* No. 941 Misc., Oct. Term 1964.

2. By said repeated discrimination against Sherman H. Skolnick, he has been denied the equal right of access to the Federal Courts, and denied the equal right to sue and be a party-litigant and witness in the Federal Court, and denied the right to seek damages in the Federal Court, on an equal basis with other citizens, for damages to his person, property, and effects.

3. Thereafter, Judge Joseph Samuel Perry, in combination with District Court Clerk Elbert A. Wagner, Jr., removed Sherman H. Skolnick's Complaint at Law from the file and records in said Case No. 64 C 1084, and returned it to him with the first page thereof altered, defaced, and mutilated, all in violation of the provisions of the Federal Criminal Code, 18 U.S.C.A. Sections 1506 and 2071, and in violation of 28 U.S.C.A Sections 951 and 952, and in violation of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 79.

4. Further, acting in secret, without notice to Sherman H. Skolnick, plaintiff, and without the defendants in said Case No. 64 C 1084 having made their appearances, and before the time expired for said defendants to answer or plead, Judge Perry entered a judgment against Sherman H. Skolnick.

5. Thereafter, Judge Joseph Samuel Perry acting in combination with District Court Clerk Wagner, falsified the record on appeal in said Case No. 64 C 1084. Sherman H. Skolnick offers evidence to show said falsification of the record on appeal, which was a further discrimination against him, depriving him of the equal right of statutory right of appeal.

6. Sherman H. Skolnick states on information and belief that there are other instances of the misconduct of said District Judge Joseph Samuel Perry, and Sherman H. Skolnick offers to have witnesses subpoenaed to come to testify in that regard.

7. Nothing said herein constitutes a waiver of the right of Sherman H. Skolnick to move for the disqualification of Honorable John S. Hastings in any other proceedings in this Court or any other tribunal.

8. The discrimination of the Honorable John S. Hastings against citizen Sherman H. Skolnick is set forth in detail in the following matters, copies of which have heretofore been served upon the said Honorable John S. Hastings:

(a) *Sherman H. Skolnick, petitioner,* v. *John S. Hastings et al.,* respondents, in the Supreme Court of the United States, Oct. Term 1964, No. 941 Misc., with references to the certified Supreme Court record.

(b) *Sherman H. Skolnick, petitioner,* v. *Elmer J. Schnackenberg, F. Ryan Duffy, Latham Castle, Win G. Knoch, Roger J. Kiley, John S. Hastings, and Luther M. Swygert,*

respondents, in the Supreme Court of the United States, Oct. Term, 1965, No. 773 Misc., with references to the certified Supreme Court record.

9. By such discrimination, the Honorable John S. Hastings has CEASED TO REPRESENT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN RESPECT TO CITIZEN SHERMAN H. SKOLNICK, and should disqualify himself.

WHEREAS, Sherman H. Skolnick moves as follows:

(A) That Chief Judge of the Seventh Circuit, Honorable John S. Hastings, or that Honorable Seventh Circuit Justice Tom C. Clark, upon disqualification of said Chief Judge, immediately convene, pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. Sec. 332, in Chicago, Illinois, or such other place, a council of the circuit judges for the Seventh Circuit, in active service, to hear Sherman H. Skolnick, party-complainant, complaining of the misconduct of United States District Court Judge Joseph Samuel Perry;

(B) That after said Judicial Council of the Seventh Circuit has heard Sherman H. Skolnick, and heard evidence offered by him, that said District Court Judge Joseph Samuel Perry be ordered to take no action whatsoever in any court case, and particularly so in cases arising under 42 U.S.C.A. Sec. 1981 et seq., know as the Civil Rights Acts of 1871;

(C) That other and further supervisory measures be taken by the Judicial Council of the Seventh Circuit in respect to the misconduct of said Judge Perry and his present inability and unwillingness to discharge the duties of his office.

(D) That Honorable John S. Hastings disqualify himself in this matter because of his discrimination against citizen Sherman H. Skolnick, as hereinabove set forth.

Respectfully submitted.

SHERMAN H. SKOLNICK,
Party-Complainant, Pro Se.

A YOUNG AMERICAN'S DEATH IN RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MINISH). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, for nearly a quarter of a century, the United States has been engaged in what historians have come to call the cold war; the war of nerves between the democratic, free peoples of the West and the Communist slave societies of Eastern Europe and Asia.

Over the years we have witnessed the ordeal of many martyrs who have sacrificed their lives on the silent, shadowy battlefields of that war. We can only guess at the countless others whose names will never be known to history, whose deeds are forever shrouded in secrecy and anonymity.

The most recent name, and in a sense among the most significant, to be added to the roster of cold war victims, is Mr. Newcomb Mott, of Sheffield, Mass.

Newcomb's ordeal is the more tragic and the more senseless since it appears he was an innocent victim of the tensions, the blind hatreds, and the complex political intrigues that have become the weapons and strategems of the cold war. Newcomb was a naive, unsuspecting bystander, sucked into the whirlpool by his own intellectual curiosity, betrayed by his own self-confidence, struck down by his own naive belief in international justice and understanding.

We do not yet know the full circumstances behind the shocking and tragic conclusion of Newcomb Mott's ordeal. Perhaps we never will, despite the efforts of the Massachusetts delegation, the State Department, and every other interested party, to determine the facts.

Newcomb Mott's home in Sheffield lies in my district, a scant few miles from my own home in Pittsfield, Mass. My concern, my personal anxiety, and my efforts to first secure the release of young Mott before, during, and after his trial in Russia and most recently to determine the facts of his death, stem both from my responsibility as his Congressman and from my natural interest as his neighbor.

As an American, of course, I share the natural shock and indignation we all have felt in this matter.

My own activity on behalf of Newcomb Mott commenced on the day I was informed by his family of his arrest in Russia. Because I felt the swiftest and most urgent action possible should be brought, I immediately telephoned the State Department in an effort to first, determine what was being done for Mr. Mott and, second, to make certain every possible avenue would be explored.

I had a number of such calls and telephone conversations with officials at the State Department subsequent to Mr. Mott's arrest and throughout his imprisonment and trial. I felt that I could perhaps best encourage new ideas and possibilities in young Mott's interest by maintaining an open and personal dialog with U.S. officials most concerned with the case.

At the suggestion of officials with whom I had been dealing, I addressed a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk reaffirming my interest and concern in the matter. I was informed in a reply dated December 9, 1965, and signed by Assistant Secretary Douglas MacArthur II, that my letter would be forwarded to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow on grounds that it might prove of some help in the combined effort to secure Mr. Mott's release.

Under unanimous consent I insert the text of my letter to the State Department and the subsequent reply appears at this point in my remarks:

NOVEMBER 30, 1965.

Re Newcomb Mott, Sheffield, Mass.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter will serve to reaffirm my sincere interest and concern for the above-captioned subject, who is a constituent of mine.

In September, Mr. Howard Mott, father of Newcomb, called me regarding the arrest of his son by the Soviets for crossing the border without a visa. Since that time, I have been in close contact with your Department, and was hopeful that Mr. Mott would be released by the Soviets. However, when I learned of the sentence recently handed down on this case, I was truly shocked and dismayed. Certainly, it is my feeling that the severity of this sentence is not commensurate with the so-called crime that was committed.

This is a most unfortunate situation, and it is unfortunate that Mr. Mott is the victim of international circumstances. However, if there is anything that you might do to assist this young man in his present plight, it would be most appreciated.

With my best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

SILVIO O. CONTE,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 9, 1965.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONTE: The Secretary has asked me to thank you for your letter of November 30, 1965, expressing your continuing interest and concern in the case of Newcomb Mott, who was sentenced by a Soviet court for alleged intentional violation of the Soviet border. The Department of State fully shares your concern of the extreme and harsh treatment which the Soviet authorities have meted out to this young man, and is continuing to take every appropriate step to obtain his release.

Newcomb Mott's Soviet lawyer filed a juridical appeal to Mr. Mott's sentence on December 1, 1965. Our Embassy is doing what it can to insure that the strongest possible case is made for him under the provisions of Soviet law. The appeal must be decided on within a month. If it is rejected, clemency appeals will be made to the executive body of the republic in which Mr. Mott's case was tried and finally to the highest executive organ of the Soviet Union. The Department hopes that the Soviet authorities will recognize that it is in their interest to apply the precedents of the past and release Mr. Mott.

I have taken the liberty of forwarding a copy of your letter to our Embassy in Moscow for use at its discretion in contacts with Soviet officials. The Department of State feels that it is important and possibly helpful to inform the Soviet Government of the reactions of prominent American political leaders to the Soviet handling of the Mott case. Your message would be useful toward this end.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations
(For the Secretary of State).

Since that exchange, and throughout the months since Newcomb Mott's arrest up to the present time, I have been in constant touch with the State Department.

I have maintained my liaison with officials there and have continued to urge the fullest possible exploitation of every hope, every lead no matter how slim that might provide the truth behind the incidents surrounding Mr. Mott's death.

I have eschewed personal publicity and have sought to avoid overdramatizing the incident in public out of a sincere desire to ease the burden of abysmal grief for Newcomb Mott's surviving family.

But, in view of the complete frustration of my efforts and the efforts of my distinguished colleagues and of the dedicated officials of the State Department, it appears that we will be no more successful in this endeavor than we were in trying to secure a fair and just trial for Mr. Mott last fall.

We must of course, continue to press for the facts in the case. We must continue to demand a full and accurate ex-

planation from the Russians. The world must not be allowed to forget the callous, brutal, and insensitive motivations of the Russian Government in their treatment of this young man.

If we are to be denied the truth in the matter, then the world must be reminded of that, as well.

But indignation and recrimination are not likely to generate much in way of permanent value from this incident. As the press has stated and all of us surely realize, the incident has only increased tensions between our opposing camps, between East and West. It has widened the gulf of ignorance, superstition, hatred, and misunderstanding between us.

How many more Newcomb Motts will tumble into that gulf as a result?

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we must explore the Newcomb Mott case not only from the standpoint of the immediate facts, but also in an effort to find a positive angle, a spark of hope for the future. We must seek to avoid a repetition ever again of this sort of thing. We must seek the avenues to understanding; we must open doors and pave new roads that might give us the means to avoid another Mott tragedy.

One of these angles, it seems to me, is a new consular treaty with the Russians such as has been before the other body on several occasions in recent years—and has been rejected by interests who apparently are more afraid of what the Russians will gain than they are hopeful of what the United States will gain.

I would renew my appeal—an appeal I made at the time of Newcomb Mott's trial last fall and again at the time of his death on January 21—for open minded consideration of a new consular treaty between the United States and Moscow. I made the point in November that such a treaty, had it been in effect at the time of Mott's arrest, might well have paved the way for his release, even without a trial.

It is no stretch of the imagination or of the truth to speculate that Newcomb Mott might be alive and free today if we had the sort of treaty in force that the Senate rejected last year.

I submit that if we would profit from Newcomb Mott's death, if we would make sure that he did not die in vain, we will devote our energies and thoughts to some meaningful device that would prevent a recurrence of this incident.

Instead of raising our voices merely in shocked indignation, instead of demanding cooperation from the Soviet Government in what experience and commonsense clearly tell us will be a vain and unanswered appeal, let us rather seek the less sensational but infinitely more profitable means to prevent the needless sacrifice and pointless martyrdom of any more innocent pawns in the cold war.

We must support an enlightened and open approach to the question of East-West relations if we would sincerely prevent a recurrence of the Mott incident. Martyrs are made only in time of ignorance, hatred, and misunderstanding. If we would avoid creating any more martyrs, it seems to me we must include an attack on these causes along with whatever else we say and do.

Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Star of February 6 contained an excellent article dealing with the events and personalities involved in the Mott case. The article, by the Star's specialist on East-West relations, Mr. Bernard Gwertzman, documents clearly the nature of the personalities involved and the frustrating train of events throughout the trial and up to the present hour.

Under unanimous consent I insert the article in full at this point in the RECORD:

A YOUNG AMERICAN'S DEATH IN RUSSIA

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

On the morning of September 4, 1965, the weather was clear and cool in Boris Gleb, a tiny Russian village on the Norwegian border, 220 miles north of the Arctic Circle.

It was about 10:30 o'clock and Miss Victoria Kochimalkin, a multilingual guide-interpreter, was chatting with two of Boris Gleb's border police. There was nothing to do until 11 when the gates were to open for Norwegians arriving to sightsee and buy inexpensive vodka.

They were standing in front of the village's hotel when they saw a tall, foreign-looking young man come out of the woods about 40 yards away. They were surprised since they knew foreigners were not permitted to stay in the village overnight, and the gates had not opened for the day.

"When he saw us, he walked right to where we were standing," Miss Kochimalkin was to testify later at Newcomb Mott's trial. "He was smiling. I asked him, when he reached us, if he was Scandinavian."

"He said, no, he was an American who had come over the hills to buy souvenirs for his father and friends if the price was right."

Newcomb Mott, in later recalling his last minutes of freedom, said he showed his U.S. passport to Miss Kochimalkin and she translated it for the border guards.

"The girl told me I had trespassed on Soviet territory," Mott testified. "It was the first time I was aware I had done anything illegal."

Newcomb Mott, 27, 6 feet 5 inches, 250 pounds, college textbook salesman, graduate of Antioch College, was arrested after that encounter in Boris Gleb, imprisoned, tried, and sentenced to 18 months in a Soviet labor camp. He died on January 20 by his own hand while on a train to a prison camp, according to the Soviet Government.

His detention became a source of intense friction between the State Department and the Soviet Foreign Ministry, and his death has worsened the already strained state of Soviet-American relations.

There are still many unanswered questions. Mott's parents and others feel there was foul play involved in his death. The Soviet Government has not yet made a full report.

It is possible, however, to reconstruct the circumstances of Mott's arrest, his trial, and his last days from letters and documents in official files.

The story of Newcomb Mott's life and death in Russia is a sad one because no man was less prepared to become the subject of a cause celebre. The world of intrigue and espionage was foreign to him, and his main desire throughout his confinement was to return to the United States and resume selling college textbooks.

Mott was from Sheffield, Mass., a town in the Berkshires. His father, Howard Mott, is a dealer in rare books and art. His mother is a registered nurse.

Newcomb graduated with an undistinguished record from Antioch College in 1961. After teaching at a boy's school for 2 years, he began work as a textbook salesman for D. Van Nostrand Co. of Princeton, N.J.

Those who met him were struck with his size. He was in the words of a friend, like a "St. Bernard pup." He was very serious and had a somewhat inflated image of himself, friends said.

William Arbogast, of the Associated Press in Washington, recalls that Mott worked during his Antioch work period from January to March 1960, as a copyboy for Associated Press reporters covering the House of Representatives.

"He was not a longhair, but was of better than average intelligence," Arbogast recalled. "When he left, I gave him a good rating. I would have liked to have kept him."

MADE $6,000 A YEAR AS BOOK SALESMAN

Theodore A. Saros, vice president in charge of the college department at D. Van Nostrand, said Mott made about $6,000 a year plus expenses and a car.

"He tended to be quite literal and painfully honest. If you told him to do something, he took you quite literally and reported back in a literal way," Saros said.

Mott had a long vacation, from mid-June until Labor Day, Saros said. Even though he traveled the college circuit in western New York and Pennsylvania all year, he apparently still had the travel bug.

Before leaving on a European vacation last summer, Mott had a long talk with Saros and told him he had decided to make the book business his career.

"He called in before he went to Europe and we reminded him to be back for our sales conference about Labor Day," Saros said.

Mott left on July 19 for Copenhagen on a SAS flight. From there he went to Sweden, stopping for some days in Malmo and Kalmar. He then went to Visby on the island of Gotland, and took a boat to Helsinki, the capital of Finland.

Mott said later in a letter from prison to the American Embassy that he stayed in Helsinki until his tourist hotel closed on August 31. He had a few extra days before going to Stockholm and London where he was to meet his parents and return to the United States.

At his trial, Mott said he inquired in Helsinki about joining a tourist trip to Leningrad, the Soviet city across the Gulf of Finland. But there was none open at that time, so he took the advice of a desk clerk and flew to Ivalo in Finnish Lapland, across the Arctic Circle.

This, he wrote from prison, was "my first mistake."

He arrived in Ivalo on September 2, and immediately made plans to visit northern Norway to see the fjords.

A FATEFUL CHANGE OF PLAN

Originally, he planned to go by bus to Lakselv, a Norwegian city 2 days away. But because time was running out, he took a plane on the afternoon of September 2 to Kirkenes, a few miles from the Soviet border.

There were three passengers—Mott and two Finns.

Mott wrote: "I mentioned (to them) that it was too bad I couldn't see the U.S.S.R. since it was so close. They said that I could. There was a tiny tourist base just across the border open to anyone with a passport. I hadn't known that before."

(They were wrong. The Soviet Government was allowing Norwegians and Icelandic tourists to visit Boris Gleb without visas, but no one else.)

Mott was told by a Finnair representative in Kirkenes that he couldn't visit Boris Gleb and two desk clerks in his hotel in Kirkenes confirmed this.

Still, the idea of visiting Russia seemed to obsess him. Later on September 2, an engineer at an iron works in Kirkenes told him anyone could visit Boris Gleb.

"Sometime on the third, I decided I would go on the fourth to see for myself if I would be permitted to see the tourist base," Mott wrote. "But if I were not, it would matter very little because I would at least, so I thought, be able to see what a Soviet passport control-customs post and Soviet border officials looked like (for the first time in my life)."

At his trial Mott told the court he had a hobby of collecting visa stamps; that he already had 21 in his passport, and was hoping to persuade the Russians to give him one, too. Apparently, he had no idea of the redtape needed to get a Soviet visa.

His return plane to Ivalo was to leave Kirkenes at 5:15 on the afternoon of September 4.

Mott awoke early on the fourth, packed his two bags, left them in his room, and set out for the Soviet border, with only a vague idea how to get there. He knew chances were that he would not be permitted to enter Boris Gleb.

At his trial Mott said he took a 7:15 a.m. bus—he was the only passenger—and was dropped off at a crossroads. He followed a road with a sign "Sovietique"—thinking this would lead to the border post.

"I had not asked anyone what the border crossing point, or the way to it, was like. Perhaps I should have been able to see the correct border crossing point a few times," Mott wrote. "However, I did not see it."

The road he was on turned into a path. He passed two Norwegians picking berries. They said Boris Gleb was straight ahead.

THOUGHT FENCE WAS FOR REINDEER

He came to a wire fence that he thought was put up to keep reindeer from crossing into Russia. He went over the fence and kept going.

Further on, he saw a yellow border pole with a hammer and a sickle on it. This was described by Soviet officials later as the "212th border pole."

"I knew I was crossing into the U.S.S.R.," he wrote, "but it stupidly did not occur to me that I was doing something illegal. I was tired from walking and I was lost, I thought."

What was going on in Mott's mind? Knowing he had crossed, why didn't he turn around?

"I was so intent upon finding the place that I was not conscious that by walking past that pole, I would commit an illegal act. If I had been, I would never have done it, nor would I have continued walking right up to where I expected to find people.

"Undoubtedly this is the stupidest thing I've ever done. I'm not unintelligent, but I was then. I did not think * * *.

"I do not commit illegal acts. I was naive, but I had no interest in doing something illegal. As you know, good intentions in a situation like mine are rather hard to prove."

After his encounter with the guide and two border police at Boris Gleb, he was asked to go to the guardhouse. The chief of the border control point at Boris Gleb, Alexander N. Mironichev, was summoned, and he ordered a check of the border area. Dogs were used to trace Mott's scent back to the Norwegian border.

At the trial Mott said Mironichev told him he could have entered without a visa if he had only gone to the control point. But Mironichev denied this on the stand.

Mott also said the guards told him after he was taken into custody he probably would go back that day. But on September 5, a representative of the Soviet Committee on State Security (the famous KGB) interviewed him.

The KGB man and Mott took a walk outside the guard station at Boris Gleb, and the agent asked Mott for the first time if he were working for the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. Mott said, "No." This line of questioning continued for a month, Mott said, stopping on October 5.

SENT TO PRISON IN MURMANSK

On September 6, Mott was interrogated again by the KGB, and the decision was made—no one knows by whom—to send him to Murmansk, 75 miles to the east by train. At the trial it was said that Mott was put under arrest formally on September 6.

At Murmansk, Soviet officials assigned him alone to cell No. 88 in the Murmansk prison, after first taking away his belt.

Mott asked several times that the American Embassy in Moscow be informed of his detention, and each time he was promised this would be done.

The interrogation continued until September 11, when he first was told he was under arrest.

The U.S. Government first heard about Newcomb Mott on September 8 when Norwegian authorities reported him missing. On September 9, the Kirkenes police chief queried Soviet border officials and was informed that Mott was in custody in Murmansk.

On September 11, after repeated U.S. requests for information, the Soviet Foreign Ministry confirmed that Mott was detained for illegal border crossing and was held in Murmansk. The Embassy was also told that a consular official could visit Mott.

