

In only one way does the city subsidize him and that is with a subway ride for 15 cents which costs the city much more. I favor an increase in subway fare to 25 cents rather than any form of tax upon suburban residents. It is the fairest way to collect needed revenues. Just stop giving something away below cost. New York City residents should want to stop subsidizing each subway rider from out of New York City by giving him a ride which costs more than a quarter for only 15 cents.

By taking this step, the mayor of the city of New York will be taking a step in the right direction. The commuter or nonresident income tax would be a grave mistake. It will result in a loss

to the city of New York of a great many service businesses and other small business which could operate out of the suburbs where their proprietors live.

On Sunday, March 27, 1966, the New York Times reported that New York City Investigations Commissioner, Arnold G. Fraimon stated that the city was losing about \$9 million a year and the State of New York about \$22.5 million a year as a result of interstate shipments of cigarettes to avoid the tax. The New York State tax is 10 cents a pack and the New York City tax is 4 cents a pack.

The legislation which I have introduced today would help bring about an increase in New York State's revenues of approximately \$22.5 million and about

\$9 million to the city. In view of the difficulty in estimating the loss of revenue due to illegal operations resulting from cigarette bootlegging, this figure may be considerably higher. By plugging up such tax leaks and through an increased transit fare, if necessary, we can bring financial help to the city without a nonresidents and commuters tax.

This legislation will also help other States and municipalities to collect their just share of taxes levied on cigarettes. Where State and local legislation is required to effectively implement the proposed amendment to the Jenkins Act, it is expected that it will be forthcoming to the end that smuggling and bootlegging of cigarettes may be stopped.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Victor S. Koontz, First Christian Church, Disciples of Christ, Hooversville, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Fountainhead of all wisdom, Creator of all existence, Author of life, and Preserver of peace, grant this day the visitation of Thy Holy Spirit upon the deliberations of this body as it seeks to unite our great Nation in the common good for all.

Give to each legislator wisdom and harmony in cooperating with and in the support of the interests of Thy people at home and abroad. May the actions of this assembly today become the will of God, the consent of the governed, and the choice of all who seek freedom.

Bless every effort expended toward the causes of man's questing for truth, justice, and peace with all others whom Thou hast fashioned after Thyself. Through Jesus, the Christ, our Lord, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee on mines and mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXPORT-CONTROL ORDER ON HIDES

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago eight Members of the House joined in a request to three of the major committees of this body to investigate certain aspects of the recent export-control order on hides. Our request followed information which was supplied to us by the Secretary of Commerce in a meeting in the office of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] that the price on military shoes was expected to go up or was already up about \$1.75 a pair notwithstanding what they thought was a commitment by shoe manufacturers to hold the price of shoes down if they were able to get controls on exports of hides.

Since that time the Washington Star on March 29 has announced a 4½-percent price increase by two major shoe companies in St. Louis.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] has also received information from the Defense Supply Agency that the price for low-quarter shoes to the Army is going up from \$5.75 to \$8.75 on July 1, 1966, an increase of more than 50 percent in the price of low-quarter military shoes.

Now very obviously there needs to be an investigation of what appears to be war profiteering by some shoe companies, especially in view of the export-control orders which were placed on hides. I think the export-control orders should be terminated without delay and I think the shoe companies should be brought before the proper congressional committee and a thorough investigation conducted.

WHY SAVE HAIPHONG?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, not very long ago I made the statement on my own responsibility that there was on the high seas a Soviet ship which I conjectured was headed for Haiphong.

In order to keep the American people properly informed I would like to report to the House—and the American people—

the fact that the Soviet ship *Sovetsk* arrived in Haiphong Harbor at 1:35 p.m., Saigon time, on March 23, or 10:35 a.m., March 24, Washington time.

This ship—I am reliably informed—is reportedly carrying 2 MI-6 Soviet helicopters.

These helicopters are reportedly the largest in the world, and have a lift and carrying capacity far in excess of anything we possess.

I saw them at the Paris Air Show last year.

They are big—and they are reportedly efficient.

If my information is correct, their delivery to the North Vietnamese—through Haiphong Harbor—and the courtesy of the sanctuary we have so far provided—will improve the supply situation of the Vietcong by a very considerable amount.

I continue to ask the question, "Why save Haiphong? Why save Haiphong?"

PLEASE—NO BULLETS FROM OUR FRIENDS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, our Government does not control the policies of the West German Government. Nevertheless, I hope that strong representations are being made to the West Germans against their plans to help build a steel mill in Red China. It should be very plain that the Red Chinese Government is a belligerent one, which is agitating the conflict in South Vietnam. It is known that the Red Chinese are the principal source of weapons and ammunitions which are being used by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese against our forces there. It is also known that Red Chinese labor forces in numbers estimated at 20,000 to 35,000 are in North Vietnam, helping to build, maintain, and repair roads, railroads, and bridges, which keep open the supply lines and troop routes to South Vietnam for the Communist forces.

A steel mill in Red China will certainly contribute to the economic strength of that nation and directly or

indirectly to Red China's ability to provide weapons of war. It is very likely that American dollars spent for the development of West Germany would also contribute to build the steel mill in Red China. There is equal likelihood that such a steel mill would provide bullets to kill Americans in South Vietnam, or it would free other facilities to do so. It is not in any sense, in the best interest of the free world for this mill to be built. There is even less reason for a leading nation in the free world forces to make construction of the mill possible.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday, April 2, 1966, to file a report on H.R. 14025, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE ALBERT THOMAS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, at its meeting on March 25 the Committee on Appropriations adopted a set of resolutions memorializing the life and service of our late beloved colleague, the Honorable Albert Thomas, of Texas. I insert a copy of the resolutions in the RECORD at this point so that they may be included in the permanent compilation of eulogies on our departed colleague.

A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS CONCERNING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF THE LATE HONORABLE ALBERT THOMAS OF TEXAS

Whereas on the morning of Tuesday, the 15th of February 1966, the Honorable Albert Thomas of Texas, in his 30th consecutive year as a Member of the House of Representatives in the service of his country, crossed the great threshold in response to a call from his Maker; and

Whereas for more than a quarter of a century Congressman Albert Thomas served diligently and faithfully as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, providing outstanding service in the administration of the budgetary and appropriation processes of the Nation, accumulating a fund of knowledge about the operations of the agencies and departments of Government; and

Whereas Congressman Albert Thomas, combining this vast fund of knowledge with gifts of persuasion and great courage, was a tireless and talented legislator, an effective leader, who with force of character tempered by a just spirit of mind and heart, walked the corridors of power nobly; and

Whereas in the words of the late President Kennedy, Congressman Albert Thomas was characterized as a statesman with "a

young man's interest in the future and a young man's hope for his country" who not only represented his district with distinction but also served well the United States; and

Whereas in the words of President Johnson, "of the qualities that made Albert Thomas a remarkable man, devotion to the people he served and loyalty to his friends stand higher than all": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Committee on Appropriations, recognize that in the passing of our colleague, Albert Thomas, we have lost a courageous leader and beloved friend; and be it further

Resolved, That we extend our deepest sympathy to his wife and other members of his family; and, therefore, be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be entered in the journal of this committee, a copy sent to Mrs. Thomas, and that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations arrange to include a copy of these resolutions in the ceremonial proceedings of the House of Representatives.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the 25th day of April 1966, which is equivalent to the 5th day of Iyar in the Hebrew calendar, the State of Israel will celebrate its 18th year of independence. I intend to ask for a special order on that day—I am sure that many of our colleagues will desire to extend their greetings and felicitations to this new State, the bastion of democracy in the Middle East. I welcome their participation in my special order on April 25.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until midnight Friday, April 1, to file a report on H.R. 7406.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WAR PROFITEERING IN THE SHOE INDUSTRY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I joined with eight other Members of the House in a bipartisan appeal for an inquiry into the war profiteering that seems to exist in the shoe industry. Many of us in livestock areas have been shocked at the imposition of hide quotas by the Department of Commerce which are damaging greatly the economic stability of the livestock industry, which will cause an increase in the price of meat to the

housewife, and which also harms our balance-of-payments position in the world.

In light of the Secretary of Commerce's supposed encouragement for American businessmen to seek cash export markets, we are at a loss to determine the reason for this arbitrary order. We had a conference with the Secretary and a number of individuals from the Department of Commerce last Monday, and the major reason they gave for this hide export quota was the fact that the price of military footwear had gone up approximately \$1.75 per pair during the 7-month period from August 1965 to March 1966. They went from approximately \$6.25 to \$8 per pair. Information we have just received indicates that the price increase was even greater than the one the Secretary mentioned—all contrasting to approximately a 5-percent increase for civilian footwear for the same period of time.

Few Members of this House have any time for those who would profiteer in war and if this profiteering is the reason for the hide export order, certainly both the profiteering and the export order should be stopped immediately. I am happy to join my friend and colleague, Ed EDMONDSON, in calling this serious matter to the attention of the House.

BOYCOTT OF TRADE WITH RED CHINA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, at long last the administration has moved boldly to persuade our free world allies to boycott trade with Red China. Last week, the Treasury announced that it had negotiated agreements with Britain, Belgium, France, Japan, South Korea, Hong Kong, India, and Taiwan to ban from their exports to the United States wigs made from human hair obtained in Red China, North Korea and North Vietnam. That is cooperation with a vengeance.

Let me suggest that the administration got its signals crossed. The problem of free world trade with our Communist enemies is not to keep false hair—Red hair, if you like—off the heads of American women but to grow real hair on the chest of the State Department.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee may have until midnight Friday, April 1, 1966, to file a report on H.R. 14122, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATIONS IN BROADCAST RATINGS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an announcement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have written the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission to request specific data as to the extent of control over television programing which broadcast rating services exert today.

Furthermore, I have written the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission to request an examination by that agency of the possibility of monopolistic domination of the TV ratings industry by one company.

These actions are needed, Mr. Speaker, to obtain more concise information which should be useful to the Congress in determining whether additional legislative authority is needed for regulation of TV ratings.

UNITED STATES RELATIONSHIP TO CHINA

Mr. VIVIAN. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, there has been much public discussion of our relationship to China. The opinion has been voiced widely that we should desist from past efforts to isolate the nation, and in particular, or more accurately, to cease isolating ourselves from contact with China. We could, for example, publicly state that we will issue visas to all citizens who desire to travel to China. We could relax our embargo on trade with China—an embargo which has become virtually ineffectual—by extending to China the same conditions for trade which we extend today to the Soviet Union. Now every evidence indicates that China will not at this time reciprocate to either of the above steps, for China, in turn, has said it intends to isolate us. But by removing restrictions on travel and trade, we will demonstrate to the younger men who soon will rule China, that this Nation does desire, and will take concrete steps toward, peaceful coexistence.

But finally, as all Members are aware, the most troublesome, unresolved question between the United States and China appears to be the status of Taiwan. Let me suggest on this question that, first, we acknowledge that China should now enter the United Nations; second, that Taiwan should relinquish its seat on the Council, and third, and most important, that a plebiscite first be held by the United Nations in Taiwan to determine whether the Taiwanese desire either to rejoin main-

land China, or, I would hope, to be an independent nation. The United States should then support the people of Taiwan in whatever decision they would reach.

Mr. Speaker, our policies toward China, with its three quarters of a billion people, the most populous nation on this planet, cannot stay sterile. We must look toward the future, rather than stay entrapped in the past.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight Saturday night, April 2, to file a report on House Joint Resolution 997, supporting U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. 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. 52]

Andrews, Glenn	Evans, Colo.	Powell
Ashley	Fallon	Rivers, Alaska
Baring	Feighan	Rooney, N.Y.
Barrett	Flynt	Rumsfeld
Bolling	Fuqua	Scott
Burleson	Gettys	Senner
Burton, Utah	Green, Oreg.	Smith, Iowa
Cameron	Griffin	Teague, Tex.
Carter	Hardy	Todd
Cederberg	Hollifield	Toll
Chelf	Jacobs	Tupper
Clark	Karth	Tuten
Colmer	Keogh	Udall
Conyers	Leggett	Ullman
Craley	McMillan	Vigorito
Dawson	MacGregor	Watkins
de la Garza	Matthews	Whalley
Dent	Nix	Willis
Dowdy	O'Brien	
	Pool	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight on Monday to file a report on the Post Office, Treasury, and Executive Office appropriation bill.