The officer chosen for this assignment was Vice Consul William T. Shinn, Jr., one of the Foreign Service's many young Soviet specialists. Shinn, 29, a graduate of Princeton and Harvard, had studied Soviet law at Moscow University in 1959–60 under the cultural exchange program. He spoke Russian fluently and also understood Soviet law.

Shinn saw Mott on September 13, with a KGB officer present. Shinn reported that after more than a week of confinement, the prisoner seemed in good health, but was quite nervous. Mott complained of constant headaches and said he had lost weight, which he said was perhaps a good thing.

Following the interview, Shinn spoke to the KGB man, who refused to reveal his name. (During the trial, it was revealed that the investigation was under the command of KGB Lieutenant Colonel Gripotseyevich and Captain Adrov.)

The investigator said Mott had broken the law and that the Soviet Union had direct evidence from Norwegian officials that he had been warned about the law before he crossed.

"There is no question of the guilt," the investigator said.

PREPARATIONS FOR TRIAL BEGIN

Under Soviet law, a person is not entitled to a defense lawyer until he is formally accused of a crime and a date set for trial. In the interim, his legal rights are supposed to be looked after by the office of the procurator, a carryover from the Napoleonic Code used in czarist Russia.

Shinn met with the assistant procurator of Murmansk who told him that Mott would not be released on bail even though Soviet law provides that in nondangerous crimes, bail can be provided.

After Shinn returned to Moscow, the embassy protested the failure to give Mott bail, and urged early release in conformity with past precedents.

On September 20, the police chief of Kirkenes told the American Embassy in Oslo that there had been eight known illegal border crossings in his area since 1945 and in each case the Russians had returned the person without a trial.

The Mott case became a matter of international significance when Secretary of State Dean Rusk on September 29 and on October 1 raised the matter with Foreign Minister Andrei N. Gromyko during conversations in New York during the U.N. session.

On October 15, the second interview between Mott and Shinn took place in Murmansk.

This interview was disquieting to Shinn because Mott seemed obviously nervous and said that although his physical health was good he was worrying about the effect of confinment on his mental state. He said the isolation in his 7-by-20-foot cell made him very nervous.

The Russians apparently noticed Mott's nervousness because they substituted a blue light in his cell for the white one which made sleeping difficult. They also gave him extra food and allowed him to receive parcels from the embassy.

Mott had at first refused to eat because he did not want to use the hole in his cell which served as a toilet. The authorities, in a special dispensation, allowed him finally to use the prison doctor's toilet.

The second interview produced a not unexpected political "feeler" from the Russians. The KGB investigator gave to Shinn a letter written by Mott on October 10, which obviously had been read by the prison authorities.

The fact that the KGB man gave Shinn the letter led the Embassy to suspect there was something special in it. There was. For the first time, an allusion to a prisoner exchange was mentioned.

"You know what penalty is prescribed in article 83—1 to 3 years in a labor camp or prison," Mott wrote. "Only occasionally is a transgressor in the U.S.S.R. fined instead of imprisoned.

"The only alternative, as I understand it, is American Embassy negotiation of my release. It is this that I ask you and the U.S. Government for. I hope, somehow, to be released so that I can go home soon. I know that the United States has often in the past successfully negotiated the release of other American tourists and even of Americans accused of serious crimes, like Barghoorn of Yale.

(Prof. Frederick C. Barghoorn of Yale was arrested by the KGB in Moscow in 1963, and charged with espionage. He was released after President Kennedy made a special plea to Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev. No exchange was involved.)

URGES ACTION BY GOVERNMENT

"Since under Russian law I have committed a crime, I imagine (I don't know) that something tangible would have to be given or promised in return for my release. If the only way I could be released soon was by U.S. exchange of a Russian prisoner of some sort, I hope the United States would do it."

Mott noted the difficulties of being in a jail where "I don't speak the language." He said he had been confined for 37 days—"and most of it in a prison with all that implies."

"Many, many more days are possible. I am in danger of losing my liberty, my country, my family, my job, my friends, and other relatives and all the comforts of life for an indefinite but long period. Any time, I begrudge, but I can now do nothing about it.

"I have never been subversive; I vote in elections; I'm not delinquent on my taxes; I am truthful and honest while abroad as a tourist (I've been in 21 countries since 1959), in addition to enjoying myself. I try to behave appropriately because people unconsciously rate you as a representative of your country (no matter which one); and I consider it my pleasure, and my duty as an American citizen, to possess and increase my knowledge of world and national affairs."

Washington felt the request for an exchange of prisoners was an idea planted by the Russians. The only Soviet citizen in U.S. custody is a KGB agent, Igor A. Ivanov, a former chauffeur for Amtorg, the Soviet

trade agency. He is currently appealing a 20-year sentence for espionage.

On October 23, the American Embassy protested Mott's detention again, and told the Russians that under no circumstances would the United States consider an exchange of prisoners. Washington felt it would be a bad precedent to trade a tourist for a spy.

The last time Shinn saw Mott before the trial was on October 30. Mott was told by Shinn that no exchange was contemplated, and that he would have to stand trial—even though the Russians had told Mott there was no question but that he would be found guilty.

Mott again told Shinn he was very nervous and requested tranquilizers from the embassy (some were sent later). The chief investigator was present, and upon hearing Mott mention his nervousness, said that the weather was unstable in Murmansk and this affected people.

The KGB man asked Shinn if he thought Mott was getting good treatment. Shinn said only Mott could answer. Mott said he suffered from no physical threat, but indicated mental harassment. He said he had refused to sign a legal paper on October 8 which was, in fact, a summary of statements made by Mott to the investigators. Mott said the investigators had told him if he refused to sign, the judge would hold it against him. Mott then signed.

Mott also said he was discriminated against because he was an American. He apologized to Shinn later for sounding, in his words, "paranoiac." The KGB man denied any discrimination.

As a passing note, Mott said the only reading matter the prison supplied consisted of three books on Lenin and a copy of the Communist Manifesto. Shinn brought him some American reading matter.

TRIAL STARTS IN MURMANSK COURT

Several more protests from the U.S. Embassy went unheeded, and on November 22, the trial of Newcomb Mott began in the Murmansk Oblast (regional) Court.

The court was presided over by Judge Kiementev, head of the criminal department, assisted, as is Soviet practice, by two lay assessors—or jurors—one a matronly schoolteacher, and the other an engineer. As is usual in Soviet trials, the judge did most of the questioning.

The case for the prosecution was presented by the procurator of the Murmansk Oblast (region), a one-armed, lisping lawyer named Lebedyuk. In American eyes, Lebedyuk was singularly lacking in compassion, and apparently had orders to seek a conviction.

The defense lawyer was Boris A. Zolotukhin, a talented and compassionate attorney from Moscow, who was selected by the U.S. Embassy from recommendations made by the Moscow organization of lawyers. Everyone involved in the case believes that Zolotukhin did a first-rate job.

There were three court stenographers, and several armed guards in the courtroom. Mott's parents were in the second row with Vice Consul Shinn, as were Soviet correspondents from Tass, Novosty, and the local paper, Polyarnaya Pravda. The few witnesses were in the third row, and two American reporters in the fourth. About 15 other persons attended the trial.

The trial lasted 3 days. On the opening day, the indictment was read by the procurator. Its main points were that Mott intended from the beginning of his stay in the Norwegian city of Kirkenes to visit Boris Gleb; that he knew he could not do so legally, and so he decided purposefully to do so illegally.

Mott was asked for his comments, and the tall American, now 40 pounds lighter, rose to speak. He seemed very nervous, but kept to the story he told in prison.

He denied he had crossed the border with the intention of breaking Soviet law—and he said he had not broken any fence, merely climbed over the "reindeer fence" he passed.

Then Mott apologized for causing both Governments "so much work." He described his early life, stressed his love of travel and interest in foreign customs and people. He said he always had a great interest in Russian literature, music, history, and noted that he had read Marx, Lenin, and other authors.

Discussing the fateful day, Mott said he was tired, hot, and lost, and had no illegal intentions. He said over and over that he simply did not "think." After reviewing the encounter that led to his arrest, Mott talked about his 11 weeks in confinement.

He said the guards had been extremely kind to him and had provided him with extra food, allowed him to take warm showers (every 12 days), and had conversed with him on many subjects. He said they had all wished him luck in court and had told him they hoped he would be freed. Even the chief investigator (the lieutenant colonel of the KGB) had wished him well and had asked Mott to send him a copy of a New York Times article on the case after he returned to the United States.

JUDGE'S QUESTIONS SHOW NO MALICE

The judge's questions of Mott showed no malice. He asked him why he had gone to the border, if he had been told he couldn't cross without a visa.

Mott replied that he didn't consider the desk clerks in the hotel to be government officials, and that others had advised him differently; that his original intention was only to go to the border, seek permission to cross and ask for a passport stamp.

The border guards and the Intourist guide-interpreter who first met Mott were questioned and told the story of the September 4 encounter.

Toward the end of the first day's trial, the judge turned to Mott and asked him whether his actions stemmed from frivolity, from his own character or from habits common in his native country.

Mott said he considered his a frivolous act. When the judge asked if he respected the laws of other countries, Mott replied "I respect all law."

A medical report was read that said Mott suffered from hemorrhoids, and complained of headaches and abdominal pains. It did not mention his mental distress, or that his knees were weak from two operations as a youth.

The defense lawyer then read into the record some character references. An Embassy telegram telling about previous border violations at Boris Gleb was read partly, but then the court took it privately. The U.S. Embassy, thanks to the Norwegian Government's cooperation, had found that about eight other people had crossed the border but none had been forced to go to trial. This conflicted with the official Soviet view, stated at the trial by a border guard, that no one ever had crossed the border before illegally.

The next day, the procurator made his summation.

Reading from a typed text, he stressed the sanctity of the Soviet frontier. He argued that violation of the border was a state crime of grave social danger regardless of the intentions of the violator. He said Mott's explanations were "dishonest." He said Mott "consciously" went to the border to cross it illegally. The procurator asked that Mott be sentenced to 2½ years loss of liberty.

DEFENSE WAS WELL STATED

Mott later revealed to his parents that Zolotukhin whispered to the interpreter, "This is serious." As he left the courtroom to prepare his speech, Zolotukhin, a reserved, self-controlled man, looked agitated and pale.

Zolotukhin's presentation was well organized and logical. He said his remarks were designed to achieve one purpose—to convince the judge and the people's assessors (jurors) that Mott should be freed from prison and allowed to return to his home and his job. He suggested a suspended sentence.

He said there were five mitigating circumstances:

1. Mott's acts were not premeditated, and Mott did not know their legal and socially dangerous consequences.

2. Mott had no base or mercenary intentions since his acknowledged purpose was tourism.

3. Violation of the border around Boris Gleb is less socially dangerous than the violation of other Soviet borders since it is a tourist base open to some foreigners without visas.

4. Mott was tired as a result of two knee operations which had exempted him from military service.

5. He had sincerely repented his actions.

Zolotukhin urged the court to consider the personality of the defendant, his good behavior in prison, his cooperation during the investigation, and the fact that he might lose his job. He asked that Mott be released and allowed to go home with his parents.

On November 24, the court convened at 9 a.m. to hear Mott's "last word," the practice in Soviet law by which the defendant is given one final chance to influence the court.

Mott again apologized for crossing the border, and said he was sorry for the trouble he had caused. He said he felt he had already been sufficiently punished by 11 weeks in prison and asked the court to free him into the custody of his parents.

JUDGE PRONOUNCES 1½-YEAR SENTENCE

The judge and the assessors then left the room. When they returned 2½ hours later, the judge said the guilt of Mott was proved, but that Mott's good behavior in jail had been noted. He sentenced Mott to 1½ years in a labor colony of "regular regime"—the least severe form of imprisonment. At the reading of the sentence Mott's eyes were closed and Zolotukhin turned to him, holding him by both hands.

Following the conviction, Mott was allowed for the first time to meet his parents. During a 4-hour discussion, he told his mother that he had contemplated suicide but had rejected the idea.

A pro forma appeal was made to the Supreme Court of the Russian Federated Republic (the largest Republic in the U.S.S.R.). It was backed up by appeals from U.S. Ambassador Foy D. Kohler on December 29 to Soviet President Nikolai V. Podgorny, and by letters from virtually every prominent Massachusetts official.

A leading role in this attempt was played by Senator EDWARD KENNEDY who saw Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin in Washington and urged Mott's release.

The appeal was denied on January 8, and the Embassy immediately appealed to the Soviet Government for clemency.

Mott's last letter to the U.S. Embassy was received on January 13. It was written on January 2, and said he was told that pending final disposition of his case he would remain in Murmansk.

On January 21, the Embassy made a routine check at the Soviet Foreign Ministry to see if there was any news of Mott's clemency appeal. At 3 p.m. that day, the Embassy was told there are "no new developments."

But at 6 p.m., the Foreign Ministry informed the Embassy that Mott committed suicide while being transported from Murmansk to an unspecified place where he would serve out his sentence.

THE MOLYBDENUM SHORTAGE

Mr. KREBS. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years this country has been suffering from a shortage of molybdenum, an essential raw material for the production of tool and other specialty steels.

The action in Vietnam has aggravated this shortage and many steel mills are hobbling along under serious handicaps.

The mills in my district find that they cannot plan expansion, or for that matter go all out on present orders, which, of course, curtails their activities in building up future production orders.

The President has cooperated in my efforts to supply a sufficiency of molybdenum for distressed plants. However, the overall policy of our trade and balance of payments in our State and Commerce Departments makes it difficult even for the President to assure a supply to U.S. industry.

The attached correspondence from Mr. Andrews, of the Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp. is typical of the situation found by all of our specialty steel producers.

I have introduced three separate bills, each aimed at relieving the situation and in my humble opinion, one or more of these bills must pass or we will face a more serious problem in this area.

I attach the letter from Mr. Andrews in the hope that action will be taken on the bills I have introduced:

ALLEGHENY LUDLUM STEEL CORP.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., January 24, 1966.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Thomas Shannon has asked me to write you concerning our observations on the molybdenum shortage and the present plans under consideration for the relief of this shortage.

One of our most serious concerns is the fact that molybdenum is being offered quite widely on what we would call a black market. Molybdenum oxide, which should normally sell for $1.75, is being offered for $3.75. Some of this material is foreign produced, but much of it is guaranteed to be U.S. domestic produced. Those who offer this material frankly tell us they are buying the material here in this country, and they are either offering it direct at black-market prices or exporting it where it can command a higher price in the world marketplace.

One of the suggestions for relief of the current short situation is an additional disposal from the Government stockpile. Our first thought here is that this country produced about 76 million pounds of molybdenum in 1965. It is my understanding that there is a proposal to release 5 million pounds from the stockpile. Therefore, this is a fairly small addition percentagewise to the available supply. It should be remembered that in 1965, we not only produced 76 million pounds; but we added to that a very late 1964 stockpile release of 3 million pounds and a February 1965 stockpile release of an additional 3 million pounds, both lots of which were consumed during the calendar year 1965. Therefore, the total available from the United States in 1965 was not 76 million pounds but 82 million pounds. Five million pounds put into this large capacity is relatively insignificant.

However, be that as it may, we do not want to take a position against the stockpile release, as we must admit that every pound helps. We would like to suggest, therefore, that careful consideration be given to the means of disposal from the stockpile. It is our feeling that much of the stockpile material from the last go around drifted out of this country in spite of the intentions of the Government to the contrary. The terms of the release specified that the material had to be consumed in the United States. Since it was molybdenum disulfide, the buyers had it roasted (converted to the ferro or oxide state) in the United States and thereby fulfilled the requirement of being consumed in the United States. They were then free to export it or do as they pleased with it. We therefore, feel that some disposal means similar to the cadmium disposal or at least the last stockpile disposal of molybdenum be insisted upon.

While on the subject of the stockpile release, we would also like to point out that the urgent need for material to relieve the shortage is now. In your bill, H.R. 10361, you provide for the release of molybdenum disulfide from the stockpile. Let us assume that it would take 60 days to get the bill passed through both Houses and signed. It would then take an additional 60 days for the GSA to make its offering, receive its bids, and deliver the goods. Another 60 days would be required for the buyer to arrange for roasting and delivery to his plant. This means that the consumers would have molybdenum in a form which they could use in about 5 to 6 months from now, provided the Government would be willing to withdraw its roasting contracts from the major roasters to make room for the roasting of this stockpile material. In the 68 million pounds presently in the stockpile, 7,500,000 pounds are already in the ferro state; 19,500,000 pounds in the oxide state; and 39 million pounds in the disulfide state. We would like to suggest that you change the wording in H.R. 10361 to provide for the release of ferro or oxide material which could be sold directly to the consumer and thus avoid the speculators getting around the technicality of consuming it when they roast it. This would also eliminate a very serious step in the timing and speed up the flow to the consumer.

We have said we feel that the stockpile release, while helpful and needed, will be too little, too late. Therefore, it is our feeling that the Commerce Department should impose some sort of curtailment of exports at least for the first 6 months of 1966. We note that Secretary Trowbridge, in a letter to Mr. THOMAS E. MORGAN, indicated that the exports have, in fact, dropped from 40 percent of production in 1964 to 37½ percent in 1965 and that he anticipated they would go to 33½ percent in 1966. We have indicated in a previous letter to Mr. James Rill, of Collier, Shannon & Rill, that we take issue with these figures, and we still do. However, we admit that in the case of Bureau of Mines figures it is difficult in this instance to make sure that everyone is talking of apples and apples. Therefore, let us for the moment accept the Department of Commerce figures as Secretary Trowbridge presents them and let us admit that the export rate in 1965 was 37½ percent of our production. There is no question but that during 1965, with an export rate of 37½ percent, there was a severe and injurious shortage of molybdenum in the United States. It is fairly well estimated, and certainly is true in our own company, that we could have used a minimum of 25 percent per month more last year over and above that which we were able to obtain. We have heard other companies advise that their shortages ran as high as 50 percent per month. Be that as it may, let us assume that we would be satisfied with the same amount which we had in 1965 when an admitted serious shortage existed. Most major consumers have been advised by the major producer that, for the foreseeable future in 1966, we will receive 15 percent less per month than we received in 1965, so we start out the year with 15 percent less material than we had last year. Secretary Trowbridge's letter indicates that exports will be curtailed from the 37½ to 33½ percent. This would mean that we would have 4 percent more material from the export areas than last year. We are still 11 percent short of 1965 figures.

The only new material available to the domestic consumers during 1966 would be the Molybdenum Corp.'s New Mexico facility. This mine is rated at a capacity of 10 million pounds. The 10 million is based on their beginning to produce at rated capacity on January 1 and maintaining that rate until December 31. This, of course, has not and will not happen. If the Molybdenum Corp. can get into business and put 7 million pounds into the bloodstream during 1966, and if we are able to keep all of it in the United States in the hands of domestic consumers, this will be less than 10 percent of the material available during 1965. So, when we say we are going to get 9 percent help from Molybdenum Corp. and 4 percent help from exports, we are still 2 percent short of the amount we had in 1965 when a serious shortage existed. If we release 5 million pounds from the stockpile and it gets into the bloodstream by summer, we would be adding another 3 percent to the available material. We would then be 1 percent better off than last year, provided it does not leak out of the country. It should also be noted that it is generally agreed, and history has shown that the demand in this country is increasing at the rate of 7½ percent per year. Therefore, if all of the above-mentioned help comes into existence and does not leave the country, including the stockpile release, we will end up with a 7½ percent more serious shortage than we had in 1965.

The latest figures we have on export are the Bureau of Mine statistics. One of the things that bothers us is the tremendous rate of increase of exports noted at the end of the year, particularly when it is recognized that the major producer is bringing in a new plant on stream in Rotterdam. The October Bureau of Mines figures indicate that the exports to European countries in October over September were increased as follows:

	Percent
West Germany	21
Netherlands	16
Japan	14
Belgium	11
United Kingdom	9
Sweden	8
Australia	7
France	6

These countries received 92 percent of the total exports. What is even more alarming is that the October rate to the Netherlands and to Belgium was over 1,000 percent higher than the rate last year. During this same period of time in 1965, when all of these countries were receiving increased exports over the previous month, we were reduced by an additional 15 percent available to us. If we take the first 9 months of 1965, we were exporting at the rate of 24.6 million pounds per year. In October we exported at the rate of 31½ million pounds per year.

It should also be noted that the October figures of the Bureau of Mines indicate that our stocks, or inventories, at the end of October were 3½ million pounds. It is easy to see that our national inventory is approximately 2 weeks' supply. Therefore,

some strong effort must be made to fill the pipelines. As anyone knows, you just cannot keep operations flowing properly with this small a quantity in the pipeline. This is why we suggest both release from the stockpile and curtailment of export to not only make more material promptly available to the consumers, but to also give the pipeline an opportunity to adjust to the demand.

Another argument which has been advanced in favor of the export of molybdenum is that it aids the balance of payments. This argument does not stand up when you realize that if we had molybdenum, we would be exporting 100 pounds of 316 stainless steel for $35 to $50 rather than 3 pounds of molybdenum for $6.

It should also be noted that the world supply of molybdenum is also going up. Canada has added about 5 million pounds last year and will add an additional 15 million pounds within the next 2 years. This material is not available to the U.S. consumers because of a prohibitive import duty on molybdenum in this country. Therefore, we support your efforts to eliminate or at least reduce this duty permanently or set it aside temporarily as we did the nickel duty.