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

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

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMEND SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 802 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 802

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2729) to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 802 provides an open rule, waiving points of order, with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of S. 2729, a bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act.

S. 2729, as reported, would increase by \$125 million the authorization for the Small Business Administration for the amount of loans and commitments that may be outstanding in SBA's regular business loan program, disaster loan program, prime contract authority, and title IV loans under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It would also increase the total amount which may be appropriated to SBA's present revolving fund by \$125 million. This increase is estimated by SBA to be needed to continue these lending functions through June 30, 1966. Section 2 of the bill, as amended, would establish two revolving funds for financing SBA's lending functions effective July 1, 1966. One fund would be available for financing SBA's physical disaster loan program. No authorization ceiling is placed on this fund. The second fund would be available for the other programs of SBA. Three ceilings are placed on activities financed from this fund. A ceiling of \$400 million is placed on SBA's functions pertaining to small business investment companies; a ceiling of \$200 million is placed on its loans to State and local development companies; and a ceiling of \$1,400 million is placed on its other activities financed under this fund; that is, the regular business loan program, displaced business disaster loans, trade adjustment loans, prime contract authority, and loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The bill would require SBA to make quarterly reports on the status of the two revolving funds, including its

recommendations whenever 75 percent of any ceiling on outstanding obligations has been exceeded. The bill would transfer relevant portions of Public Law 87-550, authorizing SBA to make trade adjustment loans, to the Small Business Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 802 in order that S. 2729 may be considered.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell us why points of order are sought to be waived on this bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Points of order are to be waived, I advise the gentleman from Iowa, because of the change in the funding of the program.

Mr. GROSS. Has this become a standard operating procedure in the Rules Committee, to bring out every rule in this way? It seems to me there were three bills yesterday to which points of order were waived.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, I believe there were.

Mr. GROSS. Yet the members of the Rules Committee call these open rules. I do not see how anyone can possibly call these open rules, since they waive points of order. This is the same procedure that was used yesterday.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I advise the gentleman from Iowa that his point certainly has merit with regard to the waiving of points of order generally. In this case the waiver is necessary because of the question of germaneness in the last section of the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further on that point?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Do I correctly infer from the reply made to the gentleman from Iowa concerning the waiver of points of order by the committee which passed out the rule, the House Committee on Rules, that there has been no authorizing or legislative committee action insofar as the transfer of these funds is concerned, or the germaneness of that portion of the bill? Is this not the corollary of legislating on an appropriation bill, the so-called Holman rule of this House?

Mr. YOUNG. I am not sure that I understand the full import of the gentleman's question.

The bill, consideration of which the rule would make in order, does pertain to the change in the funding of this program. That is part of the reason why it is necessary to waive points of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, would it not be the proper procedure for the committee to bring in a bill asking for authorization instead of doing it through the process of the Rules Committee by waiving points of order? Why should not the committee follow the normal procedure and bring up a bill to authorize this? Let us settle the issue as it ought to be settled.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman that this is a technicality

with regard to the current legislation before the House. That is why the points of order are to be waived.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I have two other questions.

I wish to say first, that is exactly the point I make. The waiving of points of order by the Committee on Rules, whether at the request of the chairman or by direction of someone else or simply for the expedition of business of the House, is a procedure by which we are deleting and emasculating completely the power of individual Members of Congress to raise points of order, which, since the time Jefferson first wrote the Rules of Procedure of the House of Representatives, has been the prerogative of individual Members. It is for that reason I ask this question. I wonder if the gentleman would tell us further whether or not this was requested by the chairman, or whether it was merely done within the wisdom of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. YOUNG. My recollection is that it was requested by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

I would point out that this must stop; and, if necessary, we shall have to start making objections on the basis that a quorum is not present when the rules are presented for a vote.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I regret that I have a special meeting of my Defense Appropriations Subcommittee immediately, and I will not have the privilege of hearing the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, having jurisdiction over this bill, explain the bill, because I am sure in his direct statement he will answer the questions I am going to ask. But I would like to ask him now.

As the chairman knows, many of us have been receiving letters for some months from our regional offices to the effect that there are no funds available for Small Business Administration loans. He knows the gist of this problem. What relationship to these letters and to that problem does this bill have? What will we tell our people as soon as we pass this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] yield to me?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the obvious purpose of this is to get SBA back into business. It is almost out of business, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. They are dependent on selling securities that they hold in order to stay in business. Besides, the budget for 1967 will have \$428 million for regular business loan programs.

In addition to that, we have a bill now that will help, that will permit the SBA

to sell participating certificates from a pool of securities, which will give them great security and more money to do business with.

I think all this is in the direction of doing what the gentleman would like to have—to get the SBA back in business as it was and making regular loans.

Mr. FLOOD. I am very anxious to do that, but may I say this to the gentleman from Texas, if the gentleman will yield further, it was said in the Committee on Appropriations, when the supplemental bill was before us last week, that there was no request in the supplemental appropriation bill for the SBA and, of course, there was not.

Mr. PATMAN. That is the supplemental bill?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct. It was also said—and this is what I am not clear about—it was also said by a responsible member of the Committee on Appropriations that in addition to that, or even more alarming than that, there was nothing in the coming budget for the SBA; is that so?

Mr. PATMAN. It is not; that is not correct.

Mr. FLOOD. That is not correct?

Mr. PATMAN. The budget estimate by the President in January contains a request for \$428 million for loan programs under SBA.

Mr. FLOOD. And if and when that becomes law, the SBA will be back in business?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely.

Mr. FLOOD. And, finally, this: All of the letters we receive from the regional offices of the Small Business Administration—and by "we" I mean the gentleman from Texas and my other colleagues—the reason is that the SBA has been out of funds because of the tragic hurricane disaster in Louisiana.

Does this bill propose to meet that problem?

Mr. PATMAN. We believe it does. That has been appropriated for and the funds segregated.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young], House Resolution 802 does provide for 2 hours of debate under an open rule for consideration of S. 2729, to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act.

Mr. Speaker, the rule does waive points of order. I would like to have the RECORD show my understanding of this, why we have waived points of order on this bill. It is not a question of the Committee on Rules going up or down, or deciding or denying what things we spend it for under the language as contained on page 5 of the bill, the money that has heretofore been appropriated is in this one pot and that is what we are trying to unscramble today, and it will be unscrambled if this legislation is enacted.

Mr. Speaker, the only way we can do that is to waive points of order. If we

do not waive points of order in my opinion it would be subject to a point of order, and we could not accomplish what we have started out to do.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Could not the proper legislative committee have brought legislation to the floor of the House which would have obviated the need for waiving points of order?

Mr. SMITH of California. This is exactly what this bill does. What else would you have it do? This is an authorization bill. Language is in there to do exactly what the gentleman from Iowa is asking to be done.

Mr. GROSS. If that were true there would be no necessity for the waiver.

Mr. SMITH of California. Well, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that if the gentleman can tell me how to do it any differently than this I would be more than pleased to do it as the gentleman suggests, and bring it before the Committee on Rules at another date. But this is the best we could do under the circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would suggest that it be handled in such fashion as to bring a bill to the floor that provides for the handling of funds in the normal procedure.

Mr. SMITH of California. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that that is exactly what it specifically does.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, but it would be subject otherwise to a point of order.

Mr. SMITH of California. Of course; that is the only way I know how to do it. That is my explanation for it. We are not promiscuously waiving points of order. We have talked to the Parliamentarian about it, and that is my statement on it.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] has very ably explained the bill and what it provides. I shall simply revise and extend my remarks, and not repeat it. My understanding of the bill is as follows:

The Committee on Banking and Currency has traced the natural disasters of 1964 and 1965 in its report, recounting the SBA's diversion of regular business loan funds into its disaster program. This series of events has given rise to this bill's two main provisions, an additional authorization for the remainder of fiscal 1966 and the division of SBA funds into two revolving funds in order to separate disaster funds from regular business funds.

The purpose of the bill is to make available for fiscal 1966 additional funds to cover the loans and commitments which may be outstanding in the regular business loans program, prime contract authority, and title IV loans under the Economic Opportunity Act. An increased authorization of \$125 million for fiscal 1966 is made. The current revolving fund's appropriation may be increased by \$125 million to carry out commitments which are current now.

Further, the bill will establish two revolving funds for SBA's financing of lending, effective July 1, 1966. One will finance the physical disaster loan program; no authorization ceiling is placed on this fund. The second will be available to finance the other SBA programs. Three ceilings are placed on this fund: First, a ceiling of \$400 million on loans under sections 302 and 303—small business investment companies; second, a ceiling of \$200 million on loans to State and local development companies; and third, a ceiling of \$1,400 million on other activities under the fund, business loans, displaced business loans, trade adjustment loans, prime contract authority, and title IV loans.

SBA is required to report whenever 75 percent of any ceiling, in outstanding obligations, has been exceeded. The bill also transfers authority to make trade adjustment loans from Public Law 87-550 to SBA along with funds now available for that purpose, currently \$1,500,000. No such loans have been made to date under these provisions.

Sums remaining in the revolving fund on July 1, 1966, will be divided between the two funds by the Administrator, in a ratio reflecting past experience.

There are no minority views to the committee report.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] will speak on this rule in just a moment, and will undertake to explain how we must go about unscrambling this pot.

I offered an amendment to a Senate bill last year designed to start the first unscrambling of this pot so that when we do have a disaster such as that which occurred in Alaska and Louisiana, we will have some money available with which to help the people in the disaster area who need the money at that particular moment.

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the purposes of this bill, to take care of the people affected in disaster areas.

Mr. Speaker, under the Economic Opportunity Act there is a window in most of the Small Business Offices. What we are trying to do is to unscramble that pot of money and find out how it is going to be used in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in 1953 the House Small Business Committee, when considering the proposed Small Business Act, unanimously supported elimination of the \$100,000 loan limit the act contained. A higher loan limitation, subsequently established by the Congress at \$350,000 was deemed essential if the agency was to operate effectively and provide maximum financial assistance to the Nation's small businesses.

The Johnson-Humphrey administration apparently seeks to alter the business loan program with drastic changes of traditional loan policy for the maximum direct SBA loan has been lowered to \$25,000. Such a limitation prohibits assistance to those sizable, though technically small, businesses which require substantial loans and which, in turn, provide the great bulk of the Nation's production and employment.

SBA is consequently cast as a small loan shop whose penuriousness guarantees that no small business in need of financial assistance for growth can increase in size. Worthwhile assistance will not be available to serve the critical needs of those substantial, deserving, and qualified small businesses which would contribute to the Nation's economy.

S. 2729 increases the authorization of funds for the SBA business loan program. By its passage the Congress again demonstrates its willingness that adequate funds be provided the SBA business loan program. The past excuse of the present administration for curbing loan limitations has been proven, once again, to be without foundation.

I call upon the Small Business Administration to respect this mandate of the Congress and to restore immediately its business loan limitation to the sum of \$350,000.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that a great number of the membership of the House have been concerned over the operations of the Small Business Administration.

The Small Business Administration since October of last year has refused to accept any applications under the business loan program which was a creature of the Congress. The reason that the Small Business Administration is out of business is that the Congress, from time to time, has suggested other uses for the corpus of the loan funds available to that agency for any one of a number of very meritorious programs. Particularly, this is true with respect to the responsibility for handling the disaster loan fund applications for all of the natural disasters that occur from time to time in the country. What we did not envision in the Congress at the time we placed this obligation upon the Small Business Administration is that a time would come when a natural disaster would absorb or would take all of the loan funds which the Congress had appropriated and therefore cause the basic small business loan program to close down because of the lack of funds.

That is exactly what happened in the case of Hurricane Betsy. That natural disaster was of such tremendous proportion that for the Small Business Administration to carry out its obligations, it took every dime which was available to that agency. The only choice the agency had, and I say this speaking, just as fairly as I can of the administration of that agency—the only thing they could do was to say to the small businessmen of the country, "We do not have any money now to respond to any loan application which you may desire to file—unless, you can get a bank to provide the money, in which case we do not have to put up any of the money, but we could guarantee a portion of that loan. This gave birth to the wide use of a program called the guaranty loan program. This gave the banking community veto over a Federal small business loan program in my opinion. So, what has happened and the reason the Congress is under some pressure is that the small businessman today goes into the regional office of

the Small Business Administration in his State; the director is entirely sympathetic; the loan may have all the merit in the world, but the director has to say, "I cannot make this loan because we do not have any funds in the business loan program."

The wisdom of the legislation presented is obvious. It seeks to isolate or departmentalize or compartmentalize the funds which we authorize by this bill—saying that x number of dollars goes into a disaster fund; and x number of dollars is utilized for a small business loan and investment fund for about five other programs that the Congress has obligated the Small Business Administration to administer.

Therefore, it is anticipated, and I think this is the high merit of the legislation which is presented: We will never again have a natural disaster which will absorb all of the business loan funds, and which, for all practical intents and purposes, will force the Small Business Administration to refuse to receive a small businessman's loan application.

I have sent to the membership of this body a proposal to further guarantee the sanctity of the small business loan fund—and there is not a Member of this House who does not seek to do that. That is the very reason we created and made permanent the Small Business Administration: To see to it that the small businessmen of the country had a place to come if he could not obtain funds through private lending sources of the country.

Now what I seek to do is this. I only want to go one step further than the provisions of S. 2729.

They have separated the business loan program and the disaster program into two different funds. There is one area in which we have given the Small Business Administration responsibility wherein we could have a set of circumstances that by reason of that authority the Small Business Administrator would be obligated to take every dime out of the small business loan fund, just as he did on the disaster in Louisiana: To meet the commitments of title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act.

All I seek to do is that which, I believe, every Member of this body wants done, and that is: make secure the operation of the small business loan program and see to it that we do not have the maximum individual loan ceilings lowered below the \$350,000 the Congress intended, that we do not have cutoffs, or have periods of time when applications cannot be received and processed.

I propose and will propose at the appropriate time that in this particular authorization bill a ceiling of \$100 million be placed upon those funds which would be available for the operation of the poverty loan program under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Now, what does this do? Does this tie the hands of the Administrator of the program? The answer is an emphatic "No." As the report shows on page 7, it is anticipated that by the end of fiscal year 1967 the program would only absorb \$69 million. You may say, "Well, ARCH, if that is the case, what are you worried

about?" Well, it is very easy to assume that an aggressive administrator—may set up a network of small business development centers—as provided by title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act and start obligating funds which we intended to go into the small business loan program.

You might say, "Well, no, it will never happen." But, we have seen the business loan program close down due to the drain of the disaster loan program upon a common fund. It can happen if this title IV program should similarly explode. So I say, the sound and sensible thing to do is to impose a ceiling in order to secure the operation of the small business loan program, the prime reason for this agency in the first place, and say, "We will put a limitation of \$100 million on what you can use for poverty loans."

It is anticipated they will only use \$69.7 million through fiscal year 1967. We will have provided, however, a ceiling; they cannot further invade the funds this bill authorizes for the operation of the small business loan program. To me the only argument that could be made against this is, "Well, they have not had a chance to study it in the Banking and Currency Committee. Perhaps they would have given it consideration had it been before the committee."

But, may I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the problem we have in the matter of the Small Business Administration. We have a Select Committee on Small Business of the House which has the responsibility of conducting investigations and hearings to protect and foster small business in the country. Yet, when it gets down to the legislative part of the program, another committee of the House has jurisdiction. I am not speaking critically of the committee that has the authority legislatively on this matter, but I daresay that they will not conduct a thorough examination of the Small Business Administration or its problems for another year or until again they once again must give consideration to that which is provided under the rule which we are discussing here today.

Yet, the Select Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives, with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] as chairman, and myself as the ranking minority member lives with the problems of the small businessman on a day-to-day basis. The only reason in the world that we have not presented this proposal of further compartmentalizing SBA funds is the limitations of the existing dual committee responsibilities. The right hand does not know what the left hand is doing.

Beyond that, may I say, I should not sit down without remarking to the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] that in bringing this bill to the floor today they have, in my opinion—and in the expediting of its consideration—made and will make a tremendous contribution to breathing new life into the Small Business Administration and the small business loan program of that agency.

I should like to have some assurance from them that they might accept this vital amendment.

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

I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 363, nays 4, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]
YEAS—363

Abbott	Dague	Hansen, Wash.
Abernethy	Daniels	Harshe
Adair	Davis, Ga.	Harvey, Ind.
Adams	Davis, Wis.	Harvey, Mich.
Addabbo	Delaney	Hathaway
Albert	Denton	Hawkins
Anderson, Ill.	Derwinski	Hays
Anderson, Tenn.	Devine	Hébert
Andrews	Dickinson	Hechler
Andrews, George W.	Diggs	Helstoski
Andrews, Glenn	Dingell	Henderson
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dole	Hicks
Annuzio	Donohue	Hollifield
Arends	Dorn	Holland
Ashley	Dow	Horton
Ashmore	Downing	Hosmer
Aspinall	Dulski	Howard
Ayres	Duncan, Oreg.	Hull
Bandstra	Duncan, Tenn.	Hungate
Baring	Dwyer	Huot
Bates	Dyal	Hutchinson
Battin	Edmondson	Ichord
Beckworth	Edwards, Ala.	Irwin
Belcher	Edwards, Calif.	Jarman
Bell	Edwards, La.	Jennings
Bennett	Ellsworth	Joelson
Berry	Erlenborn	Johnson, Calif.
Betts	Everett	Johnson, Okla.
Bingham	Evins, Tenn.	Jonas
Boggs	Farbstein	Jones, Ala.
Boland	Farnley	Jones, Mo.
Bow	Farnum	Jones, N.C.
Brademas	Fascell	Karsten
Bray	Findley	Karth
Brock	Fino	Kastenmeier
Brooks	Fisher	Kee
Broomfield	Flood	Keith
Brown, Calif.	Foley	Kelly
Brown, Ohio	Ford, Gerald R.	King, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.	Ford	King, N.Y.
Broyhill, Va.	William D.	King, Utah
Buchanan	Fountain	Kirwan
Burke	Fraser	Kluczynski
Burton, Calif.	Frelinghuysen	Kornegay
Byrne, Pa.	Friedel	Krebs
Byrnes, Wis.	Fulton, Pa.	Kunkel
Cabell	Fulton, Tenn.	Kupferman
Cahill	Gallagher	Laird
Callan	Garmatz	Landrum
Callaway	Gathings	Langen
Casey	Gialmo	Latta
Cederberg	Gilbert	Lennon
Chamberlain	Gilligan	Lipscomb
Clancy	Gonzalez	Long, La.
Clausen	Goodell	Long, Md.
Don H.	Grabowski	Love
Clawson, Del.	Green, Pa.	McClary
Cleveland	Greig	McCulloch
Clevenger	Grider	McDade
Cohelan	Griffin	McDowell
Collier	Griffiths	McEwen
Conable	Grover	McFall
Conte	Gubser	McGrath
Cooley	Gurney	McVicker
Corbett	Hagan, Ga.	Macdonald
Corman	Hagen, Calif.	Machen
Cramer	Haley	Mackay
Culver	Halleck	Madden
Cunningham	Halpern	Mabon
Curtis	Hamilton	Mailliard
Daddario	Hanley	Marsh
	Hanna	Martin, Ala.
	Hansen, Idaho	Martin, Mass.
	Hansen, Iowa	Martin, Nebr.

Mathias	Powell	Sisk
Matsunaga	Price	Skubitz
May	Pucinski	Smith, Calif.
Meeds	Purcell	Smith, Va.
Michel	Quie	Springer
Miller	Quillen	Stafford
Mills	Race	Staggers
Minish	Randall	Stalbaum
Mink	Redlin	Stanton
Minshall	Rees	Steed
Mize	Reid, Ill.	Stevens
Moeller	Reid, N.Y.	Stratton
Monagan	Reifel	Stubblefield
Moore	Reinecke	Sullivan
Moorhead	Resnick	Sweeney
Morgan	Reuss	Talcott
Morris	Rhodes, Ariz.	Taylor
Morrison	Rhodes, Pa.	Teague, Calif.
Morse	Rivers, S.C.	Tenzer
Morton	Roberts	Thomas
Mosher	Robison	Thompson, N.J.
Moss	Rodino	Thompson, Tex.
Multer	Rogers, Colo.	Thomson, Wis.
Murphy, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.	Trimble
Murphy, N.Y.	Rogers, Tex.	Tuck
Murray	Ronan	Tunney
Natcher	Roncallo	Ullman
Nedzi	Rooney, Pa.	Utt
Nelsen	Rosenthal	Van Deerlin
O'Hara, Ill.	Rostenkowski	Vanik
O'Hara, Mich.	Roudebush	Vivian
O'Konski	Roush	Waggonner
Olsen, Mont.	Roybal	Walker, N. Mex.
Olson, Minn.	Ryan	Watson
O'Neal, Ga.	Satterfield	Watts
O'Neill, Mass.	St Germain	White, Idaho
Ottinger	St. Onge	White, Tex.
Passman	Saylor	Whitener
Patman	Scheuer	Whitten
Patten	Schisler	Widnall
Pelly	Schmidhauser	Williams
Pepper	Schneebell	Wilson, Bob
Perkins	Schweiker	Wolf
Philbin	Secrest	Wyatt
Pike	Selden	Wyder
Pirnie	Shipley	Yates
Poage	Shriver	Young
Poff	Sickles	Younger
Pool	Sikes	Zablocki

NAYS—4

Ashbrook	Hall	Walker, Miss.
Gross		

NOT VOTING—65

Barrett	Feighan	Rivers, Alaska
Blatnik	Flynt	Rooney, N.Y.
Bolling	Fogarty	Rumsfeld
Bolton	Fuqua	Scott
Burleson	Gettys	Senner
Burton, Utah	Gibbons	Slack
Cameron	Gray	Smith, Iowa
Carey	Green, Oreg.	Smith, N.Y.
Carter	Hardy	Teague, Tex.
Celler	Herlong	Todd
Chelf	Jacobs	Toll
Clark	Johnson, Pa.	Tupper
Colmer	Keogh	Tuten
Conyers	Leggett	Udall
Craley	McCarthy	Vigorito
Curtin	McMillan	Watkins
Dawson	MacGregor	Weltner
de la Garza	Mackie	Whalley
Dent	Matthews	Willis
Dowdy	Nix	Wilson,
Evans, Colo.	O'Brien	Charles H.
Fallon	Pickie	Wright

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mr. Keogh with Mrs. Bolton.
 Mr. Toll with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Todd with Mr. Curtin.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. MacGregor.
 Mr. Scott with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Rumsfeld.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Watkins.
 Mr. Burleson with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Whalley.
 Mr. Feighan with Mr. Nix.
 Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Dawson.
 Mr. Hardy with Mr. Leggett.
 Mr. O'Brien with Mr. de la Garza.
 Mr. Senner with Mr. Dent.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Gray.
 Mr. Hardy with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Matthews.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Blatnik.
 Mr. Chelf with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Cooley with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Udall with Mr. Vigorito.
 Mr. Cameron with Mr. Carey.
 Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Clark.
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. McCarthy.
 Mr. Colmer with Mr. Jacobs.
 Mr. Pickle with Mr. Rivers of Alaska.
 Mr. Wright with Mr. Willis.
 Mr. Weltner with Mr. Mackie.
 Mr. Flynt of Georgia with Mr. Gettys.
 Mr. Tuten with Mr. Gibbons.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be given until midnight to file a report on H.R. 14088.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMEND SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2729, to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2729, with Mr. ICHORD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under House Resolution 802, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield myself 15 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset I want to make it clear that the legislation before this body today—S. 2729—is truly a bipartisan measure. At no time in either the Senate or the House Banking and Currency Committee has there been an objection raised to any portion of this legislation. The minority members of your Banking and Currency Committee, under the capable leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] contributed many worthwhile suggestions to this bill.