We apologize for being so lengthy in this letter, but it is difficult to be brief and at the same time clear. Thank you for your attention and your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

E. F. ANDREWS,
Vice President, Purchases.

VIETNAM WAR

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the intensification of the war in Vietnam has brought on a renewed wave of discussion and debate of our Vietnam policy, both in Congress and in homes and public forums across the country. For discussions to be meaningful and debate fruitful, the participants must be informed and their arguments reasoned.

The Milwaukee Journal devotes the front page of its editorial section of Sunday, February 6, 1966, to three articles which review the Vietnam problem in depth:

(By Douglas Mendel, Jr.)

Secretary of State Dean Rusk once used the old French term for the Vietnam conflict: "A dirty war." Today, 18 months after our first retaliatory raid against North Vietnam and almost a year after our major troop commitment and combat initiative, Vietnam has become a very bloody war also, that promises to get much worse before it ends. But how much worse? How should it end? Congress and the Nation have reached a crisis of decision as 1966 opens the door to either a major land war in Asia or some kind of compromise withdrawal.

Step by step since 1954, without any treaty commitment to South Vietnam and without the kind of overt aggression that unified us behind President Truman's actions in June 1950, Washington gradually went from economic aid to military advisers to major combat participation in the Vietnamese civil war. From a few hundred advisers and modest aid funds, we escalated to nearly 200,000 troops, mostly combat, and an annual cost of $7 to $8 billion.

Experts in government and the academic community are equally puzzled and divided over past facts and future policy. The ordinary citizen who wants to avoid both extreme brinkmanship and equally irrational pacifism must be even more perplexed to find an answer to the Vietnam mess.

The four major options open to the United States in the Vietnam situation range from extreme escalation (no holds barred in attacking North Vietnam or Communist China, as advised by Gen. Curtis LeMay, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek and a few others) to the opposite extreme of accepting Hanoi's demands for our unconditional withdrawal from South Vietnam.

Between these extremes, neither of which has much support at a responsible level, lie two more moderate options.

One, the relatively tough policy, is to return to the 1965 bombing of military targets in the north and to continue B-52 attacks on suspected Vietcong targets in the south. The administration implemented this policy last week by ending the 37-day lull in bombing the north, but simultaneously called for United Nations Security Council action on Vietnam. The limited bombing of the north can be reconciled with the professed policy of not wanting to overthow the Hanoi regime or spread the war to China, but it failed in 1965 to persuade Hanoi to "stop its indirect aggression," and there is little reason to think its resumption will succeed now.

The less tough option, favored by Gen. James Gavin and Senator CLARK, Democrat of Pennsylvania, would be to retreat to coastal enclaves in the south, now being built more securely, and stress economic and social attack on the problem of villager disaffection toward Saigon.

Marine Gen. Wallace Greene, back from Saigon, was quoted as saying: "You could kill every Vietcong and North Vietnamese in South Vietnam and still lose the war." Most foreign experts on Vietnam domestic affairs would second that statement, but neither "moderate option" will satisfy people who want a quick victory or a quick peace.

What are the obstacles to clear decisions on Vietnam? First is the obvious division of opinion among sincere, patriotic, and well-informed men in Congress and the academic world. If the critics were only kooks, or fringe radicals, we could ignore them; but they include such genuine experts as Professor Kahin, of Cornell, and Senators MANSFIELD and FULBRIGHT, among many others. Even the Rand Corp. in California, which does much classified research for Washington, is deeply divided on Vietnam.

A second obstacle is the emotionalism expressed in charges of disloyalty against critics of administration policy, and reinforced by the casualty lists from Vietnam. Warhawks and peace doves are the extremes playing upon popular fears respectively of communism and of nuclear holocaust.

Another obstacle, which appears to me less valid than the others, is the charge that the administration has concealed the facts and distorted the truth about Vietnam by managed news and secrecy. We have many checks, under our free press tradition, against such attempts, but every administration does its best to distort, suppress, and cover up embarrassing facts.

The biggest problem we have in understanding the Vietnam issue is the multitude of ambiguities and conflicting evidence about our aims and the effectiveness of our methods. What is our American national interest in keeping South Vietnam out of North Vietnamese control? Is it more or less vital than keeping Tibet, Greece, South Korea, Formosa, or other areas from the creeping grasp of Sino-Soviet communism?

IS IT REALLY A NATION?

How valid is our commitment to Saigon? Washington claims it is based on a protocol to the almost-defunct SEATO Treaty of 1954 and direct pledges of the last three Presidents to Saigon. Yet Saigon has never had a popularly elected regime, so perhaps the 15 million South Vietnamese don't consider themselves a separate nation with loyalty to a central Saigon government. Surely, since the fall of Dictator Ngo Dinh Diem in 1963, no "government of the month" in Saigon has won popular support, as Congressman ZABLOCKI reported after his recent Asian tour. The 1954 Geneva accords did not create a sovereign state of South Vietnam and no amount of American repetition can make that area a nation if its peasants lack a sense of nationality.

Is the conflict only a "naked aggression" by the north, as Washington alleges, or does it have indigenous roots in the south? Here is another murky subject on which we can find conflicting opinion: There has never been a reliable survey of Vietnamese public opinion. The Communist regime in Hanoi lent support to the Vietcong after 1960, but much of the Vietcong 100,000 plus membership seems to be southern and non-Communist. Could an agreement with Hanoi or even the Vietcong leaders stop the guerrilla warfare in the south?

"Total victory" over Asian communism seems to be a goal of many Americans eager for a quick, easy solution. Japan tried that policy in the 1930's with far more men against a weaker China. How many millions of Americans would be needed to conquer, police, and pacify the 700 million Chinese? Bringing stability to the 17 million North Vietnamese and 15 million South Vietnamese would seem easy by comparison.

IMPACT OF WITHDRAWAL

A major argument in support of our Vietnam policy has been the alleged impact of an American withdrawal on Sino-Soviet relations, the world Communist movement, and our allies around the world. It is argued by my friend Prof. Robert Scalapino, of California, and some others that if we seem to be giving in to the Vietcong, the Peiping hard line will be vindicated and Russia will have to give more support to wars of national liberation all over the world. This is one risk in a "soft" option, but the risks of a tougher option may prove much larger, including alienation of even the South Vietnamese population, condemnation by world opinion and escalation to a major confrontation with China and perhaps the Soviet Union.

What net effect have the American bombings of North Vietnam? Can we control the Saigon regime if we negotiate a peace with the Hanoi and Vietcong leaders? How much support has U.S. policy in South Vietnam and in the world? These are only a few of the vital questions.

We do know that many of our allies around the world have either disassociated themselves from our escalation of Vietnam warfare (Pakistan, France, and others) or given little more than lipservice (England, Japan). South Korea, a very undemocratic regime, has sent a division to help us in South Vietnam, but the token troops from Australia and New Zealand caused internal dissension in those nations.

However, American public acceptance of any escalation policy is likely to continue despite minority congressional warnings and expert advice unless and until we reach our equivalent of the French Dien Bien Phu. In that case we shall be compelled to withdraw, defend Thailand and draw a more defensible containment line around Communist China.

(By Michael Malloy)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—American GI's are fighting in Vietnam for a stake so big that its very name seems to embarrass our cynical age. The patriots who signed the Declaration of Independence called this quality "our

sacred honor." Today, we edge around this concept and dredge up words like "credibility" to describe the same thing. But whether you call it old-fashioned honor or new-fangled credibility, the American stake boils down to proving whether the United States will keep its promises.

President Lyndon B. Johnson called it "confidence."

"We will stay because in Asia—and around the world—are countries whose course of independence rests, in large measure, on confidence in American protection," he said in his state of the Union message to Congress.

South Vietnamese Foreign Minister Tran Van Do spelled it out in tougher terms, in an interview.

"If you back down on your commitment here," he said, "then nobody in Asia will ever believe in America again."

"If you backed down after all your tough talk about Vietnam, even the Russians would think the United States was a paper tiger," cautioned an observer who recently visited Saigon from a neutral country.

The American commitment to defend South Vietnam from communism is almost 12 years old. It was voiced by the last three American Presidents, representing both major parties. It has been backed up with billions of dollars and more than 1,700 American lives.

Each step further into Vietnam has made American credibility more and more dependent on victory.

To yield today, after sending nearly 200,000 men to Vietnam, might be even more dangerous than yielding in April, when there were only 30,000.

The American stake in the war has been clouded by and criticized because of the original reason the United States came to help South Vietnam: To defend its freedom and independence.

The reason behind the commitment was always subject to attack, because there was no real proof that a free and independent South Vietnam would not welcome the Vietcong with open arms.

There has never been a reasonable test of the Communist contention that the South Vietnamese support them, nor of the American claim that the people are against the Vietcong.

But the argument over whether America should get involved in South Vietnam has been passed over by events. The United States has already pledged and repledged its honor, fortune and the lives of its young men to repelling the Communists.

The crucial question is how America can make good on her pledge, end the war with a minimum of bloodshed, and retire from South Vietnam with her reputation intact as a nation that keeps its promises.

The options have narrowed as the American stake has grown. The possibilities divide between military victory and a negotiated settlement, with neither of them offering an easy solution.

The allied forces presently outnumber the Communists 4 to 1. This is enough to hold the cities, to launch raids into the Communist hinterland, and to temporarily open roads for the movement of convoys.

But this is not enough to root the Vietcong out of the country's 17,000 villages in the patient, frustrating process called pacification.

"One thing people seem to forget is that it takes 10 to 12 regular forces for every guerrilla, because regular forces have to protect everything while the guerrillas can pick the time and place of attacks," says Maj. Charles Keever, who heads up pacification programs for the U.S. Marines in Vietnam.

The marine effort around Da Nang is usually accepted as the most successful of the present pacification programs. But it is being carried out by more than 40,000 leathernecks jammed into an area the size of an American county.

The pacification program for the coming year calls for concentration on a few key areas. If these areas can be made capable and willing to defend themselves, the program will move on to other vital regions.

ABOUT 25,130 AIR STRIKES

The American command here has asked Washington for an increase in U.S. troop strength to 360,000 by the end of the year, and to at least 425,000 in 1967.

There are voices being raised in support of massive bombing of North Vietnam, and even China, as a quicker way to end the war.

There is no doubt that North Vietnam is the fountainhead of the Vietcong war. It provides the leadership, the inspiration, key personnel and part of the weapons. In the last year it has poured in units of its own army, as well.

American and Vietnamese aircraft hurled 25,130 air strikes into North Vietnam during 1965, with the intention of choking off infiltration of Communist men and arms.

But infiltration jumped from 1,000 men per month when the bombings started in February 1965, to 4,500 per month by the time Washington ordered a pause on Christmas eve.

The final American option is negotiations with the Communists. The very idea is bitterly opposed by the Government of South Vietnam. It is viewed pessimistically by American Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. It is sneered at by the Vietcong, the North Vietnamese and Communist China.

The Communists refuse to negotiate the fate of South Vietnam outside the framework of four points laid down by Ho Chi Minh. When you boil them down, the four points amount to withdrawal of American Armed Forces and recognition of the Vietcong as the legitimate rulers of South Vietnam—in other words, absolute American capitulation.

Either of these steps would have disastrous effects on the South Vietnamese Government. Its leaders are frightened of negotiations for this reason.

NEGOTIATIONS ARE PERILOUS

A withdrawal of American troops would hand the country to the Vietcong. The government forces were already on the verge of defeat when American soldiers came to bail them out last spring. Their prospects would be even bleaker today, because Vietcong strength is about 50 percent greater than before.

Any transfer of the war from the military to the political arena could destroy the delicately balanced Vietnamese Government in Saigon. The regime is held together by nothing but its fear of the Communists and its faith in American support. It does not have a party or program or machine that could compete with the Vietcong in elections or political horse trading.

For these reasons, negotiations are as perilous as continued warfare. To hold talks without endangering its South Vietnamese allies, the United States will have to continue to demonstrate its commitment by fighting as hard as ever.

Thousands of North Vietnamese were loyal to France, and paid for it at the hands of the Communists when France abandoned them.

Almost a million North Vietamese fled from their half of the country, and have nowhere else to run if South Vietnam should fall.

Vast numbers of South Vietnamese soldiers and administrators and humble village chiefs are in the same boat with the refugees. They pinned their faith in American support and may suffer for it with their lives if America doesn't keep its promises.

(By Marriner S. Eccles)

Under no circumstances should we escalate the war in Vietnam. Our position there is indefensible. Contrary to Government propaganda we were not invited by, and have no commitment to any representative or responsible government of South Vietnam. We are there as an aggressor in violation of our treaty obligation under the United Nations Charter. We have not observed either the letter or the spirit of our obligations with respect to our actions in Vietnam. As a result, we have the opposition of not only the entire Communist world but the rest of the world as well, with few minor exceptions.

The facts are, the Geneva Agreement of 1954, after the defeat of the French, affirmed the independence of the colonial government of Vietnam and called for an end to hostilities. The British and the Russians were cochairmen of that conference.

An interim trusteeship was agreed upon whereby the French would preside in the south and the Vietminh in the north for 2 years, ending in a national election in 1956 when the Vietnamese people would choose their own government. The United States Vietnam lobby did not permit that election to be held knowing that Ho Chi Minh, the Communist leader of the north, was so popular he would unquestionably win the election.

John F. Kennedy, then Senator, in a major speech in April 1954, warned against any negotiated solution that would allow participation in the Vietnamese Government by Ho Chi Minh. The Communists, he said, would eventually take over because they were so popular. In his memoirs Eisenhower stated that had an election been held in Vietnam, as provided in the Geneva accord, an estimated 80 percent would have voted for Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader.

Diem was brought to the United States in 1950, after a 17-year, self-imposed exile, under the auspices of Michigan State University, and here he found strong support in the hierarchy of the Catholic Church, his brother being a Catholic bishop. Cardinal Spellman became a strong supporter, also Justice Douglas, Joseph Kennedy and his son, John F. Kennedy, General Lansdale (the CIA man in Saigon), CIA Director Allen Dulles, General Donovan, and other strong anti-Communists. They were largely responsible for bringing about Diem's ascension to the premiership of South Vietnam in July 1964.

From his first day in office he set about crushing opposition and concentrating power in small nepotist groups. Diem's targets included the private armies of the religious sects and the anti-Communist Vietnamese leaders who were also anti-Diem. He wasn't looking for popularity. He knew his support was slim—that he would have trouble with the majority of the population who had been supporting the Vietminh in the long war against the French; therefore, force was the only way he could effectively ready his people for the democratic alternative. Due to the paid propaganda of the United States-Vietnam lobby his dictatorial tactics were not widely reported in the American press until 8 years later when his brother was assassinated by the military within his own government. Since that time South Vietnam has been unable to develop a stable or responsible government, as evidenced by the many changes in leadership.

The South Vietnamese Communists, with the help of the North Vietnamese, defeated the French. They are now fighting for the independence of their country against the non-Communist South Vietnamese. In short, it is a civil war with the Vietcong supported by North Vietnamese and the South Vietnamese held together and supported by the United States. The South Vietnamese Catholics (about 10 percent of the population), the property owners and business in-

terests in the large cities are the strong anti-Communist supporters of South Vietnam.

DESTROYING VIETNAM

We have provided large amounts of military and economic aid and supplied them with military advisers, but until the present administration came into office we did not furnish American troops to help fight their war, until it was apparent they were being defeated. We have gradually taken over the direction of their Government as well as their war until now it has become an American war rather than a Vietnamese war. Why go to Vietnam to drive the Communists out when we can't get them out of Cuba, 90 miles from our shore?

The North Vietnamese supplied troops to the Vietcong only after American troops entered the war in large numbers and we commenced heavy bombing of North Vietnam and the Vietcong. It was then that China and Russia publicly announced they would give all the military and economic aid necessary to the North Vietnamese in order to defeat the U.S. aggressors. As a result, we now have alined against us the powerful countries of China and Russia, including all the Communist world, with practically no support from the rest of the world in spite of Rusk's and McNamara's recent appeals to NATO. Under these conditions we cannot win. You cannot defeat people in a jungle war where the majority is against you and it is impossible to tell your friends from your enemies.

We are rapidly destroying the very country we propose to save—South Vietnam—as well as killing thousands of its men, women, and children by our incessant and heavy bombing of the Vietcong. We are adding to our burdens tens of thousands of refugees that we must feed, clothe, and house. What would the situation be if North Vietnam, with the help of China and Russia, should retaliate by bombing Saigon and the other principal cities in South Vietnam? Even if we won their freedom and turned the country over to them they have no capacity for democracy or self-rule.

With a bigger war shaping up on the ground and fighting 9,000 miles away, logistics are almost an insolvable problem. With troop strength only 158,000 in November our logistic needs shot up from 75,000 tons in February to 700,000 tons in November. The jet aircraft are burning more than a million gallons of fuel a month. Ports are clogged—ships wait 10 days to 2 months to unload cargoes. What will the situation be if we undertake to double or quadruple our fighting forces, planes, helicopters, etc.?

Our concept of negotiating a peace reveals total insensibility to the other parties' problem. The antagonists cannot negotiate their own peace terms. The matter should be turned over to an impartial body, like the United Nations.

If the war is escalated, before many months the United States will probably be required to go on a war footing and our present domestic prosperity will be ended. Inflationary pressures will greatly increase and the position of the dollar in the world market will be further jeopardized unless we bring about a balanced budget through increasing taxes and cutting back domestic programs.

"WE FELL INTO A TRAP"

It may be the North Vietnamese do not control the course of the war—it is now in the hands of the Chinese and the Russians. As cochairman of the Geneva conference the Russians have refused to take any part in bringing about a peaceful settlement. They may be glad to have us tied down in a most unpopular war in Asia, which greatly weakens our position in NATO as well as throughout the world. They must avoid giving support to Peiping's charges that they are conniving with President Johnson to end the war. To do otherwise would greatly weaken their own leadership in the Communist world.

It would seem we have fallen into a trap that neither China nor Russia is willing to let us get out with either facesaving or victory.

We could not have chosen anywhere in the world a more difficult place to challenge the Communists and more to the liking of China—on her border. How could we have been so blind and misinformed? The decisions were made by the President and a handful of advisers in the White House, State and Defense Departments without debate or prior approval of the Congress. This is dictatorship that has no place in our democracy. The public has not been advised as to what was taking place. They have been misinformed and brainwashed to such an extent that opponents are accused of being disloyal and supporting the enemy and patriotism has come to mean unquestioning support of the administration.

Blindly accepting the Government's position in Vietnam is more senseless than blindly accepting its domestic programs because mistakes in Vietnam can be far more disastrous. The real patriots today are the Members of Congress and other public leaders who have the courage to oppose the administration and urge it not to escalate the war but to get out of Vietnam at the earliest possible date. This would be the least costly from every standpoint—even our world prestige would be enhanced.

SAVE LIVES, NOT FACE

If our leaders insist on escalating this war to a finish it is likely to be the most disastrous of the wars we have fought, measured by cost, loss of life and prestige throughout the world, and the most futile. It could lead to world war III—the United States alone fighting the Communist world. This could trigger an atomic war which all the world dreads.

The alternative is to recognize China and bring her into the United Nations before she becomes an atomic power in 3 to 5 years. Even her avowed enemies, India and Russia, have voted for her inclusion in the U.N.

The billions being wasted on the war in Vietnam, if used to eliminate mass poverty and illiteracy in the undeveloped countries, would do far more than aggression to prevent the spread of communism.

We must recognize that it is just as important, if not more so, for the Communists to save face in Asia as it is for the United States. We should be less interested in saving face and more interested in saving lives. Great nations over the years have survived by withdrawing from an untenable position. It can be done with dignity. Certainly we are a sufficiently great nation to relieve the world of the fear of war that is so terrifying. We would win approval of the world and gain in stature.

THE BUDGET AND NEEDY CHILDREN

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget message proposed to increase aid to the needy through legislation to improve the nutrition of needy children and to shift the focus of the school lunch and special milk programs more on needy children, helping to provide them with adequate and well-balanced meals.

Legislation to carry out these new directions will be sent soon to the Congress, but charges already are being made that these proposals would cut back the child-feeding programs.

The facts are that:

The school lunch program will continue to expand and will reach even more than the 18 million children who participated in the program this year. Federal funds, however, will be directed more toward helping more needy children who now cannot afford school lunches, and toward helping districts with higher proportions of children from low-income families.

This latter objective is especially pressing. Few large metropolitan cities today have a fully adequate school lunch program, and the schools which do not provide lunches are usually those which have the highest proportion of children from needy families. Rural districts where tax funds are low and the number of low-income families are proportionately high also lack adequate lunch facilities.

In Minneapolis, 70 percent of the schools with over 55 percent of the student enrollment do not have feeding programs.

Last year the Congress provided $2 million for special assistance to expand school lunch programs in needy schools. The 1967 budget proposes to increase these funds to $6.5 million. We estimate that some 300,000 children in low-income areas can be provided an adequate lunch with these funds.