SMALL BUSINESSMEN DEPEND ON SBA

I am certain that there is not a Member of this Chamber who has not received a letter from a constituent regarding the slowdown, and in some cases shutdown, of SBA lending activities which have been in effect since October 12. And I am fully aware of the heartaches that small businessmen across our Nation face when they find they need financial assistance. There is no place they can turn except to the Small Business Administration. Banks long ago closed their lending windows to the small businessman. On occasion, banks will lend to a small businessman if the Small Business Administration will guarantee the loan and the bank can charge its normal interest rate, which is higher than the rate the borrower would be able to obtain from SBA. But how many of you have received letters from small businessmen complaining that banks would not even let them fill out loan applications?

S. 2729 would not only reopen the SBA lending windows for all loans, but would all but guarantee that such closings would not occur in the future.

The legislation is divided into two major sections: Section 1 would increase the total amount which may be outstanding from SBA's present revolving fund by \$125 million. This authorization increase will allow SBA to spend funds which are available, but because of pressing ceiling limitations might not be able to be disbursed once the ceiling is reached. SBA officials estimated that at the end of March there will be \$76.6 million available in its revolving fund. However, unless S. 2729 is passed, raising the authorization ceiling, SBA will be able to spend only \$23.2 million of the revolving fund total before it reaches the authorization ceiling. In addition, as the revolving fund is increased through loan sales, SBA would still not be able to use the money if the ceiling is reached.

SOME LOAN PROGRAMS OPEN

SBA has not completely closed its lending program. It is still making loans under title 4 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; loans in the investment division; that is, small business investment company and local development company loans; as well as disaster loans, both physical disaster loans and loans made to small businesses who are displaced by some Federal project such as an urban renewal area or highway development. Some regular business loans are being disbursed but only on a guaranteed basis. Under this arrangement a private lender lends the funds to the small business concern and SBA guarantees a portion of the loan. However, even on a guaranteed basis, while SBA does not disburse the funds, it still must charge the entire amount of the loan against its authorization.

The situation is compounded because SBA must keep a loan reserve due to the threat of traditional spring floods in various areas.

The agency, however, has not been able to make regular direct business loans since October. During that time 5,097 loan applications, totaling more than \$140 million, have piled up at SBA offices around the country. This backlog

of loan requests consists only of those applications in which some preliminary checks as to credit statements and amounts of loan needed and other such information have been processed. It does not include the thousands of small businessmen who have requested that their name be placed on a list to be contacted as soon as the agency has enough funds to reopen its loan program.

COULD REOPEN SHORTLY

I was informed by SBA officials yesterday that if S. 2729 is passed, that the agency will be able to reopen its regular business lending program within several weeks after the President signs the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is not enough to apply merely a first-aid treatment to the statutes governing the Small Business Administration. Since 1956, SBA has had to cut back its lending program or suspend its operations on eight occasions. A situation as severe as this which threatens the very existence of small businesses throughout this Nation, requires more than a legislative "band aid." Your committee feels that it is well on the way toward solving SBA's ills through the actions encompassed in section 2 of S. 2729.

At the present time, SBA operates under one revolving fund. Under this arrangement, all appropriations, and loan repayments are lumped together. All loans are similarly made from that one fund. At the present time, the total amount which may be outstanding from the one fund is \$1,841 million. S. 2729 would raise that figure by \$125 million to \$1,966 million. Under the existing law there are two ceilings contained in the revolving fund. Regular business loans and disaster loans and all other SBA lending activity not conducted by its Investment Division are limited to \$1,375 million. Loans made from the Investment Division; that is, SBIC loans and State and local development company loans, are limited to not more than \$461 million. The single revolving fund has proved ineffective, particularly in recent years where we have witnessed two unfortunate costly disasters, the Alaskan earthquake and Hurricane Betsy. Disaster loans in recent years have far exceeded their estimated figures. In order to make certain that there is enough money available for all disaster victims, SBA has had to borrow from other programs within the single revolving fund in order to replenish the disaster money. Conversely, the same might be true during a period where we had no major disasters and a heavy demand for regular business loans. In this kind of situation SBA would have to use funds otherwise earmarked for disaster loans and shift them to regular business loans.

REPLENISHMENTS REQUIRE TIME

Fortunately, SBA has always been able to replenish its revolving fund following a disaster loan drain. But, such restorations take time. In one instance it was 6 months before new funds could be appropriated to put back into the revolving fund money which had been used for disaster loans.

When we speak of disaster loans, we speak primarily of loans made to victims

of hurricanes, floods, forest fires, earthquakes, or other similar natural tragedies. But it is as much of a disaster to a small businessman who is about to lose his business because he cannot obtain adequate financial help, as it is to a small businessman who has lost his business because of floodwaters. Who is to say which small businessman is more deserving of a loan; and if funds are available for only one loan, who gets the loan? S. 2729 provides the answer. On July 1, 1966, it provides that two revolving funds shall be established. The funds in the existing revolving fund will be separated into the two new funds under an equitable arrangement to be worked out by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. The first fund—the disaster fund—would not be limited as to authorization ceiling. This fund would still have to obtain its moneys either through appropriations, sales of outstanding loans to private investors, or repayments on loans. But it would not be hampered by an authorization ceiling which could slow down disaster loan processing if a large-scale disaster struck at a time when outstanding disaster loans were bumping the authorization ceiling. The second fund, which would receive its moneys through the same methods as the disaster fund, would house all other SBA lending activities.

THREE CEILINGS ESTABLISHED

In order to establish congressional safeguards, three ceilings have been placed on loans from this fund. Loans under the small business investment program would be limited to \$400 million. Loans totaling \$200 million would be authorized for State and local development companies. All other lending functions of SBA, including business loans, prime contract authority, and title 4 loans of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 would carry a ceiling of \$1,000,400,000. As originally introduced, S. 2729 had ceilings which were \$112,700,000 below those established in the bill reported by your committee. The original figures were supplied from estimates given by the Small Business Administration based on their projection for anticipated loan needs through fiscal year 1967. They did not, however, provide for any unforeseen lending increases. To offset this, your committee has raised the total dollar amount which may be outstanding to \$2 billion, as opposed to \$1,887,300,000, as contained in the original legislation.

INTERFUND BORROWING PROHIBITED

One of the most important features of S. 2729 is that it prohibits borrowing between the funds. In addition, repayments of loans and loan sales proceeds will be channeled back into the fund from which the loan was originally made. This arrangement will preclude a drain on one fund for the other. The inter-fund borrowing restriction will be of greatest value in the area of regular business loans, since the volume of loans to be made over a projected period is far more predictable than are disaster loans. Consequently, the bulk of SBA's budgeting goes into the business loan program. Since the inception of the agency, more

than 65,000 business loans have been made by SBA, or nearly \$2.5 billion of SBA funds. The monetary figure is much higher since many of these loans were made in participation with other financial institutions, and their share of the loan is not included in the \$2.5 billion figure.

This legislation establishes further congressional controls in that it requires that the agency shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Banking and Currency of both the House of Representatives and the Senate quarterly reports on the status of each fund. This will provide Congress with an effective review policy.

Mr. Chairman, it would be foolish to state that S. 2729 will solve all of the problems facing the millions of small businessmen throughout our country. However, this legislation will enable the Small Business Agency to reopen its lending programs and reextend its helping hand to our small business industry.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. GROSS. Am I correctly informed that the chairman of the committee, or some member thereof, will offer an amendment to lines 21, 22, and 23 on page 3 of the bill to strike out the language "including its projection of the future needs of such funds, and its recommendations for such additional appropriations as it deems appropriate."

Mr. PATMAN. I shall be glad to read the amendment if the gentleman from Iowa would like to hear it.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I would.

Mr. PATMAN [reading]:

Page 3, strike out the comma in line 21 and all that follows down through the period in line 23, and insert in lieu thereof a period.

Page 4, after the period in line 6, insert the following new sentence: "Business-type budgets for each of the funds established by paragraph (1) shall be prepared, transmitted to the Congress, considered, and enacted in the manner prescribed by law (sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 847-849)) for wholly owned Government corporations."

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, the chairman will offer those amendments?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly. They have been worked out with the assistance of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], the ranking minority member, and we will agree to them, and it is my sincere hope that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will agree to it.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I support the amendments.

Mr. PATMAN. We know that they will be offered, and it is our hope that they will be accepted, and we believe they will be.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2729. As our chairman has stated this bill received unanimous support of our committee.

On January 14, 1965, I introduced H.R. 2860 to provide for an adequately financed separate disaster loan fund. As

I noted at that time, this was consistent with my position taken on behalf of the minority in 1962 when the loan funds for disaster and regular small business loans were combined over our objection.

When the Banking and Currency Committee held hearings on one of two emergency authorization requests last year, in May of last year, I received a promise from the then SBA Administrator Mr. Foley that the SBA would report on my bill the very next time they came before our committee. I also received the sympathetic interest of our chairman and of Senator PROXMIER who testified before the committee at that time.

When SBA returned to our committee on October 21 of last year, asking for another emergency authorization, no report was available. I called this to the attention of this body on the floor that very day. I had earlier that day, in committee, offered an amendment to the bill, S. 2542, to set up separate, adequate funds for the disaster loan program, but it was rejected. The next day, the bill we have before us today was introduced by Senator PROXMIER with cosponsorship by Senator MCINTYRE. The necessary bipartisan support for the separate loan fund approach was assured.

In the meantime, SBA had come to a complete standstill on regular small business loans, not even accepting loan applications, and even disaster loans and economic opportunity loans under the poverty program were encountering delays.

In January 1966 I testified before the Senate committee on this bill, and urged the inclusion of language requiring more adequate reporting than we in Congress had been receiving from the SBA in the past. The amendment proposed by me calls for quarterly reports, and reports anytime that any fund has 75 percent or more in commitments that is now contained in the bill before you.

Finally, when this bill came before our committee, I offered an amendment based on the testimony by SBA Executive Administrator Ross Davis, which would provide for an authorization of \$112,700,000 for fiscal year 1967. The original language of the bill carried the new authorization only to the end of the current fiscal year.

The three goals of adequate financing, separate disaster and regular business loan funds, and adequate, early reporting to Congress, hopefully, will now be achieved. I am pleased at the bipartisan support that this bill has developed and I think it is a particular tribute to the Nation's small business community. The effort to reach this particular plateau from which the SBA can go forward revitalized as it has not been for nearly 18 months has received support from many quarters, but I would be remiss if I did not call attention to the backing of my early bill by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], who introduced similar legislation early last year. In addition, the efforts by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], and his colleagues on the Small Business Committee have proved very helpful. I urge

immediate passage of this vital legislation.

This is only the first step, however, toward the revitalization of the Small Business Administration as a positive force on behalf of our Nation's small business community. President Johnson should forthwith appoint a Small Business Administrator, a post that has been vacant for over a year, and his administration should disclaim any intent to bury the independence and the effectiveness of the Small Business Administration in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, S. 2729 represents a significant improvement in the orderly operation of the loan funds of the Small Business Administration. To provide continuity to the business loan program, to assure sufficient funds to meet the ever-increasing demand of small businessmen for long-term credit at reasonable rates, to forestall "raids" upon business loan funds for disaster loan purposes, in short, to facilitate operation of SBA precisely as intended by the Congress in its establishment of the agency, passage of S. 2729 is essential. As far as it goes, I support the bill wholeheartedly.

I find, however, that an important provision has been omitted from this bill, which omission continues the threat to the survival of the business loan program.