The budget also proposes a 4-cent Federal subsidy for each meal served in the national school lunch program, or a penny less than in fiscal 1966. In addition to the cash reimbursement, surplus foods worth about 5.5 cents per meal will be provided through Federal donation.

This will reduce Federal participation in the program, but will cause lunch costs to increase very little.

The special milk program which provides additional milk in schools at below cost is being shifted to a pay-as-you-drink basis. Sufficient funds are being requested to provide milk for children where their school does not provide a lunch program, or where they are not able to pay for milk in the special program.

About 2 million children in schools that do not provide school lunches now receive milk at below cost through the special milk program, and they will continue to do so. About 1 million children in schools with lunch programs also receive milk free or at nominal cost, and will continue to do so.

Along with these new directions, the budget also proposes to enlarge the food stamp program by extending it to 150 new areas in fiscal 1967. The expansion will bring an additional 570,000 persons in low-income families into the program in fiscal 1967. This will bring the total to more than 2 million, including the 1.3 million people expected to be in the program by July 1, 1966.

The budget also provides for continuation of the direct food distribution program. Any area requesting this program can obtain the surplus commodities which are available. In peak winter months, the number of persons receiving supplemental food supplies under the program will run as high as 5 million.

In addition to the current programs, the budget proposal also allows for some experimental programs to improve the nutrition of needy children which cannot be tried because of present limitations in the school lunch program.

These new directions will enable the Department to release $50 million for other purposes in fiscal 1967, and they will enable Federal funds to be used more effectively in helping children in low-income families.

LUCID SUMMARY

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has told the Nation that the end of the pause—in bombing—does not mean the end of our pursuit of peace.

This administration has launched a campaign for peace not questioned in any capital except by the Communists.

In resuming the bombing in North Vietnam, has the United States despaired of peace?

Says the New Orleans States-Item:

No, we are merely dealing with the practicalities of war.

Far from believing the cause of peace hopeless, President Johnson launched a new phase of the peace offensive by reporting to the United Nations Security Council and seeking a new avenue to negotiations.

The States-Item declares:

With Communists availing themselves of the bombing lull to build up manpower and materiel and to restore bombed-out bridges, roads and facilities, renewal of air strikes by the United States comes as a measure to conserve lives of those who fight the aggressor from the north.

Here is a lucid, concise summary of some facts of life, and because many will want to read it, I offer it for the RECORD.

[From the New Orleans States-Item, Feb. 1, 1966]

AFTER 37 DAYS: BOMBS

Again U.S. bombers drop their loads of heavy explosives on military targets in North Vietnam, resuming an operation suspended for 37 days.

Has the United States despaired of peace? No, it is mearly dealing with the practicalities of war.

Far from believing the cause of peace hopeless, President Johnson launched a new phase of the peace offensive by reporting to the United Nations Security Council and seeking a new avenue to negotiations.

When the President initiated his intensive peace overtures prior to Christmas, it was with the knowledge that the effort would not be without cost.

And, after 37 days, it is adjudged the cost was not exorbitant. In turning down invitation to the conference table and in indicating no readiness whatever to discuss peace, Hanoi and Peiping have thwarted best efforts of not only the United States but the Vatican, our allies, neutral nations and, apparently, the Red governments of Eastern Europe.

Those 37 days should have eradicated any misbelief held by however few that this Nation seeks to live by war and aggression.

Should Hanoi and Peiping believe they detect major disagreement among Americans over prosecution of the war, a solid rebuff by congressional declaration can set those Red capitals straight.

With Communists availing themselves of the bombing lull to build up manpower and materiel and to restore bombed-out bridges, roads, and facilities, renewal of air strikes by the United States comes as a measure to conserve lives of those who fight the aggressor from the north.

Meanwhile, North Vietnam and Red China are thrust clearly on the defensive, responsible for spurning sincere endeavors for peace from around the globe.

THE THIRD FACE OF WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I traveled recently, during the recess between sessions of the 89th Congress, to southeast Asia. As chairman of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Joint House-Senate Economic Committee, I wanted, first of all, to judge for myself the success of our trade policies in the countries of that area and I visited Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, and Japan in that connection.

I also visited Vietnam. I wanted to see for myself what our people and the Vietnamese people thought about the war there and about the prospects for political and military success.

I wanted to look as well into what President Johnson has called the "third face of war" in Vietnam. As the President said last May, this third face is the face of human need, the sick, the hungry, and the illiterate. It is men and women, many without shelter, with rags for clothing, struggling for survival in a very rich and a very fertile land. I agree with the President that the struggle to remedy these needs is the most important battle for us in Vietnam—more important ultimately than the armed conflict or diplomatic negotiations.

As you all know, the scale of U.S. military engagement in Vietnam has changed drastically over the past several months. Our military moves have responded to the large-scale and still growing invasion of South Vietnam by regular military forces of North Vietnam. The commitment of American and other free world troops to augment the Vietnamese forces has denied the Vietcong a military victory in Central Vietnam, but has not yet assured a South Vietnamese victory. Thus, a new dimension of major military operations has been added to the older but still central struggle of government forces against Communist guerrillas with the villagers caught in between.

I believe that the evidence of U.S. determination has had a calming effect on the country's political factions which had brought down a series of governments in Saigon. The government of Air Marshal Ky, installed last June, is the first since the fall of Diem that has remained in power over 6 months without major opposition. The improved military posture has contributed markedly to relative political stability.

But military success by the United States and the South Vietnamese forces is just one part of the battle. In this new kind of war—this political war of national liberation, supported by the international Communist conspiracy—civil actions, on both sides, are often more important in the long run than military actions. Of course, one cannot succeed without the other, but our Government, including top military authorities, are well aware that unless our civil effort is handled properly, we could win the major military battles but still lose the political contest. This is why our civil efforts must match and be coordinated with our military efforts.

The bulk of the support of Vietnamese civil counterinsurgency measures fall within the purview of the Agency for International Development. In Vietnam the AID program is truly an integral part of the war effort and a major tool of counterinsurgency.

I was very impressed by the kind of people we have working for us in AID's Vietnam staff. They are a very dedicated group working in what are often very frustrating jobs. But they seem to possess a remarkably high level of morale and spirit—this in spite of the fact that they are working under often hazardous conditions and separated from their dependents. Many of them, particularly the provincial representatives stationed in the provinces, are truly a new breed of government servant, embracing as they must a wide range and combination of unusual personal qualities in their unprecedented jobs.

AID's program in Vietnam covers a wide variety of essential operations ranging from essentially relief measures for refugees to such things as helping train and equip a tripled police force, and building major capital projects, such as powerplants and new institutions such as the medical college and vocational schools. I am submitting for the RECORD a brief description of this program which, among other things, lists as an attachment the many activities which our AID program supports.

The two principal components can be broadly categorized as:

First, the counterinsurgency program which supports the Vietnamese Government's rural construction program designed to improve economic and social conditions in the rural areas. It also provides certain support for the war effort such as police training, transportation and port development, and repair of sabotaged roads and bridges, and

Second, the maintenance of economic stability through the commercial import program and working with the Vietnamese Government on economic policies. The commercial import program simply stated is U.S. financing of the foreign exchange costs of essential imports through regular private business channels, which imports cannot be afforded from the Vietnamese Government's meager foreign exchange balances. The piaster sales proceeds in Vietnam of these U.S.-financed imports are deposited in a special fund which is mostly allocated to helping finance the greatly expanded Vietnamese defense budget in a noninflationary manner. Thus this program serves a vital dual purpose.

After military action clears an area of major Vietcong and North Vietnamese troop units, we and the Government of Vietnam are faced with a major and equally important challenge of consolidating the gains and in effect reconstituting responsive local government and putting back together the shreds of local Vietnamese social and political fabric. This is not an easy job in the wake of the Vietcong attacks, assassinations, terrorism, and propaganda. The Vietcong has concentrated on destroying local government. They have killed literally thousands of civilians, particularly village leaders, schoolteachers, agricultural agents, and other representatives of local government in their campaign to intimidate, create chaos, break morale, and open the way for Communist domination.

If the local political mechanism is not made to function again, however, the area remains vulnerable to the subversive elements of the Vietcong planted underground throughout the countryside and is therefore subject to be taken over again by the Vietcong. This essentially civilian pacification effort is being conducted by the Vietnamese Government with AID support under the title of rural construction program. It combines local security with economic and social improvement in support of building responsive local government which can maintain the active political support of the peasantry.

First, in this rural construction program, security must be established, using militia-type forces, police, and intelligence networks, in order to prevent hit-and-run raids, terrorism, and assassination. The political extension of the Vietcong—the hidden Vietcong cells of persons living in the villages—the so-called invisible Vietcong government has to be identified and eliminated. New and stronger Vietnamese Government institutions need to be established, institutions which will serve the villages and which will involve the participation of the villagers.

And finally the expansion of education and health facilities, the improvement of agriculture and transportation, the gradual economic and social uplift of the village people must be commenced and continued. The Vietnamese Government with U.S. assistance will have to provide needed community services—education, health, roads, water, and electrification—directly to the people in the countryside, in an effort designed to enlist their commitment and active participation in the struggle against the Vietcong.

One of the most significant of these programs is the project to build and staff elementary and secondary schools in the many hamlets of South Vietnam. Although school enrollment in Vietnam has, with U.S. aid, been tripled since 1955, about one and a half million Vietnamese children of primary school age still are deprived of any schooling. Even under escalating warfare during the past 2 years, we have assisted the Vietnamese Government to build 5,600 hamlet school classrooms and train teachers for them. Also, over 10 million specially designed basic textbooks in Vietnamese have been provided by AID and distributed in the past 2 years. Together with the Vietnamese Government, we plan in the next 3 years to build 3,700 school classrooms and to train over 12,000 teachers to work in them. This school program will help provide the social cement needed for national unity and will do much to develop the trained manpower required for the essential postwar job of rural reconstruction.

In many respects the core of AID's rural development activities is the self-help program. Under this program, villagers assisted by their local leaders decide themselves what improvements are most needed for their hamlets, and to which they would be willing to contribute their own work and local materials. These desires are then transmitted to the district and provincial officials representing the central government. AID provides the commodities, and equipment, and the technical advice required by the Vietnamese Government to respond rapidly and effectively to the felt needs of the peasants. The two-way communication between the peasants and their government is an important step in the type of grassroots political development that can effectively counter the Vietcong.

Although this outside assistance plays an important role, the essential element of the self-help programs is the organization and labor of the people in the villages and hamlets. It is notable that the peasants have already been willing to contribute work and local material to over 17,000 self-help projects. Three thousand more are scheduled for completion by June. This represents political and economic development of the most fundamental and essential nature. Note particularly that this is not a giveaway program but that it is a mutual teamwork operation between the people themselves and their Government, with the assistance of AID.

AID will this year contribute to the support of a 40,000-man, specially trained nonmilitary corps of village workers which is being fielded by the Government of Vietnam to bring security and progress to selected areas of South Vietnam. This rural construction corps is being organized within provinces, drawing on highly motivated young Vietnamese men and women who will be trained largely in a national training center for service in their home districts. It adds to and expands on similar groups which have proven highly successful in certain pilot operations during the past year. It will also draw volunteer assistance from youth groups in the cities who are willing to devote their energies to improving the lot of the rural people.

The corps, consisting of local personnel trained in various skills, will be the basic instrument of a realistic rural construction program for which priority areas have already been designated by the Vietnamese Government. The program is designed to operate in areas where there is military security and to reconstitute effective local government. The lessons of past problems in the strategic hamlet and pacification programs have been thoroughly considered in formulating this program.

I learned from talking to a lot of people in Vietnam that this village worker is the key to success in the pacification effort there. He must have the ability to win the peasant's confidence and, ultimately, his commitment to the Government. To be effective, the village worker must be in a position to assist the peasant to meet his urgent requirements whether they be recent needs arising from the dislocations of war, longstanding needs arising from the past lack of concern for the welfare of the peasant or social injustice. The peasant wants an opportunity for a better education for his children, improved health for his family, and a chance to make a better living.

The village worker is primarily a political worker, attempting to build an effective government in the rural areas, but he is also a schoolteacher, a health technician or an agricultural extension agent. He stays in the village 24 hours every day, gets to know all the people in the village, works with them and shares their fears and dangers. In this process, he tries to explain and convince the people of the Communist danger while helping the peasants to help themselves both in defense of the village and improvement of living conditions.

The U.S. support for this important program involves the provision of the goods and technical advice necessary to help the Vietnamese Government get the job done. This material assistance takes many forms—fertilizer, insecticides, and seed for extension workers, drugs for medical workers, books and paper and pencils for village schools.

We are also involved, of course, in the complex process of training village workers by providing facilities and advisers. AID has not had an easy task in getting the right kind of people to work in Vietnam as advisers to the village workers. The proper combination of sensitivity to other people's need, of imagination, and of administrative ability needed to take on these advisory jobs is hard to come by. AID recruits men from many walks of life, and gives them intensive training in the Vietnamese language, in local geography, in political considerations, in understanding local attitudes and in learning, generally, how to deal with the problems of the rural people in terms the Vietnamese people can understand.

Other U.S. projects and direct assistance have been expanded to meet new and enlarged needs. The variety and scope of these projects is staggering but then so are the problems of the Vietnamese. Aid to refugees, a small part of our original program, became a major activity last summer and fall. More than 730,000 South Vietnamese sought refuge in government-controlled territory during 1965. About 460,000 of them were residing in camps at the end of the year. We have provided substantial amounts of food—Public Law 480 title II commodities—construction materials, blankets, and other relief supplies to the refugees. The aid and resettlement of refugees forms not only a positive humanitarian function, but becomes an important factor in winning support for the Vietnamese Government.

Major efforts are underway and expanding in the field of health. We are assisting the Vietnamese to enlarge teaching facilities in medical education. Twenty-three surgical and medical teams, about half contributed by other free world nations, are now treating civilian sick and war wounded. A team is planned eventually for each of the 43 provinces. An accelerated program of hospital renovation began last year and we plan to continue it.

These activities I have described involving government and rural people, have been undertaken to help build a sense of nationhood and to help develop a non-Communist government strong enough to resist Communist subversion. They must be geared together in integrated action programs which gradually and slowly bring permanent change, one step at a time, to areas of the countryside of Vietnam. Concurrent with these efforts is the improvement of the national police force to permit it to follow closely behind military forces and perform more effectively its crucial role of restoring and maintaining law and order in government-controlled areas. Also in support of rural reconstruction efforts are large investments in logistics and transportation. Improvements and expansions of ports and waterways are needed to handle large quantities of goods. Access to certain areas is possible only by air and consequently increased airlift capability is needed. Such highways and railroads as can be held secure must be maintained and the road net expanded wherever possible.

Now, the second major prong of the U.S. economic aid program in Vietnam is general support of the total Vietnamese economy in order to prevent inflation and shortages from erupting into political chaos. The last year has seen a great many changes in the economy, the most notable of which has been the rapid rise in prices since July.

As we known from the experience in China and other places, inflation and economic chaos can be as insidious and destructive a weapon of insurgency as military action. The expensive commercial import program and associated economic policies are undramatic and generally misunderstood by the general public but of vital importance. It is operated through private commercial channels in keeping with our fundamental belief and dedication to supporting the private enterprise system. In any event, the overburdened Vietnamese Government structure could not take over and administer the many commercial transactions involved. In this war boom it is true that importers and merchants are making money, but often overlooked is the fact that such things as canned milk for babies, kerosene for cooking, cement and steel for construction, tools and machinery required for making a livelihood, medicines, and so forth, would not be available to the masses of people throughout the small towns and villages in the countryside if this program did not exist.

The rise in the cost of living has reached about 40 percent in Saigon, even more to the north in Central Vietnam, and somewhat less in the Vietnamese rice bowl—the Mekong Delta to the south. The price rise in certain commodities has been more than 100 percent in the last few months in certain areas subject to Vietcong interdiction and shortages due to shipping congestion. Behind this rise is a combination of factors—reinforcing each other and rendering the problem more and more acute. The most important has been the increasing money supply, fueled by growing government budget deficits necessitated by the staggering defense budget increases. Until recently, additions to money supply were readily absorbed in increased monetization of the rural economy and by increased domestic production.

The escalation of Communist aggression and the response of the Government of Vietnam combined with the military assist of the United States and other free world nations have had enormous economic consequences. The continuing military buildup of United States and other free world troops, intensified military operations, and an expansion of Vietnamese budgetary expenditures, all putting more money into circulation, on top of an already very large budget deficit in 1964—have created purchasing power far beyond the capacity of the Vietnamese economy to satisfy. The economy is stretched tight, and there are no prospects of increased output of goods for the marketplace. Unemployment in Saigon, a political problem in 1964, vanished as the military draft, military construction, and a spurt of private spending created labor shortages. Vietcong harassment of the internal transportation routes has upset the balance of supply and demand—making the supply of goods difficult and irregular while demand for goods is rising.

Local shortages of goods and increased costs of production gave rise to initial increases in prices—this gave rise to increases in wages which in turn gave rise to increased demand for goods and brought forth hitherto idle hoards of cash to the marketplace.

The first defense in this situation is the commercial import program, which finances with dollars the foreign exchange costs of essential imported goods which could not otherwise be financed with the meager Vietnamese foreign exchange balances. These goods satisfy the growing demand and sop up much of the increased purchasing power created by government budget deficits.

But the import program cannot do the job by itself. Imports are not a perfect substitute for all the goods and services people want to purchase with their increased income. We have been working with the Vietnamese Government to develop a series of supporting measures. Of first importance has been a budget which meets the urgent war requirements but eliminates government spending on things that can be deferred. Related financial measures designed to siphon off purchasing power are government efforts to raise taxes and the sale of war bonds, the tightening of commercial bank reserve requirements to prevent their adding to the inflationary pressures; and the full commitment of Vietnamese earnings to meeting import requirements and the other demands for foreign exchange.

After having taken account of all of these measures which the Government of Vietnam can take by itself, there is still a gap of serious proportions—which AID estimates at $175 million for the remainder of this fiscal year. This plus the measures to be undertaken by the Government of Vietnam, will not reestablish price stability—it will only make it possible to contain the inflation. They expect out in Vietnam that prices will rise some 15 percent during the next 6 months. If inflation were to take a heavier toll it would endanger the stability of the government—at best forcing it to spend its time defending itself and diverting it from the job of fighting the war; at worst, having it toppled from power with the need to organize a new team to run the government and organize itself for the war effort. We cannot afford such interruptions of essential continuity in the direction of the war effort.

The U.S. economic aid program in Vietnam is an expensive one. In many ways, it is a frustrating one, since economic and social development rarely advance in the midst of the kind of warfare now going on in that country. But, I am convinced that the program there is an absolutely necessary one—one that this country must continue in its present form until such time as the Vietnamese people are free once more to rebuild their society.

JOSEPH VALACHI MEMOIRS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that many of our colleagues have become aware, as I have, of the possibility that the Department of Justice will give its consent to Joseph Valachi to publish his memoirs. I think that this would be contrary to the public interest and would serve further to perpetuate prejudice against Italo-Americans and I

have written to Attorney General Katzenbach to express my views.

The National Italian-American League To Combat Defamation has legitimately sought to call this Valachi book situation to the attention of the American people. The league is headed by many prominent citizens, including Judge S. Samuel DiFalco, national chairman; Fortune Pope, chairman of the board of directors; Judge Anthony D. Giovanna, chairman of the executive committee; and, Judge Ferdinand Pecora, chairman of the advisory committee. In addition, there are various distinguished residents of the Bronx who are some of the leaders of the league including Howard Molisani and Mauro Romita.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of calling this matter to the attention of all of our colleagues and to other readers of the RECORD, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD a letter which I have sent to the Attorney General urging him to deny to Valachi the permission which he would need to publish this book; and a copy of a letter from the league to its members.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 3, 1966.

Hon. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am very disturbed by the news reports that the Department of Justice is considering giving its approval to the publication of the memoirs of the convicted murderer, Joseph Valachi. I cannot see any value to the public in such a book save for pondering to the morbid interests of those who crave lurid details of crime. Insofar as law enforcement officials are concerned, I am certain that any information they need can be secured through the cooperation of the Department of Justice. Valachi, himself, would be enriched by the profits from such a book and would, therefore, be enriched by his life of crime.

I am most concerned by the prejudice against Americans of Italian origin and by the stereotypes which have engendered by television programs and other media. The great contributions which have been made, and are being made, to our society by Italo-Americans are too often lost in the welter of stereotyped denigration of the Italo-Americans. Publication of an autobiography by Valachi can only serve to aggravate this condition.

In the absence of any showing that there is an overwhelming public value to these memoirs and in the face of the obvious damage that will be done to so many of our fellow Americans, I urge you to deny Valachi the permission to publish his memoirs.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

NATIONAL ITALIAN-AMERICAN LEAGUE TO COMBAT DEFAMATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 14, 1966.

DEAR MEMBER AND FRIEND: Enclosed you will find a copy of a press release issued by our chairman, Judge Ferdinand Pecora, protesting the unprecedented permission granted to Joseph Valachi to publish a book of his "memoirs." This book can only continue an ugly and untrue image of millions of Americans of Italian origin and associate them, without reason, to crime and criminal activity. Valachi was once permitted to appear on television and to receive national notoriety which did irreparable damage to all Italians everywhere and resulted in not a single conviction or solution of any crime, nor even an arrest. Mr. Hoover of the FBI has stated that Valachi "did not reveal a single fact not already known to law enforcement agencies."

The Government of the United States is rewarding Valachi for his career of crime at the expense of further maligning and brainwashing the American public with the unsupportable and untrue premise that the Italian-Americans are the only persons involved in organized crime. Such a concept is false and should not be permitted to continue unchallenged.

It is about time that the wrongful overemphasis of the connection between Italians and crime be stopped. This can be helped if you protest the special privilege granted to this convicted murderer and character assassin. Address your protest to the President of the United States, the U.S. Attorney General and your respective Senator and Congressman.

This is the time to act and demonstrate the seriousness of this matter.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP T. LOMBARDO,
Director, Public Information.

FIRE SAFETY OF FOREIGN PASSENGER SHIPS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations has been making a study of the policies, practices, and procedures of the U.S. Coast Guard with respect to the examination and inspection of foreign-flag passenger vessels.

In public hearings held on January 25, 1966, Adm. Edwin J. Roland, Commandant of the Coast Guard, testified before the subcommittee that the Coast Guard has long recognized that existing provisions of international conventions are inadequate as regards the safety of some older vessels. He stated that at international meetings Coast Guard representatives have made a number of unsuccessful overtures toward more stringent controls.

The unfortunate disaster of the *Yarmouth Castle*, which burned and sank last November 13 with the loss of 90 lives, he felt, had undoubtedly created a more favorable climate for remedial measures.

The Commandant also testified that he was shortly to depart for London as head of the U.S. delegation to the 12th session of the Maritime Safety Committee of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, more familiarly known as IMCO. The U.S. delegation attended the meeting January 31, 1966. Perhaps the most important mission of that delegation was to press its efforts toward obtaining international support for changes in the Safety of Life at Sea Convention which, among other things, regulate the construction of passenger vessels, but which contain grandfather clauses exempting older vessels from more rigid requirements which were first adopted internationally in 1948.

Procedurally the American delegation was requesting that a special meeting of the Maritime Safety Committee, IMCO, be called to devote itself solely to a study of the conditions which make such casualties as the *Yarmouth Castle* possible, and to determine what steps should be taken to reduce these risks.

I was pleased to be advised last Friday that the Maritime Safety Committee has agreed to the U.S. proposal, and that an extraordinary session of the safety committee will be convened beginning May 2, 1966, to be devoted exclusively to the problem of fire safety of passenger vessels.

As chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, I believe the commandant and the entire U.S. delegation are to be commended on their success. International agreements matters move slowly, but they have succeeded in having that first big step taken, so essential to the safety of passengers.

SALE OF TANKS TO ISRAEL

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to applaud the State Department for making public the sale of tanks and other articles of defensive military necessity to the Israel Government. I first learned of this about 2 weeks ago and urged the release of the news at once. There is no doubt in my mind that Arab intelligence was aware of the sale of arms by the U.S. Government to Israel; hence, failing to disclose this fact served no useful purpose. Making it public, on the other hand, informs the Arab people that the United States intends to maintain the arms balance in the area.

This may bring the Arab people to the realization there is no purpose in their leaders wasting such a great proportion of their wealth for an unnecessary arms race. It may cause the people to insist that their leaders use the funds spent for arms for the necessities of life instead and may mean the first step toward peace.

PENTAGON INSENSITIVE TO SLAVE LABOR

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall in the very near future introduce legislation to prevent the Department of Defense from carrying out its plans to buy

$75 million worth of machineguns and arms from a German manufacturer who blatantly refuses to consider the claims of some 1,000 former slave laborers who were forced by the Nazis to tend its machines during the war.

The manufacturer is Rheinmetall Co. of Dusseldorf, Germany. There is good reason to believe that its managers were pioneers in the Nazi movement. But I am not commenting on behavior, however deplorable, that is decades old. I am outraged that today a German company has the arrogance to maintain that the profits it earned from the blood and indignities of slave laborers are not stained.

I will not have our Government be a party to this shameful and disgraceful situation. Our Government must have regard for fundamental decencies—and dealing with the Rheinmetall Co. of Dusseldorf I regard as indecent.

The Defense Department plans have been protested by B'nai B'rith, a Jewish service organization, which has aroused the conscience of America. It has also been protested by Mayor Charles V. Ryan, of Springfield, Mass., who argues that machineguns of equal quality are manufactured in his city and that the purchase in Germany is not necessary.

My legislation will be in the form of an amendment to the Defense Department's appropriation. I trust the Appropriations Committee will give it full consideration. I regard its enactment as essential.

If the appropriation bill fails to contain the prohibition when it reaches the House, I will ask for a floor vote. There must be no complicity on the part of our Government in excusing the bloody practices of the Nazis and their backers.

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FRED B. ROONEY, and other colleagues to establish a National Eye Institute as part of the National Institutes of Health. The purpose of the Eye Institute is to focus national support on problems involving the eye. It will conduct and support research and training in blinding eye diseases and other diseases that produce visual disorders. Research and training in special health problems and requirements of the blind and in the basic sciences relating to sight and visual function will also be authorized. The Surgeon General would be authorized to provide training and instruction and to establish traineeships and fellowships in the National Eye Institute and elsewhere relating to diagnosis, prevention, treatment of blinding eye diseases, and visual disorders.

There is much work to be done in the field of eye health; 90 million of our fellow Americans have some form of eye trouble of which 3.5 million cases involve serious trouble. The startling fact is that 80 percent of all blindness is the result of diseases whose causes are unknown to science. This points up the desperate need for basic research in this area. The time has come for a national effort to wage an unrelenting war against this scourge. I am sure that this war can be won if we put our hearts and minds to the task. Let us give light to the 10 million totally blind people of the world and the million functionally blind Americans who are unable to read ordinary newspaper type, even with the aid of glasses.

CAN WE OR CAN WE NOT AFFORD TO LOSE THIS CONFRONTATION?

Mr. KREBS. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, long before the recent acceleration of our activity in Vietnam, long before the President's peace offensive and the more recent resumption of bombing in North Vietnam, I took the position that our role in that tragic conflict cannot be finally determined until one all-inclusive question is asked and answered.

That question is, "Can we or can we not afford to lose this confrontation?"

If we can afford to lose, if the war there is of no importance to us, then we should get out. If we cannot afford to lose, and it is certainly my opinion that we cannot, then we should get about winning it as quickly and as decisively as all our might will permit us.

The Shreveport Times, in an editorial, "It's Time To Fight To Win," states the case perfectly and I would like to place that editorial here in the RECORD for the benefit of all Members. It is well worth the few minutes it will take to read it:

IT'S TIME TO FIGHT TO WIN

It is almost exactly a month since an American plane dropped a bomb on North Vietnam. The Christmas truce, which the Reds violated right and left, passed long ago. The calendar New Year and its light cessation in fighting is more than 3 weeks past. The lunar New Year of the Vietnamese—North and South—is ending, marked by another truce which the Vietcong Reds repeatedly have violated with more than 60 shooting incidents as this is written. Several Americans have been killed.

During the month of hardly even one-handed opposition from American forces the Communists have rebuilt damaged military installations, built new installations, moved perhaps tens of thousands of tons of supplies, including ammunition and weapons as well as food, to battle areas. They have transported fresh troops to what will be hot combat sectors and regrouped forces which had been scattered by attack from both the American and South Vietnamese Armies.

Only the Communists can know how much buildup of military strength, including more Russian ground-to-air missile launching sites, as well as the largest mortars in the world—the Russian 120 millimeter—has taken place. Only the omnipotent can know how many American casualties will be added to the ever-growing lists as a result of this period of security given the Communists.

President Johnson found the Nation almost solidly behind him when he first began to fight the war in Vietnam—to fight with the seeming intent of winning militarily in a manner to create a peace table at which the United States could sit with honor.

The President again gained overwhelming support of the Nation—of the whole free world—when he sent envoys to more than 40 countries in search of some means of peace—something that would bring the North Vietnamese Communists to a council table.

This so-called peace offensive has failed completely from the standpoint of creating even an approach to negotiations. The North Vietnamese Communists, the Chinese Communists and the Russian Communists all have refused to have any part of it unless all U.S. troops are withdrawn from southeast Asia.

That would be a surrender, by our country, that could destroy the morale, and the faith in America, of free nations all over the world. It would, in effect, convince the Reds of China and North Vietnam that the whole area on the map on the opposite page (not printed in the RECORD) is theirs for the taking.

But the President's peace offensive has succeeded magnificently in convincing the world that the United States has no imperialist aims in Vietnam, that it does not want to fight there but has been compelled to in order to carry out its obligations and long-established policies—policies first put into active and military effect under President Truman.

The pressure from around the world for peace now is on Hanoi and Peiping and not on Washington. That is victory, indeed, in the political phase of the war in Asia.

So, the time certainly has come when the United States must start fighting—and it must not starting fighting a one-handed war or a dead-end war. It must fight to win.

That means full-scale air and sea bombardment of North Vietnam including specifically the vital military targets in the Hanoi area and the harbor area of Haiphong. There have been rumors in Washington that when and if the bombing of North Vietnam is resumed, the Hanoi and Haiphong areas will still be immune.

That would be a tragic mistake. It would mean, in literal fact, Americans fighting and dying at the hands of the Reds in South Vietnam, while the supply bases and troop centers and ammunition dumps which enable the Communists to fight in South Vietnam are left intact in North Vietnam.

Last fall, President Johnson publicly pledged that there would be no sacred sanctuary, for the enemy in this war, as in Korea when President Truman forbade General MacArthur to cross the Yalu River boundary between North Korea and Manchuria to bomb the Red Chinese bases—or even for reconnaissance purposes. But all of North Vietnam has been a sacred sanctuary for the past month. Even when our bombing was going on most of North Vietnam was immune from attack under Washington orders. It is time to end this kind of mock warfare. Nor can eastern Laos and eastern Cambodia be left as sacred sanctuaries, as they are now.

Either we fight to win or we may as well quit in disgrace.

The United States must also recognize that the Ho Chi Minh trail, which runs from

North Vietnam through Laos and back into South Vietnam, and now—it is believed—even on from Laos into Cambodia, must be hit and hit hard. It must be hit not merely in the manner of cutting off a piece of the serpent's tail—at the South Vietnamese end—but killing the serpent by destroying the heart and head of the trail in western Laos along the North Vietnam border and in North Vietnam itself.

The long cessation of bombing of North Vietnam, the weakness of the bombing when it did take place, and the lack of any guarantee of resumption may be having an effect around the United States which President Johnson will not like. This is a feeling, or sensing, by many people, especially experienced commentators, that the United States is using the peace offensive and the prolonged cessation of bombing of North Vietnam as a step toward what could be appeasement—a truce before next summer's Federal election campaigns—which would be as disgraceful for the United States, in the eyes of the world, as Korea and the two backdowns in Cuba crises.

On the other hand, President Johnson has asked for more than $12 billion to carry on the war in Vietnam. More troops are pouring into South Vietnam almost daily. Secretary McNamara wants to build 900 planes at once—and hopes the people will forget his 5 years of cutting down the power of the U.S. Air Force. The United States now has a military supply base in Thailand—our top friend in southeast Asia—capable of supporting an army of 100,000 men.

But, also, it is no secret that the United States has been short of air bombs of the type needed in Vietnam, and whole divisions have been short of such equipment as jungle boots; that 180 ships are lying off the Vietnamese shores loaded with supplies and no place to unload them; that pilots reportedly have been sent into action (and death or capture) without the training needed for the assignments given them; and that a long, long list of incompetencies and errors can be laid at the door of Secretary of Defense McNamara.

It is quite possible that President Johnson's long lull in bombing North Vietnam has been necessary for the United States to build up its own fighting strength, even though it gave the Communists similar opportunity.

FINANCING A HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at this time of year many thousands of young people across the Nation are planning to seek admission to college next fall. Many of these people have high promise and ability but are discouraged in their education plans because they lack the necessary financial resources.

Some of the families of these young people are in what might be called a middle-income bracket. Often, however, the young person will have a number of brothers and sisters, some of whom may already be in college. We know how difficult it is for any family of moderate means to finance more than one or two children through college simultaneously.

Sylvia Porter, the noted columnist, has written a careful and very helpful analysis of college scholarships, who gets them, and how and when a high school student should apply for scholarship assistance.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I ask that Sylvia Porter's articles, which appeared serially in the Washington Star recently, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—WHO GETS COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS?—I

(By Sylvia Porter)

What does it take to get a college scholarship? How needy must a student's family be? What factors, in addition to academic standing, improve a student's chances for a scholarship today?

This year one-tenth of U.S. college students—about 500,000—are receiving more than $200 million in scholarships to help finance their higher education. At a limited but growing number of colleges more than half of the student body is getting some type of financial assistance. Beginning next fall another 140,000 needy students will go to college with the help of an additional $58 million of Federal scholarships under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Today college scholarships are multiplying as unprecedented numbers of students from middle and lower income families continue their education beyond high school. At the same time millions of American families in all but the highest income brackets are straining under the huge cost of sending their children to college.

COSTS SOAR

During the past three decades college costs have quintupled, and during the coming 10 years costs are slated to rise another 50 percent. Clearly the competition for scholarships will become even more fierce than it is today. * * *

Generally speaking, a high school student today must graduate with at least a B average and rank at least in the top half of his class simply to get into a good 4-year college. The requirements are understandably tougher for scholarships. While a growing total of colleges will admit highly qualified students regardless of financial means and automatically extend scholarship aid if necessary, the tendency at these more affluent colleges also is to select strictly from the top 25 percent of high school classes and to demand at least a B-plus average.

But glittering grades are not the sole yardstick for college admission or for winning a scholarship. Even without a superior academic record these other factors can help tremendously toward a scholarship: A student's outstanding personality, a demonstrated capacity for leadership, an unusual or special talent (say in music, art, sports, foreign languages).

Special consideration is given too to candidates who have overcome a severe handicap or misfortune during their lives.

How needy must the student's family be?

NEEDY EXPLAINED

The gifted child of the very needy (in the $3,000–$4,000 or less annual income range) has the best chances for most scholarships. The new Federal scholarships are reserved exclusively for those who couldn't otherwise attend college.

But a rising sum of aid is also now available to students whose family income is as high as $15,000 a year—if the family has other children to support at home or in college at the same time, if the family has other burdensome expenses, or if college costs are especially high at the institution the child wishes to attend.

For instance, a family with four children to support on a yearly income of $5,000 is considered by today's colleges as in greater need—in terms of eligibility for a scholarship—than a family with one child and an income of $3,000. Even the $15,000-a-year family may be considered needy—if there are five children to support and if the college charges $2,000–$3,000 or more a year.

While less needy students and their families are expected to contribute substantial shares of their earnings, savings, and assets toward college costs, a family's total financial picture is now taken into account—and the amount the family is expected to pay is measured by what it can reasonably afford. Today's student financial aid is designed to fill the gap between that sum and total college costs.

WHO GETS COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS?—II

Let's say your teenage son has superior academic qualifications that would put him in the running for a college scholarship. Let's also say that, while your family income is a relatively affluent $10,000, you have three other children, your savings are next to zero and you can't see how you can squeeze out an extra $2,000 a year for your son's college education. Would a college consider you needy enough for your son to win a scholarship?

This is typical of the quandary facing many middle-income American families as record numbers of their children head into college. The answers are important to students and parents—because a college degree is becoming a minimum requirement for many jobs.

Scholarships are generally awarded to highly qualified, B-or-better students whose families have limited financial means. The average scholarship is about $400 a year, but it may range up to $1,500 or more—according to the individual student's need and the actual anticipated total college costs.

How are "total" costs and family "need" figured today?

Here are basic guidelines just published by the College Scholarship Service, a nonprofit service of the College Entrance Examination Board in Princeton which helps nearly 700 major institutions offering scholarship funds among students.

In calculating total college costs, the CSS includes not only tuition and fees, but also room, board, transportation, clothing, books, spending money.

In calculating family need, it takes these major factors into account: Family income, number of other children to support, the breadwinner's age and retirement plans, unusual financial burdens such as other children in college at the same time, an expensive illness, whether the wife works, size of debts.

The CSS also weighs total family assets—cash savings, equity in the home, securities owned, etc.—and applies a share of this total to the amount a family can "reasonably afford" to contribute. This share, though, is comparatively small—less than 10 percent—and assets up to $7,000 are not counted. If the family head is over 55 years old, even higher sums are disregarded.

The scholarship seeker himself is expected to contribute about 25 percent of his total college costs.

Typically, the student's contribution might include 20 percent of his accumulated savings each year that he is in college, about $300 in summer earnings each year (including the year before he enters college), plus about $200 in earnings from a part-time job at school.

Assuming your assets are limited and assuming you have no "unusual" financial burdens, here is what the CSS suggests you can

afford to contribute annually toward one child's college expenses at various income levels and with various numbers of other dependent children:

Number of other dependent children before tax

Income	None	1	2	3
$5,000	$540	$330	$160	(1)
$7,000	1,030	780	550	$400
$9,000	1,570	1,230	920	750
$11,000	2,170	1,760	1,390	1,140
$13,000	2,840	2,360	1,930	1,620
$15,000	3,580	3,010	2,530	2,170

[1] No contribution.

These are just your "suggested" contributions. They by no means bind any college to provide the balance of the costs. But they do give you a general indication of what financial efforts are expected today from the student and his family.

They also indicate what many colleges expect to provide through scholarships, loans, and student jobs.

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—WHO GETS COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS?—III

Assuming you, a prospective college student, are qualified and assuming your family is financially needy, how do you go about getting a college scholarship? Today more than 500,000 college scholarships worth more than $200 million are available to students the Nation over, and another 140,000 worth $58 million will be available to exceptionally needy students entering college next fall. But competition is stiff and if a scholarship is a financial necessity for you, it's vitally important that you take the right steps in the right direction—now. Here, from a recent guide on "How to Get College Scholarships" by Gene R. Hawes and other authorities on student financial aid, are 10 basic rules for the scholarship seeker:

1. Decide on three or four colleges you might want to attend—without regard to cost—and for which you would qualify academically. If they're all high-cost colleges, add at least one lower-cost institution to the list. Scholarships at lower-cost colleges tend to be less competitive than those at the "prestige" colleges.

2. Request application forms for admission and for financial assistance from each institution and ask for details on scholarships from each. Colleges and universities themselves are the biggest scholarship sources today and they administer many of the nonuniversity funds—private and Federal—as well. A request for financial aid will not affect your chances for admission.

3. Explore "outside" sources of scholarships: One of the biggest—and most competitive—is the national merit scholarship program, for which most high school juniors routinely take qualifying tests. Also explore scholarships that may be offered by local churches, local governments, corporations, civic groups.

4. Ask your State department of education (in the State capital) for details on State scholarships and other forms of student financial aid. Find out whether a State scholarship would restrict you to institutions within the State—if this matters to you.

5. Be sure to take college board or comparable examinations when they are given at your high school—or if they're not, find out when and where you can take them. Results of these exams are required by virtually all colleges today, and your score will be a major factor in whether you win a scholarship.

6. If the colleges to which you apply require it—and nearly 700 do—get a "Parents' Confidential Statement" from your high school counselor or from the College Scholarship Service in Princeton, N.J. Have your parents fill it out well before your college application deadline. This questionnaire on your family's financial position—and needs—goes to the GSS. The GSS, in turn, will forward copies of its evaluation to each college you designate.

7. If the college to which you apply does not participate in the College Scholarship Service, you and your parents will have to assess your financial means and estimate your aid needs. In making this estimate, take all college costs into consideration—including transportation, books, incidentals, etc.—and also consider your total family resources. Make the estimate realistic.

8. Make sure you answer every question on your applications and send every required "supporting document"—photographs, transcripts, etc. Don't be careless.

9. Pay particular attention to the part of the application asking why you want to go to college and what you expect to get out of it. It appears on almost every application and the care you take in answering could be the key to your acceptance. Be brief and neither exaggerate nor underplay your statement.

10. Apply early—preferably as early as this month of December, if you are a senior. Each college has its own application deadline and this you should beat by a wide margin.

THREAT TO FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, since the days when ships-of-the-line were sent to the far-off shores of Tripoli to repel the attacks of pirates, this Nation has been committed to the principle of freedom of the seas. This is no less true now than it was in the days of pirates, or in the days of World Wars I and II when we swept clear the seas of German raiders and submarines.

But now this principle, so cherished a part of American tradition, is being flouted with increasing frequency. Vessels under the U.S. flag, manned by crews which include U.S. citizens, engaged in lawful pursuits in open waters, have been seized and forced into foreign ports. In one case a vessel flying the Stars and Stripes was fired upon several times, and two American citizens were wounded. These actions have all taken place within recent months, the latest just last week.