Mr. Chairman, the original Small Business Act of 1953 established as SBA's key function a business loan program. The need for long-term loans at moderate rates of interest was critical then; it is even more critical today. If we are to support small business not by promises, but by beneficial action, the business loan program providing sound financing, on a first-come, first-served basis, to all qualified small businesses must be maintained. We have failed in the latter in that the Congress did not adequately protect the limited funds provided for the program. By satisfying other loan programs with funds intended for business loans, and by foisting onto one revolving fund the insatiable demands of other SBA activities, the business loan program was brought to a virtual standstill.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 provided another program of loans to businesses and individuals, a program intended to reduce long-term unemployment. The loan program is administered by SBA under a delegation from the Office of Economic Opportunity. Apparently we have not learned the full lesson from the fiasco of the disaster loan drain upon the revolving fund, for no limitation of Economic Opportunity Act loans short of the total revolving fund has been provided.

Thus the funds for the business loan program ardently sought for the millions of small businessmen throughout the land is now to be jeopardized, and I predict, again brought to a standstill by the drain of a program admittedly demanding or contemplating far less of the borrower. Under the EOA program,

traditional SBA requirements of security and repayment probability may be lost in the emphasis upon character and promise. Loose operation could usurp the SBA program our constituents have so loudly supported since SBA refused to accept business loan applications last October.

Mr. Chairman, just as I have strongly supported a disaster loan program and one under separate authorization, I support the economic opportunity program and the loan assistance provided thereby. By this amendment, however, I am providing protection for the loan funds available for the business loan program of SBA. I am insuring that the demands of special purpose programs do not exhaust the available funds of programs long recognized as contributing greatly to the success of small business throughout the Nation.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, this is one of the unique authorization bills that comes before the committee. There is no other instance that I can think of in which a committee or the House considers legislation for a particular agency of the Federal Government as is done in this particular case. As the Members of the House know, we have a Select Committee on Small Business, made up of 15 members, who have the specific authority to investigate the problems of the small businessman across the country. They spend the greater portion of their time in contact with those responsible for the administration of the small business program.

But we have no legislative authority, regardless of the difficulties we may find throughout the country as far as the small businessmen are concerned. We must of necessity make recommendations to another committee of the House, the one that has legislative authority in the area. May I say we have, for the most part, received the cooperation of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the legislative committee which brings this authorization bill concerning funds for the Small Business Administration before us for consideration.

I daresay there are a lot of questions in the minds of the membership as to what in the world has happened to the Small Business Administration. Why has SBA been unable to provide funds for the small businessmen who seek to borrow from the Federal Government under a program that the Congress passed and the President signed into law? Very, very frankly—there is an easy explanation. In addition to—and I made this point when we were discussing the rule—the business loan program, which the Small Business Administration handles, the Congress has from time to time assigned the administration of other loan programs to SBA. A major responsibility has been the administration of a loan program for victims of the natural disasters that have occurred in the country. All of us are aware of the very devastating hurricane in Louisiana recently. The Small Business Administration proceeded as the Congress had directed them to do—to handle the receipt of applications for financial assistance after the disaster has been

proclaimed. The Small Business Administration moved forthwith. The applications for funds, however, exceeded the funds that the Congress has made available for all programs SBA handles. Therefore, the Administrator or the Executive Director had to close down the SBA business loan program because of the lack of funds.

This was the program that we in the Congress originally conceived as the basic program of the Small Business Administration. Since October of last year, the applications for loans that have been accepted have been negligible—and that is, of course, with reference to the regular business loan program.

As a matter of fact, today in your congressional district, if you were a small businessman—and I daresay you have heard from some of them—if you wanted to borrow money from the Small Business Administration—and you were otherwise eligible and met all of the qualifications—you could go in and see the regional director but, regardless of how fine a character you might be and how good the references you might have, he would say to you, "I do not have any money to lend you." He would say, "Well, if you go to a bank and they will provide their funds, I will consider the guarantee of 90 percent of your loan, but we do not have any funds available of our own to lend you."

This is the point the Small Business Administration has reached. It has been severely handicapped for the past 8 or 9 months.

I want to call to the attention of the membership that, originally in 1953, when this program was established, we placed a ceiling on the dollar amount of the loan a small businessman might submit an application for. The ceiling of \$100,000 proved to be inadequate. The demands of the small business community on the small business agency required higher lending authority. We in the Congress thus provided that they could make loans up to \$350,000.

So what happened? When the demands from other sources on business loan funds absorbed the funds or measurably reduced them, the Administrator or the Executive Director or whatever the case may be, immediately and administratively lowered the ceiling on loans. In other words, he reduced the loan maximum, saying, "I won't accept an application in excess of \$100,000."

Then the demands of disaster victims multiplied and he said, "I won't permit any more loans in excess of \$15,000."

Finally his fund became completely bankrupt and he said to his regional directors, "You cannot accept any further loan applications."

What we now have, by reason of a number of circumstances, some of which we in the Congress must share the blame, is a situation in which we have had no funds available for the small businessmen of the country.

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

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

Mr. MULTER. I think the gentleman should make it perfectly clear that every time the Small Business Administration has come to Congress for an authorization or an appropriation, the Congress has met the request. I do not think we share in that blame for the lack of funds in this agency.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is certainly correct. If that suggestion is made, to correct in the RECORD any suggestion I may have made that we have not given the agency the money requested, the gentleman is eminently correct. We have never failed to respond to the monetary requests for funds for the Small Business Administration. We have, however, thrust other things on this man's desk and told him to administer them. He has done the job we have given him even though it meant using funds that should have been used on other programs. He has had to close those programs down that the Congress has shown most interest in.

They did not come back and ask for funds, and that should be a firm point as far as our criticism of the administration of this program is concerned. They knew what the problem was, but they waited and waited. We would still be waiting for the Small Business Administration to come to Congress for funds had it not been for the initiative of the gentleman from Texas and the gentlemen in the other body who moved this legislation before us.

The point I am making is this: We shall have happen to us again exactly what happened due to the disaster loan program unless my amendment is adopted. The gentleman from Texas has very honestly stated what this bill proposes to do. It will isolate funds so that never again will the disasters, no matter how many we have, be given an opportunity to invade the corpus of the funds that are available for the business loan program. It is exactly what we want to do. I commend them for this.

I say there is within this legislation another opportunity for the same thing to happen again. It could occur if there were a rapid expansion of the loan program under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act. We gave the Small Business Administrator the responsibility of handling this program, and he could repeat the error of the present situation. Not a man in this body can tell me otherwise.

He could take the \$423 million which we authorize in this legislation and put it all in one program and close the small business loan program down again, simply because of lack of funds.

At an appropriate time I propose to offer an amendment which I believe would be in the best interests of both the poverty loan program and the business loan program of the Small Business Administration. The amendment would place a ceiling on the title IV loan program. You do it in other places in your report with respect to other programs.

Look at the report that is before the House. Among other things it states that we are going to place three ceilings. I want to add a fourth ceiling. Three

ceilings would be placed on activities financed from this fund. A ceiling of \$400 million would be placed on SBA's functions under sections 302 and 303 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. That is the portion of the act in which small development corporations can come to this particular program for funding for new industry.

A ceiling of \$200 million would be placed on loans to State and local development companies. A ceiling of \$1,400 million would be placed on SBA's other loan activities. But, among its other activities are trade adjustment loans, prime contract authority, displaced business disaster loans and the regular business loan program, which every one of us want to protect, and the loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

I say that we should place a ceiling of \$100 million on loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act, I am not hampering that act, I say to the Members, at all, in fact, I propose protecting it.

It is estimated, if we look at the report, that they will have in this program outstanding loans and commitments of only \$69 million at the end of fiscal year 1967.

The only thing I seek to do, I say to the Members of the Committee, is to authorize \$100 million for the title IV loan program, but not another dime.

We must keep the business loan program in operation. Applications must continue to be received from small businessmen in the various communities across the country.

If it were to be suggested that this is going to stop the title IV loan program in any way, I would say that my amendment proposes to provide almost twice as much for poverty loans as the legislation which is before us indicates has been projected through fiscal year 1967.

It would place a ceiling, so that we would not be in the same position as we are now in the disaster case, because disaster loans have absorbed all regular business loan funds. If we do not put a ceiling on title IV poverty loans, which I suggest be at \$100 million, we will have title IV loans which may completely absorb the business loan funds, and the business loan program will be shut down again. I think it is our responsibility to see to it that this does not happen again.

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

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask one question. In setting out the \$100 million, do I correctly understand from the gentleman's remarks that this would then reduce the other ceiling that is set for funds by the \$100 million, so that even though the predictions are that they would use only \$69 million of it, we would be placing inactive, then, the \$100 million? Or would the gentleman set that in a way in which it does not disturb the utilization of the other funds authorized?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is correct. I would construct it in such a way that the fund would be available up to \$100 million, but not isolate those funds

from the business loan program in the event they did not use that \$100 million.

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

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made an extremely valuable contribution. I agree with his views and, of course, join in his pointing to the disaster loan effects on the general loan program of small business.

Of course, as the report indicated on page 29, they underestimated that by 100 percent, \$200 million instead of \$400 million.

We had this before our committee when we were considering the Louisiana hurricane situation. At that time, I asked SBA specifically if they had enough authorizations and appropriations left to do the job in Louisiana. They said, "Yes, we do." But the facts and circumstances show that is not the case. Is that not true, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is correct. We have seen what happened. The small business loan program shut down.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman's proposal would prevent the same thing from happening in the other phases of the program. Is that correct?

Mr. MOORE. That is right. I would be certain the small business loan program operates and at the same time I would still make funds available for the title IV poverty loan program to operate.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK].

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, the rural area which I represent is the kind of area one might expect would benefit most by the operation of the Small Business Administration. Or to put it another way, one of the reasons that the SBA was originally created was to help provide the needed financial stimulus to areas such as mine. This is true for several reasons. For one thing, small rural banks often do not have enough capital to provide the kind of financing needed for substantial business and industrial growth. For another thing, rural banks are traditionally far more conservative than city banks and are less willing to take a chance on any but the most conservative loan applications. Now that new emphasis is being placed on the importance of rural development, it is important for us to learn whether the SBA program is succeeding or failing in the rural areas.

Over the past year, in my many discussions with the farmers, businessmen, and bankers in my area, I have gained the distinct impression that the SBA was falling down on the job. As we all know, disaster loan demands placed such a burden on the organization that direct loans had to be suspended last October. But unfortunately, it seemed that even the loan guarantee plan was not meeting the needs of the community as it did not enjoy the confidence of the bankers. In an attempt to find out exactly where the problem lay, I recently wrote a letter to the 47 banks in my district. I wrote to them when I had learned that very

few banks in our area have been interested in participating in the loan guarantee program. I said I was interested in finding out the reason for this lack of interest, in the hope that steps might be taken to make the program more attractive to local banks. Since the local bank's participation in the loan guarantee program would be extremely helpful to small businessmen in my district, I invited their comments to find out why they were not participating and what suggestions they had to make the SBA's loan guarantee program more attractive.

Replies to this request have been coming in and have been very illuminating. One bank described an incident with a guarantee loan program under which a loan was made for a factory building. When the loan became past due, the bank gave the SBA the required 30 days' notice to pay their participation in the loan. At that point, the bank tells me, instead of reimbursing the bank for their participation, the SBA began to look for technicalities in their agreement with the bank. Eventually the bank became so disgusted that they served notice on the SBA that they wanted to buy the SBA's participation in the loan, which they eventually did. The bank president wrote:

Based on this experience, we are no longer interested in the guarantee loan program.

Another bank described procedural and administrative problems in dealing with the SBA. One client was told by the SBA that a loan application could be processed in 2 or 3 weeks. In this particular case, SBA approval arrived 4 months later. And this was in a situation where the collateral for the loan was appraised at three times the amount of the loan. Another letter describes the problems the bank has in obtaining prompt payments from the SBA on a loan where the SBA is handling receipt of payments. One banker comments:

Having cited my experiences with SBA, you can understand my reluctance to mention this kind of loan to any of my customers.

Several of the aforementioned communications follow:

MARCH 23, 1966.

DEAR SIR: As you know, there has been a moratorium on Small Business Administration direct loans since last October, and the only type of SBA loan available is the loan guarantee plan, under which the bank makes the loan and applies to SBA for a guarantee of 75-90 percent of the amount loaned.

We have received many constituent requests asking our help in arranging loans through the SBA. Although we are happy to assist our constituents, there is little we can do for them directly in this area, except to try to expedite their applications.

We have found that very few banks doing business in the 28th Congressional District have been interested in participating in this program. We are very interested to find out the reason for this lack of interest, with the view in mind that perhaps there are actions we might take that would help make this program more attractive to our local banks.

We feel that participation in the guarantee loan program would be a helpful service to small businessmen in our district and we would like to see our banks involved to the maximum feasible extent.

Your comments on the SBA, and the guarantee loan program especially, would be

greatly appreciated by this office. We hope that by knowing your point of view on this subject we can help you and the borrowers to take advantage of the SBA services. Please let me hear from you.

Cordially yours,

JOSEPH Y. RESNICK,
Member of Congress.

DUTCHESS BANK & TRUST Co.,
Poughkeepsie, N.Y., March 25, 1966.

Re SBA program.

Mr. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: This is in response to your letter of March 23. We have participated with SBA in regard to one loan and have assisted a few customers in their endeavors to obtain SBA direct loans. We have also been aware of assistance that SBA has given to one of our customers in ironing out problems that our customer had with Government procurement agencies (regarding work in process) and in securing certificates of competency.

We have found personnel in the New York City office to be cooperative. To a large degree, we believe that SBA's usefulness is in the service it renders to small business as distinguished from its lending activities. Obviously, the two go hand in hand but in many cases, the service is the predominating benefit.

Our bank (and we believe this applies to many banks) is reluctant to participate with SBA or to use its loan guarantee program because of redtape in connection with both programs and uncertainty as to the bank's position under the guarantee program. We had one very sad experience in connection with a RFC-originated guarantee in which it was claimed that a technicality negated the effectiveness of the guarantee. The claim was made by a successor to RFC some 7 or 8 years after the loan was put on our books. As a result, we refuse to prepare closing papers in which a governmental lending agency participates. We believe that we can work out this problem with the SBA if a need arises, but we prefer to avoid controversy whenever possible. Thus, we shy away from SBA participations.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD A. MOORE,
President.

THE SAUGERTIES NATIONAL BANK
& TRUST Co.,

Saugerties, N.Y., March 28, 1966.

Mr. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I would like to answer your letter of March 23 regarding banks' participation with SBA in loans by relating to you my experience with the SBA.

In August 1964, we submitted a loan application to SBA in the amount of \$225,000 asking them to take a 75-percent interest. Incidentally, when a client seeks information from SBA regarding loans, they are told by SBA personnel that, if the bank is going to participate for 25 percent, it is only a matter of 2 or 3 weeks for the application to be processed. Well, in this case we received the SBA approval in December 1964, some 4 months later. I might add at this point that the collateral for this loan was appraised at three times the amount of the loan.

We have a 10-percent participation in another loan with SBA, and they are handling the receipt of payments on this loan. I wish it were the other way around. When the first payment was due, I called our customer and asked him if he had made his payment. He told me he had made the payment a week before. I then called SBA and asked where our share was. That was a mistake. (Let me warn you, sir. Don't ever call SBA unless you know exactly whom you want to speak

to and what his extension is.) In any event I did speak to someone in the office, who explained the reason for the delay and said we could expect a check any day. Two weeks later, I wrote to SBA asking about the check due us. About 1 week later, and over 1 month after the payment had been sent, we received our 10 percent. We are still getting the payments about 1 month late, but I know our customer has made them; so I don't worry too much.

You might think that after this bitter experience we would give up trying to do business with SBA. We haven't, though; because on February 25, 1966, we sent in another application. This is another of the applications in which our bank is taking 25 percent, and which, as I mentioned before, we were told takes only a couple of weeks to process. Well, we have heard from SBA, but only because they wanted some additional information. If they had given us the forms for it in the first place, it could have been sent in with the original application.

I agree with you that the SBA guarantee loan program could be of benefit to many, but having cited my experiences with SBA you can understand my reluctance to mention this type loan to any of my customers.

The only constructive comment I could make at this time would be toward the improvement of the efficiency in the SBA offices. Perhaps you might consider the suggestion of an SBA office being established in the area of the growing Hudson Valley. That might be helpful in educating people to the SBA and in clearing up some of the delay in processing applications.

My comments are being made, Mr. RESNICK, in a spirit of helpful criticism, and I look forward to your reply in regard to them.

Very truly yours,

JOHN F. CARNRIGHT,
Executive Vice President and Cashier.

THE KERHONKSON NATIONAL BANK,
Kerhonkson, N.Y., March 28, 1966.

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: In your letter of March 23, 1966, you asked me for comments on Small Business Administration and especially the guarantee loan program.

Our one and only experience with the guarantee loan program was a very bad one. We made a loan to two young men in Ellenville, N.Y., for a factory building. The loan was guaranteed under this program. When the loan became considerably past due, we gave the SBA the required 30-day notice to pay their participation in the loan. At that point, instead of reimbursing us for their participation, they began to look for technicalities in the agreement with us as the servicing bank. When you look for technicalities, they are not hard to find, but basically, we had complied with every requirement. We eventually became disgusted, gave them the required 30-day notice that we wanted to buy their participation in the loan, which we did. Incidentally, the loan was paid out in a satisfactory manner.

Based on this experience, we are no longer interested in the guarantee loan program. I assume other banks have had similar experiences.

Sincerely,

A. J. ANDERSON,
President.

The letters SBA stand for Small Business Administration. Perhaps they should also stand for Small Bankers Administration, because I believe that one of the most important functions of the SBA is to back up smaller banks and especially rural banks in an attempt to help them play a more aggressive and vital role in the economic development

of their communities. I cannot think of a better time than right now to look into the SBA's operations and ask ourselves whether it is doing the job that it was created to do; and more important, whether it is doing the job it should be doing in the light of today's social and economic goals. We must have an SBA that is streamlined and efficient, operating in a manner which makes banks want to deal with them, that exhibits a willingness to cut redtape. In short, a fast-moving, economic machine whose gears are meshing smoothly with the overall economic objectives of the Government, and which can make the proper contributions to the total growth of our business community. In addition, and what perhaps may be most important, the SBA must aggressively seek to improve its relations with the banks, so that banks will seek SBA assistance, not reject it as they now seem to be doing.

One problem that this legislation does not deal with is that of appointing an administrator so that the SBA can go forward and resolve some of its many problems. No organization can operate without an effective leader. The immediate appointment of a top-flight administrator will, I am certain, contribute to the more efficient operation of the SBA and permit it to meet the growing needs of our many hard-pressed small businesses. It goes without saying that in these days of tight money and higher interest rates the small businessman is the one who is hardest hit. Anything that can be done to make the SBA a more effective instrument to help these people should be done as quickly as possible.

I would like to state that I am in complete favor of this bill which will insure that the SBA's ability to make loans to small businessmen all over the United States will never again be impaired by unforeseen local disasters.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA].

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, there is no large corporate complex which has not been greatly aided by our Government by contracts, by tax benefit, by subsidy, by indirect assistance in transportation, by research and development of many types and kinds. Five hundred corporations have over 90 percent of the business assets in this country and are imposing giants in the business complex. Over a million corporations, partnerships, and individually owned businesses share the remaining less than 10 percent of business assets. Yet it is from these firms much of the dynamics of change comes. Innovation and flexibility are constant needs of our economy. The contribution of small business in this regard far outweighs the proportion of business assets they hold and control. Dark indeed would be the day that America lost the strength and vitality which issues from the small businessman.

I wholeheartedly support S. 2729, a bill designed to eliminate curtailments in SBA lending activities. Small business cannot survive in the United States without a strong Small Business Admin-

istration and the agency can be only as strong as the legislation with which Congress endows it. S. 2729 will help SBA to better serve small business concerns.

To many, one of the leading features of the legislation is the operation of two separate revolving funds with a prohibition from one fund borrowing from the other. The antiborrowing restriction will mean that in the event of a major disaster, there will be funds to meet this situation and that SBA can move in immediately to begin its lending operations.

Mr. Chairman, also it will mean—and very importantly—that in the event of a series of disasters the other lending programs will not be drained to meet these situations.

Mr. Chairman, under the present setup SBA operates with one revolving fund; and if large drains are made upon that fund for disaster loans the money is replaced, but it takes time. In one case it took 6 months to return funds expended for disasters to the revolving fund. We do not want that to happen again.

Mr. Chairman, S. 2729 raises the limits of loans outstanding under section 4(c). Now this limit, it should be understood by the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle, includes, first, loans made by the SBA; second, loans guaranteed by the SBA; third, SBA loans subject to an SBA guarantee; or, fourth, it should be particularly noted, loans placed in a participation pool under legislation which has just been passed by the other body and which is being considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Committee to support this legislation.

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, since 1956, the Small Business Administration has had to suspend or curtail lending activities on eight separate occasions. It is impossible to estimate how many small businesses were forced to close their doors during these periods.

S. 2729 hopefully will prevent such future closings and will enable SBA to shortly reopen its closed lending functions. For these reasons, I strongly support S. 2729.

As the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, has stated, there are more than 5,000 applications for small business loans backlogged in SBA offices around the country. In addition, there are untold thousands of people on waiting lists to be considered once SBA reopens its lending functions. The eyes of the small business world are focused directly on this Chamber today. I feel certain that this bill will pass. But I am hopeful that it will pass unanimously so that the small businessman can be firmly assured that no Congressman has turned his back on this great segment of our economy.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2729 and the Moore amendment thereto.

The need for isolation of SBA's business loan revolving fund from the inroads of special purpose programs, such as disaster and title IV loans is demonstrated by the present moratorium on business loan applications. Every Member of this body, I am sure, has seen the injury rendered to small businesses throughout this Nation by their inability to obtain long-term financing at reasonable rates of interest.

I support the implementation and expansion of both the disaster loan program and the provisions for financial assistance under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The benefits of these programs and the importance of SBA's role in them has been clearly demonstrated. The increased authorizations provided each of these programs by S. 2729 is essential. Separation of the revolving funds, however, is a common-sense precaution against any fund, and thus any essential SBA program, being depleted at the expense of any other. This occurred last year when demands for disaster loans, resulting from Hurricane Betsy, depleted funds that would ordinarily have been available for the now virtually inoperative business loan program. With separate business and disaster loan revolving funds coupled with the reporting requirements stipulated in this bill, no SBA program should ever again experience this kind of a shut-down, at the expense of the small business community.

The Moore amendment carries the compelling logic of separating the funds of various programs one step further. The \$100 million ceiling on total loans under the title IV program, and the establishment of a separate fund therefor, adequately provides for the contemplated growth of the program for the next 2 or 3 years.

Although individual program funds are protected in part under S. 2729 by the separation of disaster loan funds and business loan funds, further independence of all three programs, including title IV loans, is provided by the Moore amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is the responsibility of the Congress to do everything in its power to promote the efficient and continuous operation of each of the programs we have authorized under the Small Business Administration. The establishment of three separate revolving funds, the increasing of authorizations for all SBA programs, and the requirement of quarterly reports from the agency on its operations are essential steps in this direction, whereby SBA will perform the services to the small business community which the Congress has authorized it and intended it to perform.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to represent a district which, for many years, has been handicapped by the threat of disasters of the type about which we have been speaking today.

In 1938 a real hurricane hit Cape Cod and did hundreds of millions of dollars worth of damage, and took hundreds of lives. Many people found, to their sur-

prise, that they did not have insurance which would cover the tidal flooding damage that accompanied the hurricane. There were some insurance companies which made adjustments—adjustments which perhaps were unfair to the insurance companies and to its other policyholders. Some claims were paid but, by and large, there was no protection for those whose losses resulted from tidal flooding.

Then, Mr. Chairman, again in 1944 we had another hurricane, and then in the midfifties we had two, one upon the other, in rapid succession. Tidal flooding losses, once again were not covered.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of those two hurricanes the Congress in the midfifties passed some legislation authorizing a disaster insurance program on the part of the Federal Government. However, there were no hurricanes in the years immediately following, and so the Congress did not fund this program. It lay dormant for many years, until recently prompted by Hurricane Betsy and under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], legislation was offered which funded further study so that we might eliminate the cause of all the expenditures which we have been discussing today.