These illegal seizures have been committed not by just one nation but by four, and give indication that this disregard of the rights of our shipping and our seamen—this open defiance of the United States—is increasing. The vessels concerned are tuna boats operating off the west coast of South America, and it is into the ports of South American countries that they have been forced and detained. Illegal fines and impositions have been levied upon them, and payment forced before release was granted. Protests of our Government have gone unheeded, and the success of each succeeding episode in producing revenue for the country concerned seems to encourage the perpetration of similar acts by neighboring nations.

Even as I speak today, a purse seiner flying the U.S. flag lies forcibly held at anchor in the Colombian port of Buena Ventura, under the guns of a Colombian destroyer which had illegally taken aboard eight crewmen of the fishing vessel. The boat, the *Day Island*, was lawfully proceeding to Panama for repairs, through international waters when it was stopped on the high seas by the Colombian warship, its crew members taken prisoner, and then forced into port. Protests by U.S. diplomatic officials have not yet brought about its release.

The situation is fraught with danger, danger of an international incident that could have even more serious consequences than those to date. For our fishermen are angry. It is not in the tradition of this Nation to be fired upon without firing back, or to be unjustly confined without seeking to break that confinement by force, if necessary. They look to their Government for the protection that should rightfully be accorded every American citizen, wherever he travels. If it is not forthcoming, there is a strong possibility that our fishermen will seek to provide their own protection by force of arms. Developments of a grave nature could result.

These seamen of ours have been patient, but their patience is wearing thin. They have had confidence in their Government, but that confidence is waning. Before that confidence vanishes, before that patience snaps, action must be taken to afford them the protection that is rightfully theirs.

What form that action must take I do not attempt to say at this time. I do not call for the use of naval and air power to afford armed protection to every vessel, even though the use of such power might well be justified. But though it is not without the bounds of possibility that the increased use of some armed protective force may yet be necessary, I believe that other measures are still available.

The State Department has worked at length to find such a solution but their methods of persuasion and argument have often proved unavailing. The nations concerned—Chile, Ecuador, Peru, and now Colombia—have seemed immune to argument and persuasion. In the absence of firm worldwide law, none has been willing to make an agreement on the basis of generally accepted practices.

The time has come for a consideration of methods stronger than mere persuasion, methods that will serve to convince every nation that while the United States will scrupulously regard the rights of others on the high seas, we will insist that others give equal regard to our own rights.

The time has come to make it clear to all nations that we will protect the rights and freedoms of our citizens wherever they may be engaged in lawful activities on the high seas, and that

this protection will be extended by whatever means that may become necessary.

If this determination is made known, and this resolve becomes clear, it is my hope that nations which have been harassing our fishing vessels, and nations which might be tempted to do so, will instead be inclined to accept our repeated invitation to "come, let us reason together." From such reasoning alone can come the international agreements needed to forestall the strife that may well lie ahead without them.

SECRETARY WEAVER SPEAKS BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to hear the Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, deliver a highly informative address before the National Press Club. The topic of the Secretary's address was "Creative Federalism and Great Cities."

In his remarks Secretary Weaver pointed out that creative federalism stresses local initiative, local solutions to local problems, with the Federal Government assuming a more active role in providing support of various types for these locally initiated and locally administered activities. There is no doubt that a new and bolder approach to the problems of urban America must be launched if we are to find solutions to the growing problems of our great cities.

The new approach outlined by Secretary Weaver calls for a dynamic partnership between Federal, State and local governments—a partnership which harnesses our public and private resources behind forward looking and workable programs to meet the urban challenge.

Mr. Windsor Booth, president of the National Press Club, and Mr. John Cosgrove, chairman of the speakers' committee, deserve credit for arranging this first and timely public address by our new Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. They have performed a real public service.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident Members of Congress will be impressed by the grasp of and the practical approaches to our urban problems set forth by Secretary Weaver and under leave obtained, I include the text of his address.

CREATIVE FEDERALISM AND GREAT CITIES

(Address by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary, Housing and Urban Development, Before the National Press Club, Washington, D.C.)

Not quite 2 years ago, President Johnson made an historic speech at Ann Arbor, Mich., when he introduced two fresh concepts: creative federalism and the Great Society.

The first was cast as a path to the second, rather than an end in itself. And the President defined creative federalism as embodying "new concepts of cooperation between the National Capital and the leaders of local communities." And, as we have seen subsequently, he meant private leadership as well as public leadership.

Both concepts are, at once, a reflection of and guideposts for this Nation. Both recognize the key characteristics of the Nation at this point in time: It is urban. It is affluent. It is relentlessly innovative.

Today I would like to talk about the implications of these aspects of our society, the new Department of Housing and Urban Development, and how the Department both responds to and affects the many forces at work in this increasingly pluralistic culture. In this context, I will mention both the new programs which the President forwarded to the Congress a few weeks ago and the new structure and direction of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which is charged with the basic responsibility for carrying out these programs and a major share of the responsibility for responding effectively to what the President has called our most critical domestic problem—improving the quality of urban life.

The forces of growth which are shaping our cities must be mastered, and the new Federal Department is only one instrument in the greater effort. Every level of government is faced by the urban challenge, and every unit of government must effect an appropriate response or face physical and economic anarchy.

The sum of these responses is what is meant by creative federalism. In the budget message a few weeks ago, the President put it this way:

"Many of our critical new programs involve the Federal Government in joint ventures with State and local governments in thousands of communities throughout the Nation. The success or failure of those programs depends on timely and effective communication and on readiness for action on the part of both Federal agencies in the field and State and local governmental units."

The sort of "joint ventures" which the President has in mind represent a significant break with more traditional forms of governmental enterprise. Through the early years of our constitutional system, we operated under a concept of dual federalism—the conviction that Nation and State were divided by impenetrable walls of separate jurisdiction. The power struggle between those advocates of strong States rights and those who favored more Federal centralization resulted in a peculiar sort of stand-off. Problems which did not fall readily within one jurisdiction were swept under the rug.

But the Nation developed and older antagonisms became subjugated to the need for solving new problems of economic and social growth. And so a new sort of federalism evolved—a cooperative federalism. This pattern brought together programs and activities of shared responsibility through the device of Federal grants-in-aid. These in turn meant a measure of collaboration on a number of fronts. But precincts of power were still staked out and jealously guarded as under dual federalism.

The conviction remained that expansion of power in one level of Government worked to lessen power in another, and the spheres of cooperation were largely restricted to policy execution and administration—not mutual development of new activities. Thus, the New Deal was essentially a national inspiration—a limited response to an emergency, not a fundamental change in the processes of government.

Today, and only very recently, a third interpretation of federalism has emerged, more suited to our times, more sensitive to the rapidly changing pressures and powers in an increasingly pluralistic society.

Creative federalism, unlike earlier brands, does not conceive of power as a static commodity, to be transferred from private to public sectors or State to national levels at the expense of the earlier possessor of power. Public policy, rather, arises in response to new needs and conditions and changes as pressures change. And the energies of the creative response from all levels and sectors in turn galvanizes the Federal sector into positive action.

Today, concern over issues has given way to concern for broad problems. As contemporary problems such as poverty, social disorganization, civil rights and rampant urbanization become readily identified, creative federalism responds with solutions instead of ideologies.

This approach involves the initiation and shaping of new responses to urban and other domestic problems through a complicated interplay of many forces, public and private. In terms of urban problems, the major responsibility for such responses rests with government, as the public welfare is the focus.

Yet private enterprise and private institutions are increasingly being called upon, in this new form called creative federalism, to play key roles not only in program execution, whether as homebuilders or campus developers, but in policy formulation as well.

This development, still in its early evolution, parallels what is happening in the defense and space industries. These are today vast complexes of private and public enterprise, contiguous in their operations at many different points but ordered systematically within the context of specific problems to be solved.

But let me first indicate the broader framework. Creative federalism stresses local initiative, local solutions to local problems. The Federal role as a partner in creative federalism will continue to be one of support for locally initiated and locally administered activities. But this is not a passive role. Where the obvious needs for action to meet an urban problem are not being fulfilled, the Federal Government has a responsibility at least to generate a thorough awareness of the problem.

The goals we have set for urban America are the most ambitious in our history. The times call for inventiveness and ingenuity to match the welter of change boiling in and around our great metropolitan areas. Indeed, none of our institutions is likely to be the same by the time this century draws to a close—by the time we have built another urban America.

Thomas Jefferson suspected and even feared the city. He was a gentleman farmer at heart, although certainly the most urbane farmer in this or perhaps any nation's history. But Jefferson understood change, and the necessity for adapting to it. And he once described change in a democratic society in terms which come strikingly close to defining what we now call creative federalism:

"Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

And so creative federalism and the approaches which evolve from its conceptual framework will, indeed, change our institutions. It must, if these institutions are to survive.

Our approach today stresses innovation and the breaking of customary ineffective patterns. We intend to do this through experiment and demonstration.

Last year, a striking innovation in providing housing for low- and moderate-income families was proposed. The President called the program, for rent supplementation, "the most crucial new instrument in our effort

to improve the American city." It would bring the strength of the private building market to bear directly upon our greatest unsolved urban problem—the construction of decent housing for low-income families. This program involves mortgage insurance offered by FHA at market rates of interest of nonprofit, limited dividend and cooperative sponsors. The housing is privately owned, managed, and privately financed.

Although the Congress has not yet funded this critically needed program, interest has built up terrifically in the past several months. We have already received preliminary proposals from sponsors for the construction of nearly 70,000 low-income units. These proposals have come from 265 different localities in 43 States, and sites are already available for 40,000 of the units. There is no disputing the need for or the interest in this program.

Now we have pushed into the most dramatic form of experimentation this urban nation has ever seen—striving to demonstrate that whole chunks of cities, large and small, can be reborn in the image of this Nation's promised urban greatness.

Yesterday, I spoke to a group of 400 municipal leaders from Connecticut. I outlined how this new demonstration cities program will work. I stressed that its failure or success rides principally upon their own inventiveness and ability for effecting the changes so badly needed to make their cities viable systems for human development. Their response gives me as much confidence as anything I have yet heard in the capacity of the American city to adapt to change. Most important, even while understanding that not all Connecticut cities can be in at the beginning of this experimental program, these officials realize that the solutions and approaches which will be developed, throughout the Nation, will help them in their own problem solving. For while we have come to see that the city holds a myriad of facets to every major problem, there are solutions which can be developed and tailored to fit every individual situation. That is what we are looking for in this program.

This is, in a very real sense, where it all comes together. The President's message shows the way. It indicates that this new program has three major thrusts:

To concentrate all available resources in planning tools, in housing construction, in job training, in health facilities, in recreation, in welfare programs, in education—to improve the conditions of life in urban areas.

To coordinate all our available talent and skills.

To mobilize local leadership and private initiative, so that local citizens will determine the shape of their new city freed from the constraints that have handicapped their past efforts and inflated their costs.

Solutions will be tailored by local officials, with a minimum of Federal direction but a maximum of Federal assistance and technical aid. Those cities developing the most imaginative solutions and energetic leadership will be the first aboard. This is, perhaps more than anything else, a time for the testing of the ingenuity and resiliency of the American urban intellect.

These demonstrations, and indeed all our programs, will be operated from a new context which in itself reflects the creative federalism of which I have been speaking.

As most of you know, we have been in the midst of drastic reorganization, aimed at making all of our programs—including demonstration cities—most effective. At the same time, we are developing new management techniques, under the so-called planning-programing budgeting system, for getting the maximum impact from Federal expenditures, as well as the fullest measure of administrative efficiency.

The new organizational structure we are developing is facilitated by the legislation which created the new Department. That legislation places in the Secretary the authority to administer and effectively supervise all the programs now in, and to be assigned to, the Department. With such new powers, we are rearranging functions. In the organizational structure that will soon be announced responsibilities for supervision and direction of the major activities of the Department will be delegated to Assistant Secretaries. The grouping of activities, however, will be oriented to broad problem solving rather than on the basis of bureaucratic identification. For we are resolved that traditional agencies must be integrated to meet total objectives.

Consistent with principles of sound public administration and responsive to the needs of urban America, we shall place greater decisionmaking authority closer to the problems and the people. For those programs which are established, the decisionmaking authority will be in the regional offices. And in the new demonstration cities program, much of the decision authority will be at the local level centered in Federal coordinators.

These novel officials will be located at the local level. They will not, as has been affirmed, look over the shoulders of the mayors. Rather they will serve the local communities by coordinating HUD programs, assisting in the coordination of other Federal programs, aiding local officials in securing cooperation on the part of State agencies, and generally expediting Federal activities in the locality. Their usefulness has been recognized by many mayors in the Nation. Speaking for a group of them, Mayor McKeldin of Baltimore recently said that they had been disabused of the fear that the Federal coordinator would be a czar dictating local policies.

Thus, in this new Department we are beginning to give form and substance to the new federalism. Our efforts will be supported by a continuing program of research, demonstration, and experimentation. Not the least of our concerns will be to assert leadership for, and encourage, the development of techniques to solve the administrative problems which emanate from the long-existing proliferation and overlapping of local governments. We shall, with continuing careful evaluation of results, attempt to utilize and apply the newer tools of systems analysis to urban problems.

Two weeks ago, President Johnson called for vigorous support so that 1966 could indeed be, in his words, "the year of rebirth for American cities."

This rebirth, this rebuilding of our great cities will start against the backdrop of the strongest economy in U.S. history. This year, the gross national product is expected to total over $722 billion, representing a rise of 5 percent in real growth, after accounting for possible price changes. Perhaps most important, this great and growing economic strength provides us with the opportunity to utilize as fully as possible our manpower and to direct a maximum effort at relieving those dislocations in our labor market which have particularly afflicted cities with pools of unemployed.

The economy is strong and the temper of the Nation is, as I have already indicated, for change and continued striving toward a better life. This might seem surprising because it has often been assumed that in times of prosperity, democratic peoples are content to sit and live off the fat of the land. This is hardly true today. Not only is there widespread support for a major campaign against poverty, both in cities and rural areas, but the Nation is even exercised about beauty. And if you don't believe that, I refer you not only to the tremendous enthusiasm generated by last year's White House Conference on Natural Beauty, but also to what happened recently in the Kentucky Legislature, which just passed a pioneering law restricting strip mining in the State. This action opens the way for seven other nearby and adjacent States to enter into a compact which would halt the ravages of this wasteful practice, which has so brutalized the landscape.

So we move into the second half of this decade with a most fortunate combination of circumstances: A nationwide concern with the environment and the economic wherewithal to translate this concern into action programs.

Last year, the Congress provided great impetus to this situation, with both the Housing and Urban Development Act and the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The President also delivered a special message on developing goals for natural beauty. The latter pricked the conscience of almost every American community and has stimulated a growing preoccupation with the shape and condition of our total environment.

In closing, there are a couple of important aspects of our whole approach which I want to emphasize. First, I cannot stress strongly enough that every effort will be made to see that what are perhaps the two most enduring characteristics of the city—diversity and opportunity—are greatly enhanced through all our programs.

Diversity is what makes the city exciting and vital. We recognize that it must be fortified and made to thrive. There must be room for all peoples, of many incomes and with many different notions about what constitutes the good community. Hopefully, these will continue to be aired, in democratic fashion, and out of the continuing consensus will come the sort of urban environment which can continue to make the democratic city the chief symbol of civilized men.

Diversity is a hollow virtue without opportunity, and the President has emphasized that the demonstration cities program will aim squarely at creating new opportunities not only for employment and training, but also in the choice of housing available and the use of community facilities. While we demonstrate new ways to achieve maximum opportunity, I trust we no longer need demonstrate that this is the essential element of the democratic city. That is what the rest is all about.

Another key aspect of this new program is an emphasis upon quality which will pervade every element of every project. This means not only the highest regard for architecture and design, but also for the critical interplay of building and spaces, for the strategic positioning of open green spaces and plantings, for the opening up of those areas long congested by rubble-filled alleys and junkyards, and for the development of community vistas which can make a lasting contribution to a spirit of pride and spiritual enrichment.

The words I have been using today fall into easy sequence:

The opportunity for a better life, and to demonstrate workable solutions toward that goal through the carefully geared workings of our flexible constitutional system—creative federalism.

In the months to come, you will see the things I have been talking about coming to life. A major instrument to achieve this will be the demonstration cities program with its equally important companion proposal for demonstrations in comprehensive metropolitan planning.

In any case, our urban programs will be carried forward with a greater sense of purpose as our system evolves more effective solutions to problems plaguing our cities and metropolitan areas. In that process, our constant concern will be to lift the horizons of hope and expectation of urban America. For we are convinced that there can and must be a better America. We are dedicated

to make a significant contribution to that objective. And we know that it can be achieved only through a partnership between government at all its levels and society, with all its elements involved.

THE CONSTRUCTIVE TEENAGERS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRALEY] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, we hear and read a great deal these days about juvenile delinquents, vandalism by teenagers, and other sordid acts by youngsters in the Nation.

Because of the destructive nature of such actions, too often little attention is given to the constructive acts and accomplishments of the vast majority of the teenagers who are laying the foundations of their futures as responsible citizens.

I have in my district a very outstanding young man who, I believe, epitomizes the responsible teenagers. He is Ronald H. Boggs, of Carlisle, Pa., who was selected as one of the 14 representatives of the 5,600,000 Boy Scouts of America who will make the annual "Report to the Nation" to President Johnson on February 9 of this year.

The 14 boys making the report were selected on a competitive basis which took into account school, church, community, and scouting records.

Ronald is 17 years old and attends Carlisle High School where he is on the honor roll, a member of weight lifting, speech, art, chess, and science clubs. He holds two letters in music and has participated in the Boys Glee Club and the high school chorus.

Among the scouting awards he has won are the Bronze and Gold Palm Eagle, 15 Miler Award, God and Country Award, and Order of Arrow. In addition to scouting, he is interested in science and has received two science awards, one by the Institute of Radio Engineers and another by the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers.

I am sure his parents, Col. and Mrs. William H. Boggs are very proud of him. I commend him for his outstanding achievements and am most happy to have such a well-rounded, outstanding young citizen in the 19th District of Pennsylvania.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a House concurrent resolution commemorating the Boy Scouts of America, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the granting of its charter.

During the 50 years that this organization has been in existence, it has fostered in our youth the highest of ideals; it has promoted the manly qualities of self-reliance, endurance, and physical fitness; and it has developed honesty, integrity, and leadership in the youth of our Nation.

I have been a Boy Scout myself and have continued to take an active interest in scouting activities. Both of my sons were also active in scouting work.

I introduce this resolution to appropriately recognize this memorable year because of my belief in the ideals and principles for which the Boy Scouts of America stands.

I hope that this resolution will be favorably considered by the House of Representatives and approved.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce a bill to implement provisions of the President's message to the Congress on international education.

This bill would be the International Education Act of 1966.

I support the President in his call for this action because it is consistent with the present administration's objectives, both for educational citizenship within the Nation, and for the Nation's responsible citizenship within a larger world. A world which continues to shrink every day.

We have long been aware of the importance of educating the American public for responsible citizenship in our own country. In a 1957 speech, our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy, whom the people of my city of Tampa loved so much, when he was a Member of the Senate reaffirmed the positive relationship which exists between education and public responsibility.

President Kennedy said every man on the street was a citizen.

Every man was a citizen "who held office"; every citizen held office, as Abraham Lincoln had said, by virtue of the vote and opinion with which he made statutes either possible or impossible to execute.

Moreover, President Kennedy acknowledged how some citizens were slow and shortsighted; but the remedy to provincial opinions, according to Thomas Jefferson, rests not in removing, but in informing the citizen's "discretion and control."

With the demands of responsible citizenship so clearly unavoidable, the then Senator Kennedy said that young Americans ought to be educated for playing an active and informed role in the political affairs of the Nation.

The President of the United States in his February 2 message to the Congress and the American people, suggested that we not limit to our own shores our battle with ignorance and disease. This is the cause, the world task, he pointed out, that we may commit ourselves to by passing the International Education Act of 1966.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, and as one deeply committed tc our fight against poverty and ignorance at home, I wholeheartedly support President Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I introduce today will help to increase the dimensions of American citizenship. This is my hope and my earnest desire.

The single intention of my bill is to strengthen our American educational resources for international studies and research. But, this intention, itself, is based upon other convictions about the purposes of legislation concerning international education. Fundamentally, we are committed to the study of other nations because we believe nations are more inclined to cooperate if they know and understand each other. This seems like commonsense to me.

Furthermore, it is appropriate for the Federal Government of a prosperous Nation to initiate this work among the nations by taking the work upon itself, on one hand, perhaps only to assist the development of resources for international study at home; but, on the other, also to assist the progress of education in the developing nations.

We believe in this country that our citizens should relate to other countries from a position of educational strength. And we also believe in full opportunity for all Americans to acquire the fullest possible knowledge of other nations, peoples, and cultures.

More specifically, the International Education Act of 1966 intends to strengthen American educational resources for international study and research by setting up a grant program under the authority of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Our resources in this area would be strengthened in two ways.

Under section 3 of the act, grants may be made to institutions of higher education in order to establish, strengthen, and operate graduate centers, which will serve as national and international resources, for research and training in international studies. These graduate centers would be free to focus either on specific geographic areas, or on particular issues in international affairs.