And so, Mr. Chairman in the public works bill of last year, we authorized more than \$1 million to study the problem of disaster insurance. It is my understanding that within a year from the date of the appropriation following that authorization, the Congress will have a report rendered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and that they are to recommend a solution to this problem under the joint sponsorship of Government and the insurance companies.

It is my understanding further that the question of the earthquake insurance will take some time longer but that too is being studied.

Hopefully, this study can point the way to a joint effort on the part of the insurance industry and the Government and the individual involved so that some program can be worked out so that this kind of small business assistance will no longer be required.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he has any knowledge concerning the nature and extent and the prospects for hearings as a result of that study?

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman such time as is necessary, if he will yield to me to answer his question.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, first I want to congratulate the gentleman on the fine work he has done in connection with the proposal that he has which I consider a very constructive one and which I believe has the unanimous support of the Members of the Congress and I know it does have the unanimous support of our members of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The \$1 million that the gentleman referred to which was appropriated under Public Law 89-309 last October in the first supplemental bill was made available at that time.

Now the study under the law is being carried on and must be completed within 1 year of last October. If any questions should arise that need the attention of the Congress which will further this very desirable project, I feel reasonably certain the Congress will respond and do what is necessary to make sure that it is completed. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. KEITH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I just simply want to read from a UPI wire report this morning something that is rather significant.

President Johnson today addressed a fervent appeal—

Mind you, this is a fervent appeal—to all sections of the American economy from the housewife to the roadbuilder from the corporate executive to the union leader to cut down immediately on unnecessary spending to meet the rising threat of inflation.

Apparently, Mr. Chairman, the message has finally gotten through to the President of the United States that inflation is on his doorstep. I now anxiously await the President's message to the Congress saying, "Congress go thou and do likewise."

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2729 and compliment the committee for presenting it in such a way that the Small Business Administration will be funded and stabilized and I am particularly pleased with the committee's action in accepting the gentleman from West Virginia's amendment which further protects the primary purpose of the legislation, yet works no harm on other programs. I hope and plead with the executive branch to enhance and abet this agency which creates jobs and is generally worthy, now that the Congress has spoken.

Recently, not knowing when this bill would be programmed, I wrote and delivered by radio and mail to the district I am privileged to represent, the following:

A battle is being waged in Congress to keep the Nation's small business community from being buried in the bigness of government. The fight is built around a premise with which I completely agree—that in this day of the great big society, there is still a place for the small shopkeeper, the small family farmer, and the small businessman, competing in the open marketplace.

The loan program of the Small Business Administration has helped many thousands of small firms to get started, to expand, to grow, and to prosper. This independent agency of the Federal Government has, until recently, been sensitive to the needs of small business. To the disillusionment of the small business community, however, there has been a continuing effort in the executive branch of government to downgrade the Small Business Administration. And so effective has this effort been that, today, the SBA is operating without direction, and without funds. The Office of Administrator has been vacant since August of 1965.

Two years ago, SBA lowered its loan limits, and then, last October, stopped accepting loan applications altogether. Congress authorized the agency to use an additional \$36 million to supplement the depleted loan fund, but the agency has neither requested nor used the money.

Adding to the disillusionment of small businessmen, is the fact that of the seven agency area directors appointed since 1960, not one has had prior SBA experience. Of the 30 regional directors, appointed since 1960, only 1 had prior SBA experience.

Now has come the latest move—one which many in Congress feel will bring about the complete extinction of the Small Business Administration. The executive branch wants to take away from the SBA its congressionally established independent status, by transferring the agency to the Commerce Department. To me, this concern is justified because such a move could mean that SBA activities would be buried in the impersonal machinery of a huge bureaucratic Federal department. Small businessmen, in this complex age, face difficult problems in starting and staying in business, and they need independent attention. It is for this reason that I have joined with my colleagues in urging the immediate enactment of legislation to keep the Small Business Administration separate from the redtape of a ponderous major department.

House Republican Leader GERALD R. FORD, commented the other day: "The trend of the 20th century has been toward bigness—big business, big labor, big agriculture, big deals, big deficits, and big brother." The key to whether small businessmen survive in all of this, could well turn on our efforts to win the battle over the status of the Small Business Administration.

One bill, H.R. 8282, which may soon come before the House of Representatives, the administration proposal to federalize our unemployment compensation system, would further add to the problems of the small businessman today. One effect of the bill would be to increase unemployment compensation taxes, which are paid entirely by the employer, and thus increase his overhead costs of doing business. It would eliminate experience ratings of employers in all States. The large corporation with its financial resources may be able to stand these added costs, without going out of business, but, many small business firms, caught in the squeeze between rising costs and high taxes, are for the most part not able to absorb the additional expenses, which this bill would impose, without raising prices. In today's competitive markets, this upward price pressure could force many other small firms out of business. Our bankruptcy rate is now the highest on record. This means fewer permanent job opportunities.

Where this does happen, it is not only the small businessman who is the loser, but also the employees who work for him, and the consumers whose choice of products is further diminished. The bill to federalize unemployment compensation is still pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. In my opinion, that is where it should remain.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the provision of S. 2729 which provides for separate disaster and regular loan funds for the Small Business Administration has been badly needed for some time.

I believe that the amendment offered by my able and distinguished colleague from West Virginia is also required to fully perfect this bill.

Title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act is, in my opinion, one of the outstanding accomplishments of the present administration. I believe that small

business development centers have great potential both in terms of encouraging small business enterprises and in assisting social stability in deprived areas. However, it is clear that this is a function quite separate and apart from the conventional loan programs administered by the Small Business Administration. Therefore, the same set of reasons which made it necessary to establish separate funds for disaster and regular loans require the adoption of this amendment to establish separate revolving funds for the Economic Opportunity Act programs.

I commend the gentleman from West Virginia on his foresight in offering this amendment and urge my colleagues to fully support his proposal.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to support S. 2729, under consideration today.

On February 14, 1966, I introduced H.R. 12790 to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act. On the same day I explained the provisions of my bill.

S. 2729 covers all the objections which my bill was designed to meet.

In addition, an amendment will be submitted by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] which will place a loan ceiling of \$100 million under the Economic Opportunity Act loan program which will, in my opinion, further protect SBA loan funds.

I adopt today the remarks I made about my own bill on February 14, 1966, which will be found in the RECORD at pages 3013-3014 as being applicable to the bill under consideration today and unconditionally support the bill and urge the House to pass it.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly hope this House will wisely improve and promptly approve this bill before us, S. 2729, to amend the Small Business Act.

In summary, as it is now written, the major provisions of this measure direct increased authorizations of the Small Business Administration loan funds; separate the disaster loan funds from the regular loan funds in order to guard against the previous necessity of meeting the fund shortages of one program at the expense of the other and to insure the Congress will be given sufficient warning in advance about the development and danger of a shortage in either fund.

I believe that the great majority of Members here are in accord with the provisions of this measure and recognize the urgent need of its enactment.

However, many of us question the wisdom and the practicality in still permitting the revolving fund established by the regular business loan program to be subject to the requirements of the Economic Opportunity Act title IV program.

It would appear, therefore, that the effectiveness and even survival of the operation of the SBA's normal business loan program, so vital to a tremendous number of small businesses all over the country as a sole source of capital funds, is in danger in the same manner and fashion as it was through the drains upon it of the unforeseen magnitude of the disaster loans that were expended. It would seem, then, that we should now, or certainly in the immediate future, legis-

lative act to establish a separate revolving fund for the operation of the Economic Opportunity Act loan program administered by the Small Business Administration. Surely such action on our part would be in the national interest and it would project an imperatively important survival factor in the preservation of small business as the foundation of free, independent, private enterprise in this country.

On this score, I further urge and hope that at any and every appropriate time this House will overwhelmingly evidence its concurrence with the resolution recently adopted by the Senate Select Committee on Small Business that the Small Business Administration should be continued as an independent agency serving the vital needs of small business and thereby promoting the progress of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my enthusiastic support for S. 2729, which will help the small business enterprises of this country.

A series of unprecedented natural disasters, causing enormous suffering and losses, has struck the Nation during the last 2 years. Among these were the Alaskan earthquake, floods in California, Oregon and Washington, hurricane Betsy, floods along the Mississippi, tornadoes. They resulted in extraordinary drains upon the disaster relief funds of the Small Business Administration. This bill will replenish these depleted funds for the remainder of this fiscal year; that is, to June 30.

The heavy drain of funds in disaster loans has been at the expense of regular business loans: money which normally would have been available for normal business loans has been used up in disaster loans. This bill would separate the two kinds of loans for the first time so that, in the future, shortages in one program will not have to be met at the expense of the other program.

In addition, I wish to announce my support for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore], the ranking Republican on the Select Committee on Small Business. He proposes a third revolving fund to handle the loan programs assigned to the Small Business Administration under the Economic Opportunity Act. Unless this is adopted, these anti-poverty loans will present a continuing threat to the normal loan programs by draining away money that would otherwise go into normal loans.

Throughout all the deliberations on this bill, in committee and here today, our concern, the Republican concern, has been to see that the special needs of disaster areas and the war on poverty are met but not at the expense of the other small businessmen in the country. The small businessman is still the economic backbone of America.

The Moore amendment is still another responsive, constructive effort by Republican leadership to protect the rights of the individual in this too often overwhelming Great Society. Great Society programs bear down hard on small business. Material shortages, unwise and restrictive labor policies, redtape, unneces-

sary regulations, rising prices, advancing taxes, a reduced share of defense and other Federal spending, along with other pressures all have marked the Great Society approach to small business.

This bill, with the inclusion of the Moore amendment, will give the Small Business Administration the tools it needs to carry out its task of helping the small businessman to prosper and thus add to the betterment of the country.

I strongly urge that the Moore amendment be adopted and this bill be passed.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my strong support to the effort to pass S. 2729.

This legislation is urgently needed to provide sufficient funds for Small Business Administration's lending authority relating to flood disasters. The people of my region on the Mississippi River and its tributaries suffered serious economic losses from floods which struck in 1965 and again this year.

Many thousands of dollars of loans were made by SBA for 30 years, at 3 percent interest, and this certainly was a big help. In many instances, this permitted individuals to begin in business again.

The large number of national disasters which have occurred in the past year have placed a very heavy burden on the operations of SBA. The legislation before us will permit SBA to meet its responsibilities to the people who need help, as well as to continue its regular operations.

I urge passage of this legislation to meet our basic regional needs.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of the time remaining on this side.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(c) of the Small Business Act is amended by striking out "\$1,841,000,000" and "\$1,375,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,966,000,000" and "\$1,500,000,000", respectively.

SEC. 2. Effective on July 1, 1966, section 4(c) of the Small Business Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1) There are hereby established in the Treasury the following revolving funds: (A) a disaster loan fund which shall be available for financing functions performed under sections 7(b) (1), 7(b) (2), 7(b) (4), and 7(c) (2) of this Act, including administrative expenses in connection with such functions; and (B) a business loan and investment fund which shall be available for financing functions performed under sections 7(a), 7(b) (3), 7(e), and 8(a) of this Act, titles III and V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, including administrative expenses in connection with such functions.

"(2) All repayments of loans and debentures, payments of interest and other receipts arising out of transactions heretofore or hereafter entered into by the Administration (A) pursuant to sections 7(b) (1), 7(b) (2), 7(b) (4), and 7(c) (2) of this Act shall be paid into the disaster loan fund; and (B) pursuant to sections 7(a), 7(b) (3), 7(e), and

8(a) of this Act, titles III and V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall be paid into the business loan and investment fund.

"(3) Unexpended balances of appropriations made to the fund pursuant to this subsection, as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this paragraph, shall be allocated, together with related assets and liabilities, to the funds established by paragraph (1) in such amounts as the Administrator shall determine. In addition to any sums so allocated, appropriations are hereby authorized to be made to such funds, as capital thereof, in such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Administration, which appropriations shall remain available until expended.