Under section 4 of this act, grants would be made to institutions of higher learning to assist them in the planning developing and executing of a comprehensive program to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies. The grants would be used for a variety of activities, such as: facility planning of undergraduate courses; training faculty members in a foreign country; expanding foreign language courses; working in other fields related to international studies; student work-study-travel programs; for visiting faculty of foreign teachers and scholars.

The appealing feature about the assistance given to undergraduate schools is the fact that these grants are made both in an effort toward equitable distribution throughout the States, and with preference given to institutions showing need as well as promise in international studies.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to utilize other governmental services and facilities—section 5. No Federal Department or employee is in any way authorized to exert influence over curriculum, teaching, administration, or personnel of the educational institutions receiving grants—section 6.

The bill authorizes the grant program for the duration of 5 years—section 7. Finally, one section of this bill improves title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended, by expanding the language and area centers' program.

Mr. Speaker, with 4 out of every 10 of the world's adults unable to read or write, with large sections of some countries having an illiteracy rate of 98 percent, a total commitment to the cause of universal learning is no doubt our most constructive instrument of world citizenship.

The New York Times recently ran an outstanding editorial dealing with the subject of international education. I quote:

> Domestic educational strength is indivisible from success overseas. Shortages of highly educated, competent and committed manpower at home will continue to jeopardize the American impact in other lands.

In his message on international education, President Johnson has reminded us of the inescapable connection of learning and freedom. He said men pursued knowledge no matter what the consequences, that the increase of learning was the first work of a nation that wants to be free, that is what this bill would help bring about.

It has been said that "education is power."

It is the power to transform. To change. Through such legislation, I feel the United States will eventually be able to strike a mighty blow against the chains which enslave millions around the globe in misery, ignorance, and disease.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill to establish a National Highway Traffic Safety Agency in the U.S. Department of Commerce. The purpose of this legislation is to attack our country's mounting highway death rate from a national perspective.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman JAMES A. MACKAY, has taken the lead in this fight in the House of Representatives, as today he introduced legislation of this nature. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] and urge quick action on this legislation, for surely it is needed to help stop the terrible carnage on our highways.

Mr. Speaker, 1,284 of our fellow Americans lost their lives on the Christmas and New Year weekends. No, they did not die fighting in South Vietnam. They died right here in the United States of America on our streets and highways.

Traffic accidents cost this Nation a great price. Last year, it has been estimated that some 50,000 individuals lost their lives on our roads and highways. This figure represents a greater number of deaths than this country suffered in the Korean war and is a substantial percentage of our World War II casualties. Besides these shocking figures, total financial loss suffered every year from highway accidents of all types runs up to $9 billion. That is one-fourth of the total expenditures of the United States on all forms of education.

The President of the United States in a speech recently before the American Trial Lawyers Association said the gravest "problem before this Nation—next to the war in Vietnam is the death and destruction" from auto accidents.

The legislation which I introduce today will establish in the Commerce Department a National Highway Traffic Safety Agency and center for research into methods of more effectively attacking this problem which most certainly is a national one.

Through this Agency, national leadership would be available through joint cooperative State and local campaigns and the assistance of the American auto industry so that drastic cuts can be brought about in our staggering highway fatality statistics.

Such an agency in the Commerce Department would give overall direction and assistance to highway safety efforts now made by 16 existing Federal agencies and some 45 private agencies. It is the thought of Congressman MACKAY, and I would agree with him, that such a National Highway Traffic Safety Agency would be to highway safety much as the Federal Aviation Agency is to air traffic safety. This makes a lot of sense to me.

This would be no Federal police force. This would be a fact-finding, research organization which would help our local, State, and other governmental bodies in the formulation of adequate safety requirements for automobiles and driving standards throughout the country. I agree with Congressman MACKAY that this legislation is overdue and needed now. I urge its swift consideration by this Congress.

THE VIETNAM DECISION

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, watching President Johnson make his dramatic announcement about resumption of North Vietnam bomb raids, millions of TV viewers saw in the background the symbolic American eagle, clutching in one set of claws the arrows of war, and in the other the olive branch of peace.

It is perhaps important for us to remember that the eagle looks toward peace—while having all of the arrows of war which he needs at his ready disposal.

Praising the stand taken by this administration, Newsday said that the decision of the President "reflects well on the system and on the man." It adds:

> For the President did not merely resume a military operation; he put fresh impetus into the search for a peaceful conclusion by directing that the Vietnam struggle be brought before the United Nations Security Council.

The newspaper feels that the request demonstrates:

> Two fundamentals of our Vietnam policy: that we will honor our commitments to protect South Vietnam from aggression and that we will seek all means to move the issue from the battlefield to the conference table.

I commend this editorial for the perusal of my colleagues, and with their permission I submit it for the RECORD.

[From Newsday, Feb. 1, 1966]

THE VIETNAM DECISION

Seldom has the loneliness of the man in the White House been more apparent than in the past several weeks. President Johnson's decision to end the 37-day pause in the bombing of North Vietnam was subjected to the harsh discipline of the Presidency and it did not come easily. Many could advise and inform, but the President, ever conscious of his awesome responsibility, had to make the final choice himself. We think his decision reflects well on the system and on the man. For the President did not merely resume a military operation; he put fresh impetus into the search for a peaceful conclusion by directing that the Vietnam struggle be brought before the United Nations Security Council. His request demonstrates anew President Johnson's determination to adhere to the two fundamentals of our Vietnam policy; that we will honor our commitment to protect South Vietnam from aggression and that we will seek all means to move the issue from the battlefield to the conference table.

The President has now forcefully and dramatically answered both the foreign and domestic critics of his Vietnam policy. Hanoi had 37 days to respond favorably to the pause in bombing. But the only response was negative, coupled with a demand for total victory on Hanoi's own terms. Moreover, the U.S. pause in bombing produced only continued Communist infiltration, continued terrorism in South Vietnam, continued insistence on terms utterly detached from reality and, of course, continued invective.

The renewed use of air power in the north again will be controlled, as it had been, with great care and aimed only at military targets. The resumption serves two purposes, one military and the other diplomatic. The military purpose is obvious. The bombing will attempt to destroy the troops and supplies being infiltrated from the north. The diplomatic purpose should be just as obvious. It

is a warning to Hanoi and Peiping that the United States is not prepared to abandon South Vietnam to the Vietcong.

TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL

The decision to bring the Vietnam impasse to the U.N. Security Council is as significant as the decision to resume bombing. During the pause, the quiet diplomacy of President Johnson's peace offensive saw six envoys visit 34 countries. The President is now bringing his case to the world forum in another mode of diplomacy at a moment when the pause in bombing and the President's peace offensive are fresh exhibits before the court of world opinion.

The Security Council, of course, is powerless without great power agreement. The President's initiative in that council, therefore, may not open the door to negotiations. But the Security Council is an organ of the organization that has become the diplomatic home of the neutral nations. Pope Paul VI has suggested that the neutral nations be used to arbitrate the impasse in Vietnam. And yesterday Secretary of State Rusk said the United States would suggest to the Security Council the role that neutral nations could play in opening the way to the conference table. If neutral participation can bring about a solution, the U.N. is the arena in which to seek it.

The move to the U.N. is an expansion of the President's peace offensive. It is another demonstration of the desire of the United States to substitute diplomacy for military action. The bombing is a controlled resumption of the air war; the Security Council initiative is an escalation of the peace effort.

We think the decision represents a wise mixture. The President is entitled to the full support of all Americans.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the request of the President for authority for the United States to participate in the Asian Development Bank should be greeted with quick approval by the Congress.

Under H.R. 12563, our participation is authorized with a share of $100 million in direct capital and an additional $100 million in callable shares. This will be 20 percent of the bank's total capitalization of $1 billion. Our contribution would equal that given by Japan.

This is one of the most creative proposals made for the trouble ridden nations of southeast Asia. It will make possible the building of roads, dams, powerplants, harbors, and other facilities essential to a modern economy. The lack of these facilities has been a major factor in the poverty and tragedy that has made the foment of internal dissension possible.

Just as was the case in the Americas a decade or so ago, the nations of southeast Asia have come to realize that adequate fiscal resources are a basic requirement for peace and prosperity. The ability to transfer these resources to areas of great need has also been lacking. Through the Asian Development Bank this mobility can be achieved and it will bring greater stability and an opportunity to develop the peaceful pursuits within the nations of the entire region.

All of us have felt that more should be done in Vietnam than assist in reestablishing peace. The stability brought about by the Asian Development Bank will do much to meet the needs of Vietnam. Further, it will bring about circumstances that will assist in stemming the spread of Communist ideology. Not only will this help Vietnam, but it will materially lessen for the United States the need for maintaining troop concentrations in Vietnam.

The need for the Asian Development Bank has been demonstrated. I urge my colleagues to give this bill their full support.

THE COST OF HIGHER INTEREST RATES

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, last week President Johnson sent up to Congress his economic report, and presently this report is receiving thorough and careful study by the Joint Economic Committee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN.

Our productive and ever growing economy and the effects that the conflict in Vietnam are causing to it, is reason for intensive study. Our Republican colleagues are demanding great cutbacks in vital domestic programs so as to offset the budgetary requirements for Vietnam. Yet, next to our national defense needs, the item that has grown the most in this budget is the amount paid on our debt.

Due to the tighter money policies of the Federal Reserve and its decision last December to raise the discount rate and regulation Q, the cost of borrowing for both the public and the Government has increased substantially.

A recent editorial by Bob Cronin in the Rural Electric Minuteman, a publication of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, discusses the great increases in our public debt due to higher interest rates. The chairman of our Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas, is quoted in this editorial on the Fed's irresponsible action and their responsibility for the higher costs to the taxpayer. Perhaps if our Republican colleagues would take time to study the effects that higher interest rates have on our economy, they might find that this might be an area to cut back increased spending.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the editorial "The Interest Rate Caper: How It Happened" follow my remarks.

[From the Rural Electric Minuteman, Jan. 28, 1966]

THE INTEREST RATE CAPER: HOW IT HAPPENED

Anyone who doubted the effect that last December's actions by the Federal Reserve Board would have on the Nation's economy will be interested in an item contained in the President's new budget proposal, announced to Congress this week.

This is the estimate of an increase of $654 million in the cost of interest the Federal Government must pay in fiscal 1967 on the national debt. The total interest bill will therefore jump to nearly $13 billion.

A number of seasoned Congressmen and economists trace the huge increase in interest costs directly to the action taken last December by the Federal Reserve Board when it raised the discount rate on loans to member banks and increased the maximum rate the banks may pay on certificates of deposit.

By a curious coincidence, the amount of the estimated increase in the cost of interest charges on the national debt is nearly the amount an NRECA survey found would be needed for the REA electric loan fund in fiscal 1967. Thus, if the Federal Reserve Board had not acted so rashly, this amount of money would have been available without affecting other budgetary demands.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas, whose longtime criticism of the Federal Reserve's high interest, tight money policies has finally stirred up more of his colleagues, had some further comments on the matter this week. Here is what he told Congress, in part, on January 25:

"The interest war is putting a heavy pressure on all Government credit programs. One interest rate leaps over another interest rate and then on and on we go. The consumer, who must ultimately pay all of these increased costs, sits on the sidelines powerless to act in his own behalf.

"It is we, as Members of Congress, who have a solemn duty to provide protection for the public in this vital area. If we fail, we are certain to see pressures for even higher interest rates. And who doubts that the Federal Reserve Board will give in as quickly to these new requests as they did in December.

"The facts are there in black and white. A small number of big banks were holding about $16½ billion in certificates of deposits on December 3 when the Federal Reserve Board acted. The great majority of these certificates were coming due in December, January, February, and March. The banks desperately wanted to hold on to these deposits.

"To do this, the banks had to have higher interest rates. Otherwise, the corporations would have pulled out the funds and invested in other securities which were paying higher interest rates created by the Federal Reserve Board's tight money policies which has been created and continued throughout 1965. For example, 91-day Treasury bills had been pushed above 4½ percent and as a result were becoming more attractive than certificates of deposit.

"So these big banks were desperate to leapfrog the interest rates and thus hang onto the certificates of deposit. Remember, about 75 percent of the $16½-billion of certificates of deposit were being held by just 30 big banks.

"On December 2, the pressure reached the boiling point. That afternoon, the Federal Reserve Banks of New York—at 4:01 p.m.—and Chicago—at 4:20 p.m.—suddenly sent identical telegrams to the Federal Reserve Board in Washington demanding an increase in interest rates. Without question, these two banks were speaking for the huge financial institutions residing in those two cities and who had the great majority of the certificates of deposit.

"With almost automatic reaction to the desires of these two financial centers, the

Federal Reserve Board—within 24 hours—acted in accordance with the identical telegrams."

PATMAN pointed out that the increase in the discount rate represented a hike of 12½ percent in the wholesale cost of money and a probable retail increase—the consumers' cost—of at least 25 percent.

"All of these increases are huge by anyone's mathematics or economics. Imagine the hue and cry if any union or any industry—other than banking—had attempted to raise its prices by a similar percentage. What would this have done to the wage-price guidelines?"

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE DR. PURNENDU KUMAR BANERJEE, MINISTER, EMBASSY OF INDIA, BEFORE THE DELAWARE CHAPTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a significant speech by the Honorable Dr. Purnendu Kumar Banerjee, Minister, Embassy of India, before the Delaware Chapter of the United Nations Association of the United States.

The text of the speech follows:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION YEAR AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(Address by the Honorable Dr. Purnendu Kumar Banerjee, Minister, Embassy of India, Washington, Before the Delaware Chapter of the United Nations Association of the United States of America, Wilmington, Del.)

It is a privilege and a pleasure to address this erudite and august audience. I wish to share with you a few thoughts on an issue which is not esoteric but inspiring—the International Cooperation Year and the United Nations. You may recall that this concept was originally propounded by the late Indian Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, when he addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1961. In emphasizing the need for promoting the cause of cooperation, he said: "We live in a world of conflict and yet the world goes on, undoubtedly because of the cooperation of nations and individuals * * * even today, between countries which are opposed to each other in the political and other fields, there is a vast amount of cooperation. Little is known or little is said about this cooperation that is going on and a great deal is said about every point of conflict, and so the world is full of this idea that the conflicts go on and we live on the verge of disaster. Perhaps, it would be a truer picture if the cooperating elements in the world today were put forward and we were made to think that the world depends on cooperation and not on conflict."

The United Nations commended this proposition. In declaring 1965 as the International Cooperation Year, the General Assembly accepted "wider and more intensive international cooperation" as one of the most "effective means of dispensing international tensions." President Johnson, while proclaiming the International Cooperation Year, went further to add that it is "not an idea nor an ideal. We think it is a clear necessity for our survival. The greater the nation, the greater is its need to work cooperatively with other people, with other countries, with other nations."

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri also underlined the need for united effort and emphasized that international cooperation is the only means "to rid the world of the ancient ills of hunger, ignorance, and disease, of the new terror of the nuclear holocaust." This concurrence of views, on the International Cooperation Year, is based on a conviction that cooperation is not a corollary but the core of coexistence, which is the only alternative to coextinction.

The conceptual framework that focuses our viewpoint to cooperation rests on the premise that there is a clear need for shifting the positive factors in the life of the world community and placing them prominently on a pedestal. In other words, mankind could profitably stress that which is common rather than uncommon, what unites us rather than what divides us. This would be possible if we accept and applaud the existing and emerging international community and uphold the need for tolerance.

To take the latter first, the idea of tolerance based on mutual respect comes to Indians quite naturally. From Budda to Gandhi, the idea of cooperation and coexistence has permeated our ethos and has formed a powerful link in forging the unity of India. India too, like the United States, is a land of diversity. It has developed a multiracial and multireligious society. More by choice than by compulsion, India, has nourished and nurtured through centuries a composite culture wherein differing ideas and ideologies could live together peacefully. It is no wonder, as Arnold Toynbee described, that "the Indian missionaries of an Indian philosophy, Buddhism, were the first people in history to think and feel in terms of human race as a whole. They felt a concern for all their fellow human beings; they had a vision of mankind as being potentially a single family and they set themselves to turn this potential unity into an accomplished fact by peaceful persuasion."

Wisdom, not sword, was their weapon. They believed, like the Indian Emperor Asoka, in the great principle that "concord alone is meritorious." This idea has always acted as a beacon to the Indian people.

Though this concept of unity of humanity has been with us almost since the dawn of history, it received public acclaim only 20 years ago. The Charter of the United Nations opens with the most significant phrase "We the peoples of the United Nations * * *." The charter was not a document negotiated by "The high contracting parties." It must be admitted that along with the charter, the concept of world community gained belated recognition. There was in 1945, a great concern that we were already too late in dismantling the walls that vertically divided the world based on unbridled and uncompromising territorial sovereignty. Before long, this oneness of humanity became a historic and political fact.

A million factors have made this possible. Primarily, science and technology were making the nations interdependent and interconnected irrespective of their political attitude. The liquidation of distance has altered the rhythm of life. Science has broken the artificial barriers. Art and culture have come to be common links between peoples and nations. The isolated existence of human groups has become outdated and even impossible. The tools, ideas and media of communications available to man have generated a historical process that has unified the world.

In many matters of our daily life, there is a direct impact of cooperation through international organizations such as the World Meteorological Organization, which has established a worldwide weather reporting system; the International Atomic Energy Agency, which oversees the peaceful use of atomic energy; the aerial navigation supervised by the International Civil Aviation Organization; the frequency allocations of broadcasts controlled by the International Communication Union; and the maritime regulations instituted by the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization—to mention a few. The United States, for example, participates in more than 600 international conferences annually and has nearly 4,300 treaties and agreements to honor. It is, therefore, dangerous and harmful to seek to split this technologically and sociologically unified world into isolated compartments of the past. As Whyte (in his book "The Next Development of Man") put it, "the separation of East and West is over, and a new history opens rich in quality and majestic in scale."

It is in this world that the dynamic and vital institution—the United Nations—was born. The war-weary world sought solace in the idea of collective security based on consent, if possible or moral suasion where necessary. The organs of the United Nations naturally reflected the power patterns of the time. The instruments of persuasion and compromise were delegated to the General Assembly and those of collective action to the Security Council. This latter body is presided over by the great powers, who demonstrate their insignia of might—the veto. This split personality of the United Nations has been corrected, at the initiative of the United States, through the uniting-for-peace resolution, which gave cohesion to the parliamentary diplomacy of the General Assembly.

Though the democratic ideology has penetrated its very core, the United Nations is still not perfect. But the desideratum of the United Nations is only a reflection of the imperfections of the constituent members. The General Assembly is often painted as a body of dialog and debate, but not yet the parliament of man. For the United Nations can only recommend and not command. The resolutions of the United Nations have no legal sanction. At best the members could treat them as obiter dicta, at worst as pious pleas to be conveniently allowed to rust.

There is another school of thought. Some jurists maintain that the U.N. resolutions have validity in international law, which is essentially based or moral sanctions. Though they have no binding authority, the decisions of the United Nations have only the authority that is conferred upon them by virtue of the fact that they represent the conscience of world opinion. Such decisions may have considerable moral and popular pressure behind them. An eminent jurist, Justice Lauterpatcht of the International Court of Justice, supports this view. On the issue of southwest Africa, he remarked: "It would be wholly inconsistent with the sound principles of interpretation as well as with the highest international interest, which can never be legally irrelevant, to reduce the value of the resolutions of the General Assembly—one of the principal instrumentalities of the formation of the collective will and the judgment of the community of nations—and to treat them, for the purpose of this opinion or otherwise, as nominal, insignificant and having no claim to influence the conduct of the members. International interests demand that no judicial support, however indirect, be given to any such conception of the resolutions of the General Assembly as being of no consequence."

Those of us who aspire to bring about a world order based on respect for the rule of law can appreciate this position.

Besides, there is also a controversy on the connotation of the charter. Some consider it to be a static conference machinery while others conceive it as a dynamic instrument of governments. These conflicting interpretations have naturally influenced the effectiveness of the United Nations. Nonetheless, the achievements of the United Nations are impressive. Twenty years is but a rip-

ple on the vast expanse of the restless ocean of time. The United Nations has, on several occasions, substituted reason for unreason and has mended again and again the frail fabric of peace. It has sought to blunt the edges of conflict, not to sharpen them. The United Nations, through the diplomacy of reconciliation, served the aspirations of its members as embodied in the charter. "Conflicts may still persist for long periods without an agreed solution and groups of states may actively defend special and regional interests. Nevertheless, and in spite of temporary developments in the opposite direction under the influence of acute tension, the tendency in the United Nations is to wear away or to break down differences, thus helping toward solutions which approach the common interest and application of the principles of the charter." The United Nations has been more than a safety valve for political tensions, it has also been a school of political responsibility. The debilitating cold war issues, that too often intrude into its deliberations, have aided, rather than adversely affected, the political maturity of the United Nations.

Let me illustrate this. The case of Kashmir offers us an example. In 1947, when India and Pakistan were politically divided, the state of Jammu and Kashmir, did not join either of them. The ruler, however, entered into a standstill agreement with Pakistan to insure his supplies. Having signed the agreement, Pakistan began to twist her arm by economic sanctions and sent armed Pakistanis into Kashmir on October 22, 1947. Pillaging as they advanced, they reached Srinagar, the capital. Since Pakistan disclaimed any responsibility and declared her inability to control her citizens, the ruler of Kashmir was compelled to appeal to India for help. India refused to enter his state unless the ruler signs the instrument of accession as provided for under the Indian Independence Act 1947. Once the ruler signed the instrument on October 26, 1947, like all other 563 states, Indian troops flew into Srinagar on October 27, 1947, just in time to save the capital. The Government of India, then, had the support of the largest political party of Kashmir—the National Conference.

As we were driving the raiders out, Pakistan sent her regular troops into Kashmir without overtly admitting it. Indian forces continued to advance. But as one of the founding members of the United Nations, India complained to the Security Council about the Pakistani aggression in Kashmir. The Security Council accepted the Indian position and passed a resolution in three parts:

Part I demanded that both sides should cease-fire and "refrain from taking any measures that might augment the military potential."

Part II insisted that "as the presence of troops of Pakistan in the territory * * * constitutes a material change in the situation since it was reported by the Government of Pakistan before the Security Council, the Government of Pakistan agrees to withdraw its troops from the state." The resolution went on to state that "when the Commission shall have notified the Government of India that the tribesmen and Pakistani nationals * * * have withdrawn, thereby terminating the situation."

Part III: the two Governments "reaffirmed their wish that the future status shall be determined in accordance with the will of the people.

Both India and Pakistan ceased fighting on January 1, 1949. Pakistan soon altered the situation. She brought about a material change in the situation by "augmenting military potential" by joining military pacts and refused to comply with the requirements of part II of the resolution. It is but natural that the U.N. could not put the cart before the horse by implementing part III of the resolution. To Pakistan, the resolutions of the U.N. are like Curate's egg, good in parts. She wants the U.N. to ignore those parts which are inconvenient to her.

India, on the contrary, sought to meet her conditional commitment even when the conditions were not fulfilled. She held three general elections in India, including Kashmir. With the passage of time, the situation on the subcontinent has changed materially. Mr. Gunnar Jarring, the Swedish U.N. mediator, spoke of the changing power patterns in south Asia. Many of you are, perhaps, unaware that 84,000 square miles of Kashmir are in possession of three powers. India has 36,000 square miles, Pakistan 31,000 square miles and China 17,000 square miles. China grabbed 14,000 square miles from India by deceit and force and Pakistan made a gift of 3,000 square miles, obviously the price of political support. It is clear that the doctrine of Rebus sic stantibus is applicable to Kashmir because of essential change in the circumstances.

Emboldened by the military material collected by her, encouraged by China, Pakistan once again, gave a repeat performance on August 5, 1965. As in 1947, she sent armed infiltrators and denied any responsibility. The U.N. observer team found enough evidence to charge Pakistan with complicity and the American journalists who toured Kashmir filed reports denying any internal uprising. Pakistan, thus, completely shattered the old cease-fire line and rendered obsolete the earlier resolutions. In her attempt to stop the guerrillas, India had to fight and make it clear to her neighbor that India is willing to "pay any price, bear any burden and oppose any foe" to insure her survival and her democratic ideology. The United Nations has, once again, with our full cooperation, played a prominent role in bringing about a cease-fire. As in 1947, Pakistan has again refused to withdraw her armed personnel from the Indian territory, as demanded by the Security Council on September 20, 1965. Nevertheless, there is a cease-fire in operation and in the light of this achievement, the fighting on the subcontinent is but a receding wave in furthering the cause of the charter.

The United Nations, as the late Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold thought, could become an instrument "for the lessening of distrust and misunderstanding, and for the discovery and delineation of new areas of common ground and interest * * *. Conference diplomacy may usefully be supplemented by more quiet diplomacy within the United Nations." The charter has yet to be fully explored and applied to changing needs of the world community. Factionalism, that ubiquitous mate of mankind, within the General Assembly has persistently sought to serve particular interests. It must, however, be said to the credit of that body that it has consistently resisted such pressures and proved that it is nobody's tool.

Besides, the United Nations has displayed a tremendous capacity to adapt and adjust itself to the changing needs of the world community. The membership of the United Nations has increased from 51 in 1945 to 117 in 1965. That the new nations have accepted the precepts of the charter without demur only shows the resilience of the charter. Without any basic changes, the United Nations has been able to increase the membership of both the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council to 15 and 27 respectively This political accommodation of the new nations is a commendable achievement and has gone a long way in the further democratization of the United Nations.

But, the equality assured to all Member States grants them equality of opportunity to voice their views and not equal right to participate in the process of decision-making, which takes cognizance of the power reality. It is noteworthy that every new nation rushes to seek U.N. membership and often considers its statehood incomplete without it. The membership of the United Nations has also powerfully aided the new nations to resist outside domination. By keeping the peace in local conflicts, the United Nations has increased the options open to policymakers. In bringing about a peaceful change in the colonial world, the actions of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations have been exemplary. No one has challenged the charter as a legal basis for the eradication of colonialism. This fact demonstrates the wisdom of the full recognition given to nationalism and national aspirations as laid down in the charter. Never has national independence been stronger in the world or gained greater peaceful victories than since the birth of the United Nations. The United Nations, therefore, remains in the felicitous words of President Johnson, "the best instrument yet devised to promote the peace of the world."

No account of the role of the United Nations in furthering the cause of international cooperation, is complete without mention of the splendid contribution of the functional organizations. The political activity of the United Nations is only a part of its functions.

There are 15 functional organizations, which also silently serve the world community. Their work is unspectacular and unsensational. To a publicist, who follows the dictum no blood, no news, they are not always newsworthy. We hardly ever hear of the Universal Postal Union which helps to keep our international mail moving at the fantastically low cost of $330,000 a year. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which strives to build defenses of peace in the minds of men by collaborating "in the work of advancing the mutual knowledge and understanding of peoples"; the International Labor Organization which seeks to establish social justice; the Food and Agriculture Organization which endeavors to promote common welfare by raising levels of nutrition and standard of living of peoples; the Economic Commissions of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which seek to organize the available resources and eschew waste and redundance, receive only the passing glances of the men managing mass media. Some of these organizations serve us so gently and so quietly, we are not likely to recognize their worth until we lose them.

In the short span of two decades, the United Nations has created a range of international functional organizations, which are known for their variety and versatility. They survey our resources, distribute food, improve agriculture, purify water, take care of the children, control disease, train technicians and also engage in research, planning, programing, investing, teaching and administration of myriad projects all over the globe. These activities cost nearly $350 million a year as compared to $116 million spent for political pursuits of the United Nations. It can hardly be denied that their achievements exceed their frustrations.

The goals of the functional organizations are modest and moderate. They take the world as it is. "No fundamental political reforms are needed; no value systems have to be altered; no ideologies have to be seriously compromised." The limitation of their purpose enable them to scale the wall of sovereignty. Besides, national independence is not compromised when a state volunteers to surrender a part of its sovereignty. No nation is compelled to avail itself of their service. All participants generally share the profit of their work. Donors do not complain as they are given a voice in the formation of policy commensurate with their contribution. This quiet intertwining of nations, it is hoped, will bring them closer and make it increasingly difficult for them to resort to

arms to settle their differences. They have, I submit, created a world community with a common destiny. This is the most important silent and peaceful revolution of our time.

Further in those areas of the world where poverty is still an inseparable condition of life, the task of technical assistance along with capital investment is to hasten the industrialization. Their contribution cannot be measured in terms of material benefits and political triumph alone. For technical assistance has become a self-propelling institution. The recipients are also donors.

As a matter of fact it has enhanced the dignity and self-respect of every nation. India, for example, receives and renders technical assistance. Professors, economists, engineers, and other experts go to India and many Indians go out to many countries. There are hundreds of Indian professors teaching on American campuses; and a similar number of Americans are teaching in India. This exchange has helped, to a large degree, in fighting the age-old prejudices born out of ignorance. There is a new dimension, a new purpose and I may say, a new hope around the globe today. This is a novel and much needed development of a catalytic agent in human relations.

We dare not erode this achievement. Further progress is possible only if we make a sustained effort to maintain peace. Unfortunately, "peace and freedom are not free." The age of nationalism is dying, but not dead. There are still some nations who believe in game politics. To them international relations is a zero-sum game in which loss to one is gain to the other. Today the world has 20 million men under arms and military budgets run to $120 billion. War, that uncorrected obsolescence, is still with us. We have changed our minds on duels and slavery. Given time, the patience and perseverance, we could also allow that organized engine of violence—war—to wither way.

This is not a utopian dream. This is a practical necessity. In this nuclear age, to wage war and survive is impossible. Circumstances command that war be banished as an instrument of policy. That can be achieved if all, and I repeat all, members of the comity of nations accept and adhere to the principles of the charter. Every state has to fulfill this requirement; for a single rotten fish could pollute the pond. A single nation could destroy our dream of a peaceful world. The resistance to aggression is no less inevitable today than it was 25 years ago. But obstacles could also be our opportunity. "Our problems," as President Kennedy eloquently put it, "are man made and therefore can be solved by man. And man can be big as he wants. No problem of human destiny is beyond the reach of human beings."

Each one of us can and must contribute to the success of the International Cooperation Year by trying to learn (and unlearn) more about each other. For silent suffering evokes no response. We have to act. We must recognize that diversity is the law of life. As the Indian President, Dr. Radhakrishnan put it, "We cannot conceive a world without national differences, without cultural variety and artistic wealth. To a world which is being standardized, variety of cultures imparts beauty and creativeness." Let us seek unity through fraternity and set aside fratricide. In international relations, as elsewhere, the better is the enemy of good. Let us together seek a better world enlightened by knowledge, guided by reason and animated love.

This has been the hungry hope of man from time immemorial. One of the earliest Indian scriptures known to man 3,500 years ago, Rig Veda enjoins us: "Meet together, talk together. May your minds comprehend alike: common be your action and achievement; common be your thoughts and intentions; common be the wishes of your hearts * * * so there may be thorough union among you." (Rigveda (X, 191).)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HICKS, for February 8, on account of official business.

Mr. FOLEY, for February 8, on account of official business.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska (at the requests of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), from February 3 through February 25, on account of illness.

Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. ELLSWORTH (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. DOWDY (at the request of Mr. TEAGUE of Texas), for today, and balance of the week, on account of death in family.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the week of February 7, 1966, on account of official business.

Mr. BERRY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through February 15, 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. RESNICK, for 60 minutes, Wednesday, February 9; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CONTE, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 1 hour, on Wednesday, February 9, 1966.

Mr. MCDOWELL (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for 30 minutes, on February 8; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for 30 minutes, on February 8; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 25 minutes, on Wednesday, February 9, 1966.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 60 minutes, on Tuesday, February 15, 1966.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. REES.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. DADDARIO.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include an address by Congressman KIRWAN.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KREBS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. TENZER.

Mr. PURCELL.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 30. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 8, 1966, 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:

2000. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report of Federal plan for meteorological services and supporting research for fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87-843; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2001. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2002. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of a review of Federal financial participation in the costs of prescribed drugs for welfare recipients in the State of Pennsylvania, the Welfare Administration, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2003. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of a survey of research management functions, Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories, Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2004. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1965 annual report of cooperative water resources research and training, pursuant to the provisions of 78 Stat. 329; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2005. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, as well as a list of persons involved, pursuant to the provisions

of section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2006. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens, together with the names of the aliens covered, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2007. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2008. A letter from the Secretary, the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a report that sufficient funds have been received for the construction of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–874; to the Committee on Public Works.

2009. A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 552. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the chartering by act of Congress of the Boy Scouts of America; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1259). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 12563. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank; without amendment (Rept. No. 1267). 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. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1903. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons; with amendments (Rept. No. 1260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10994. A bill for the relief of Charles T. Davis, Jr., Sallie M. Davis, and Nora D. White; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11271. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of Defense at the Granite City Defense Depot, Granite City, Ill.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5552. A bill for the relief of David B. Glidden; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6663. A bill for the relief of Dean P. Bartelt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6665. A bill for the relief of Ronald Poirier, a minor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8937. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Turner; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 12583. A bill to authorize the waiver of collection of certain erroneous payments made by the Federal Government to certain civilian and military personnel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 12584. A bill to provide for the expansion of the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 12585. A bill to extend the period during which amounts transferred from the employment security administration account in the unemployment trust fund to State accounts may be used by the States for payment of expenses of administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 12586. A bill to amend section 5(1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide benefits for children of deceased railroad employees who are over the age of 18 and below the age of 22 and are attending an educational institution as full-time students; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 12587. A bill to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 12588. A bill to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 12589. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the income of a veteran's spouse who is 70 years of age or older shall not be considered in determining the veteran's eligibility for pension under section 521 of that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R.12590. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the position of Chief Veterinary Officer of the Service and provide for the rank of Assistant Surgeon General for said position; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 12591. A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 12592. A bill to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12593. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 12594. A bill to amend the act of October 3, 1965 (Public Law 89–236); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12595. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12596. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 12597. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 12598. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the 12th World Jamboree and Conference of Boy Scouts to be held in the United States of America in 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12599. A bill to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 12600. A bill to provide overtime pay for substitute postal employees for hours worked in excess of 8 hours in any single day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 12601. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the loan provisions relating to directors, members of the supervisory committee, and members of the credit committee of Federal credit unions, to increase the unsecured loan limit that a member can borrow from a Federal credit union, to require each Federal credit union to establish an education committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12602. A bill to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal- or State-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 12603. A bill to correct certain inequities and relieve certain liabilities arising out of overpayments of compensation to Government employees as a result of administrative error in the application of certain provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964, and other provisions of law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12604. A bill to provide a retroactive effective date of July 1, 1965, for the severance pay provisions in section 9 of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965 so as to extend the application of such provisions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 12605. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 12606. A bill to amend the House Employees Position Classification Act to revise and improve the classification system for certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 12607. A bill to enhance the benefits of service in the Armed Forces of the United

States and further extend the benefits of higher education by providing a broad program of educational benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and certain members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 12608. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 12609. A bill to enable cottongrowers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research and promotion to improve the competitive position of, and to expand markets for, cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 12610. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a comprehensive program of scientific and engineering research, experiments, tests, and operations for increasing the yield of water from atmospheric sources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 12611. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 12612. A bill to increase educational opportunities throughout the Nation by providing grants for the construction of elementary and secondary schools and supplemental educational centers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 12613. A bill to enhance the benefits of service in the Armed Forces of the United States and further extend the benefits of higher education by providing a broad program of educational benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and certain members of the Armed Forces; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 12614. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to eliminate certain requirements for the furnishing of nursing home care in the case of veterans hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration in Alaska, Hawaii, or the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 12615. A bill to amend sections 404(d) and 408 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize members of the uniformed services to be reimbursed under certain circumstances for the actual cost of parking fees, ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12616. A bill to amend chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize a dislocation allowance for travel performed under orders that are later canceled, revoked, or modified; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12617. A bill to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 12618. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for certain dependent parents of individuals entitled to old-age or disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 12619. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 12620. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease surplus land to the county of Orange for fair market value and to permit a credit against rental payments thereunder for the amortized cost of a county-constructed bypass channel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12621. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12622. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax to offset losses of retired pay sustained by certain individuals who retired from the Armed Forces before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 12623. 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. BATES:

H.R. 12624. A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 12625. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 12626. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 12627. A bill to amend the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, to permit the Commission to require the carriers in the offshore domestic trade to keep uniform accounts and permit Commission representatives to inspect the accounts and records of such carriers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 12628. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 12629. A bill to enhance the benefits of service in the Armed Forces of the United States and further extend the benefits of higher education by providing a broad program of educational benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and certain members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 12630. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 26, 1934, to authorize the overprinting of certain of such stamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 12631. A bill to amend section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit further Federal use and donation of exchange sale property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 12632. A bill to authorize financial assistance to certain State programs for the development of safer automobiles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.J. Res. 823. Joint resolution to require that reports on imports into the United States include the landed value of articles imported, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 824. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to modernize, coordinate, and foster passenger rail transportation within the area of such States and authorizing the multistate authority to request the President of the United States to enter into negotiations with the Government of Mexico to secure its participation with such authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 573. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 574. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to direct negotiations between the Arab host countries and Israel on the resolution of the Palestine refugee problem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. Con. Res. 575. Concurrent resolution to extend the greetings and felicitations of the Congress to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the granting of its charter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H. Con. Res. 576. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States in the International Convention Relating to International Exhibitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALL:

H. Con. Res. 577. Concurrent resolution providing support for the international jamboree of Boy Scouts in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 578. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all foreign aid be suspended to countries maintaining diplomatic or trade relations with North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Con. Res. 579. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 973 on river and harbor, beach erosion, flood control projects, and water supply of the Committee on Public Works; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 580. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on H.R. 6991, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 712. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. Res. 713. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 112; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Res. 714. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 84; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H. Res. 715. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Com-

mittee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 716. Resolution to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 133; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 717. Resolution to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 133; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 718. Resolution providing additional funds for further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 68, 89th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H. Res. 719. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BELL:

H. Res. 721. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Government Operations to conduct an investigation and study of the administration of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Res. 722. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Committee Print No. 1 of the Committee on Public Works on section-by-section analysis of H.R. 4, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1955, and differences between H.R. 4 (89th Cong.) and H.R. 11946 (88th Cong.), as reported to the House of Representatives, and S. 2782 (88th Cong.), as passed by the Senate; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 723. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 539 by the Committee on Public Works on the Public Works and Economic Developments Act of 1965; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 724. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings by the Committee on Public Works on the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Res. 725. Resolution authorizing a Representative in Congress who is a member of a certain committee to designate one of his employees to be cleared for access to classified information available to the Representative in his capacity as a member of such committee; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

391. By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of the West Virginia Legislature, conveying its displeasure at the action taken by the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, concerning the importation of residual oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

392. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to an investigation of the cancellation and discontinuance of contracts for the transportation of mails by railroads, and conditions resulting therefrom; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

393. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, transmitting a copy of the joint resolution passed on January 24, 1966, relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

394. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the condemnation proceedings now pending against landowners who have lost acreage to the floodwaters of Big Bend Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

395. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, transmitting a copy of House Joint Resolution 1, passed on January 20, 1966, relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 12633. A bill for the relief of Calogera Tranchina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 12634. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vivencio P. Baitan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 12635. A bill for the relief of George Marinakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 12636. A bill for the relief of Sai Shun Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12637. A bill for the relief of Chu Yan Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 12638. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Velina D. Lambert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 12639. A bill for the relief of Fred W. Kolb, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 12640. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands on Hog Island in Northampton County, Va., to the individuals who originally donated the land to the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 12641. A bill for the relief of Specialty Paper Products, Inc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 12642. A bill for the relief of Romeo A. Quiniquini and his wife, Milagros Y. Quiniquini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 12643. A bill for the relief of Yuen Kum Wing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12644. A bill for the relief of Marianna and Francesco Turco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.

H.R. 12645. A bill for the relief of Jean Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12646. A bill for the relief of Elenita Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 12647. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Michelon and his wife, Gibriella Michelon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 12648. A bill for the relief of Cecil Dominique and his wife, Psyche Dominique; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

322. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to urban renewal; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

323. Also, petition of the city of Chicago, Ill., relative to expressing approval of the programs promulgated by President Johnson in his state of the Union address; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Nuclear Nonproliferation Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have issued the following communication to the House GOP conference today which may be of interest to others:

From: Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Chairman, Committee on Nuclear Affairs.

To: House GOP conference.

Subject: Senate Resolution 179, urging negotiation of a nonproliferation treaty.

Tomorrow the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will take testimony from Secretary of State Dean Rusk on Senate Resolution 179 and companion bills in both Houses which urge the negotiation of a treaty banning the spread of nuclear weapons. Negotiations toward this end currently are going on in Geneva at the 17-Nation Disarmament Conference.

Present members of the "Nuclear Club" in order of seniority are the United States, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., France and Red China. Sidewalk estimators claim 10 to 20 more countries could achieve nuclear weapons if they want to spend the money to do so. The most frequently mentioned candidates for membership are India, Israel and the United Arab Republic. The Russians also talk much about their dread of West Germany getting "the bomb" even though it does not appear to be doing anything about it.

Senate Resolution 179 undoubtedly will pass. It is doubtful the JCAE can find any persuasive witnesses favoring the spread of A-bombs and H-bombs. Politically being pro-proliferation is about the same as being pro-sin and antimotherhood. Therefore passing the resolution will be something of a pious platitude.

It could achieve significance, however, if it is amended as follows:

1. To recommend that the non-proliferation agreement be accomplished by amendment of the existing Limited Test Ban Treaty; and

2. To recommend that the Limited Test Ban Treaty be further amended at the same time to permit the peaceful use of nuclear explosives.

Present terms of the Limited Test Ban Treaty make these uses practically impossible. The United States has a real need to dig a second "Panama Canal" and using nuclear excavating techniques will make the second canal economically feasible. We will have other projects requiring these techniques, so will many other countries even including the U.S.S.R.