"(4) The total amount of loans, guarantees, and other obligations or commitments, heretofore or hereafter entered into by the Administration, which are outstanding at any one time (A) under sections 7(a), 7(b) (3), 7(e), and 8(a) of this Act, and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall not exceed \$1,364,100,000; (B) under title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, shall not exceed \$366,500,000; and (C) under title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, shall not exceed \$156,700,000.

"(5) The Administration shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and House of Representatives, as soon as possible after the beginning of each calendar quarter, a full and complete report on the status of each of the funds established by paragraph (1), including its projection of the future needs of such funds, and its recommendations for such additional appropriations as it deems appropriate. If at the close of the preceding calendar quarter the aggregate amount outstanding or committed by the Administration in carrying out its functions under any of the sections or titles referred to in paragraph (4) exceeded 75 percent of the total amount authorized to be outstanding or committed under such sections or titles, the Administration's report shall include its recommendations for such additional authority as it deems appropriate.

"(6) The Administration shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, following the close of each fiscal year, interest on the outstanding cash disbursements from each of the funds established by paragraph (1) at rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields on outstanding interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as calculated for the month of June preceding such fiscal year."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 7 of the Small Business Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The Administration also is empowered to make loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lenders through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis) to assist any firm to adjust to changed economic conditions resulting from increased competition from imported articles, but only if (1) an adjustment proposal of such firm has been certified by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, (2) the Secretary has referred such proposal to the Administration under that Act and the loan would provide part or all of the financial assistance necessary to carry out such proposal, and (3) the Secretary's certification is in force at the time the Administration makes the loan. With respect to loans made under this subsection the Administration shall apply the provisions of sections 314, 315, 316, 318, 319, and 320 of the Trade Ex-

pansion Act of 1962 as though such loans had been made under section 314 of that Act."

(b) Section 2 of Public Law 87-550, approved July 25, 1962 (76 Stat. 220), is hereby repealed. Any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore appropriated for the purposes of such section are hereby transferred to the business loan and investment fund established by section 4(c) (1) of the Small Business Act.

(c) This section shall take effect on July 1, 1966.

Mr. WIDNALL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be open to amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 11, strike out "\$1,364,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,400,000,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 13, strike out "\$366,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 15, strike out "\$156,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200,000,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. PATMAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 3, strike out the comma in line 21 and all that follows down through the period in line 23, and insert in lieu thereof a period.

Page 4, after the period in line 6, insert the following new sentence: "Business-type budgets for each of the funds established by paragraph (1) shall be prepared, transmitted to the Congress, considered, and enacted in the manner prescribed by law (sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 847-849)) for wholly owned Government corporations."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, both of these amendments are minor and technical in nature and in no way change the intent or effect of the bill. The amendments have been cleared with the Bureau of the Budget, as well as the minority leadership of the Banking and Currency Committee.

The first portion of the amendments would merely make it clear that budget requirements and projections would still be handled through the Bureau of the Budget and would not come directly from SBA without consulting the Bureau of the Budget.

The second portion of the amendments would put SBA under the Government-owned Corporation Act so that the Appropriations Committee would still be able to review the funding of the agency every year.

Mr. Chairman, these amendments were carefully drawn with the support and help of the minority, and the Members on both sides agree to it. I do not believe there is any objection to it. I hope that it is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOORE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE: Page 2, line 4, strike "and" the first time it appears.

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike "and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964."

Page 2, strike the period in line 10, and insert: "; and (C) an Economic Opportunity Act loan fund which shall be available for financing functions performed under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, including administrative expenses in connection with such functions."

Page 2, line 16, strike "and".

Page 2, lines 18 and 19, strike "and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964."

Page 2, strike the period in line 20 and insert: "; and (C) pursuant to title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall be paid into the Economic Opportunity Act loan fund."

Page 3, line 14, strike "and".

Page 3, strike the period in line 15 and insert: "; and (D) under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 shall not exceed \$100,000,000."

Page 3, lines 10 and 11, strike "and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this is a very concise amendment. I made reference to it during consideration of the rule and made reference to it under the general debate. By this amendment, however technical it may sound in removing the "and's," "or's," and "but's," it is hoped that we would establish a separate ceiling of \$100 million for the total dollar value of poverty loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

It limits to this sum that portion of the SBA revolving fund available for such loans and prevents a further drain of SBA funds, to the injury of the business loan program. It prevents a drain, similar to that which occurred by reason of demands of the disaster program, which we have heard alluded to here today.

What is the foundation of this amendment? Will it hurt the poverty title IV loan program? The answer to this is no. It is estimated that the total title IV loans outstanding at the close of fiscal year 1966 will be about \$26.7 million. At the close of fiscal year 1967, it is estimated that \$69,400,000 will be outstanding.

The authorization of \$100 million, the ceiling which is proposed to be established by my amendment, I believe it is plain to see, will provide for the mone-

tary needs of 2 years or more, on the basis of the projected operation of the poverty loan program.

The business loan authorization, however—the one which we in the Congress originally created for this agency to handle—will not be dissipated. There will be no chance for poverty loan requirements to invade and utilize all of the funds that are available through this legislation for the business loan program.

If the title IV program should accelerate, and there is every indication that it may—it is the fond hope of the Congress that it will—it is proper to suggest that we have a subsequent review or reexamination of it. But, if it should accelerate without restraint, it can very well again have the effect, as the disaster loan program did, of completely shutting down the small business loan program in the country.

So, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the committee for bringing this bill before us. I want to help. As the ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Small Business, I live with the problems of the small businessmen on a day-to-day basis. I want to preserve the historic small business loan program. A program which is vital to the small business community of the United States.

I just hope that the Committee will recognize that my amendment is but a further step to protect that historic business loan program of the Small Business Administration.

If this is not done, what is going to happen? It did happen once and it can happen again. We may have a complete shutdown of the business loan program. That, basically, is what all of us are interested in preventing, even though, from time to time, we have thrust additional responsibility upon the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and had him taking other loan programs under his wing.

It is ironic that in every other respect the committee in bringing this bill to the floor has placed a ceiling in order to guarantee the operation of the business loan program.

They did not provide a ceiling, however, for the title IV economic opportunity poverty loan program. Therefore, I seek simply to provide this additional safeguard for the business loan program.

It is anticipated they will not use in excess of \$69 million for poverty loans. That is the SBA figure. But, in the event that they do, they will not have the opportunity to destroy the basic program, which is the business loan program of the Small Business Administration.

I seek, Mr. Chairman, to improve the situation so that the membership may not at some future time need to ask, as we do today, "What happened? Why did we run out of funds? Why can't you get a small business loan?"

I think the record has been written well by the Small Business Committee as to the reasons. They are being restated here today.

The record of our investigation, however, was not submitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency. As I ex-

plained to the membership, we have dual responsibility in the matter of the Small Business Administration. One committee investigates and another legislates. Very frankly, the one that investigates is rarely in contact with the one that legislates and vice versa. How in the world we can ever get the record of our hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee at an appropriate time I do not know.

I ask favorable consideration of my amendment, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, when we, in 1953, established the Small Business Administration, the business loan program was viewed as and intended to be the agency's most important activity. The need of small businesses throughout the country for long-term financing at reasonable interest was then and continues to be of critical importance.

Through the intervening 12 years, business loans totaling billions of dollars have been made to qualified small businesses unable to borrow needed funds elsewhere.

The 1962 merger of SBA regular business loan revolving fund with that established to meet financial needs of disaster victims caused an unprecedented financial drain such as the requirements for Hurricane Betsy to completely usurp funds available for SBA's principal loan activity.

The depletion of the revolving fund demanded a moratorium on all business loan applications effective October 11 of last year. It is still in effect. Meanwhile, thousands of qualified and deserving businesses have experienced irreparable injury or ruin due to the denial of financial assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of S. 2729 and the Moore amendment thereto as a significant step toward the restoration of the SBA business loan program. Dedicated as I am to the small business segment of our economy, I fully appreciate the urgent need for increased authorizations and, I trust immediately forthcoming appropriations, to bolster the sagging fortunes of so many small businesses which have suffered of late. The earmarking of funds for SBA loan activities provides commonsense protection against raids upon the available funds of one program due to unanticipated drain upon another. It is a good business practice and should be employed.

May I again point out that the appropriation of funds is yet required before the SBA business loan program will be reactivated. I trust that the request for such funds will be immediately forthcoming.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I must oppose vigorously any amendment to S. 2729 which would set up a separate revolving fund for Small Busi-

ness Administration loans made under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

SBA's proposed budget for fiscal 1967 provides \$428 million for the regular business loan program, and \$50 million for title IV loans made to poor people. This is ample proof, I believe, that SBA has no intention whatsoever of allowing the title IV program to claim a disproportionate share of SBA's total loan funds.

The total size of the title IV program is controlled by other factors besides the amount of loan funds available. Each loan must be made through a small business development center, which provides management assistance and other non-financial help to borrowers. During fiscal 1967 there will be only 70 of these centers in operation across the country—certainly a limiting factor on the size of the program. The number of such centers is controlled by the size of the regular budget appropriation made each year by Congress—certainly an effective, even though indirect, way of limiting the amount of loans made.

Should the title IV program continue to prove successful, and continue to grow—as I hope it will—adequate funds for it will be available without taking them from any other program—the regular business loan program included. A bill now pending—S. 2499—will permit SBA to sell participations in pools of its loans. Proceeds from such sales will be more than ample to allow all SBA programs to operate at realistic levels.

Besides, I believe that attempts to create broad distinctions between the title IV loan program and the regular business loan program fail to recognize their basic similarity. Both provide loans to businesses which need them. The fact that these business loans go to poor people under the title IV program, and to people who do not meet the definition of poverty under the regular business loan program overlooks the fact that in each case, small businesses are being helped.

I believe that attempts to set up artificial distinctions by creating a separate revolving fund for title IV loans are really attempts to prevent the Federal Government from carrying out the clear mandate of Congress expressed in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This legislation seeks to help small businessmen and potential small businessmen who do not readily fit into SBA's regular loan program.

I cannot believe that the Congress will now sabotage that sound program and deny assistance to poor people who have the capacity and the energy to build sound, productive small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that I know the gentleman from West Virginia is a very sincere and able Member of this House. He is a member of the House select committee to study small business problems. I happen to know something about that committee, since I offered the resolution that caused its creation in 1941 and was the chairman of that committee for over 20 years. I think that committee has performed wonderful services to small business—

particularly under the chairmanship of the Honorable JOE EVINS of Tennessee—but, of course, it is not a legislative committee and was never intended to be. It is just like the small business study committee in the other body. This committee in the other body does not have legislative powers either. They have a Small Business Committee in the Senate, which is the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which handles legislative matters, just as we have in the House, and which handles problems of small business. The Committee on Small Business in the House, which is a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, considered this bill and approved it, as well as the full committee, and they approved it unanimously.

I am sure none of the bad things predicted by the gentleman from West Virginia will happen. The object of this bill which your Banking and Currency Committee unanimously reported has as its purpose to clear up the criticisms and objections that have been made by Members of Congress about the Small Business Administration.

We know this is a good bill. I do not think it is in accordance with good legislative procedure for an amendment to be brought up here at the last minute, a substantial amendment involving all kinds of technicalities to which no study has been given by the Small Business Subcommittee or by the Committee on Banking and Currency. This amendment, I understand, was brought to the attention of the Senate committee. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] appeared before the Senate committee. He brought several amendments to the attention of that committee, and they were adopted, but this particular one so I have been told, was not adopted. Therefore, the Senate is in the position of having turned this amendment down one time. If we were to adopt it now, I do not know whether they would accept it or not. We must assume the chances are it would not be accepted. That would mean, although the gentleman from West Virginia I know would not like to delay this bill, it would delay it. This bill is urgent and it is crucial. We must get it passed now, so we must not run that risk.

May I say to the gentleman from West Virginia, whom I always consider a good friend of small business, that I hope he will not insist on his amendment at this time. We have before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House now a bill to amend the Small Business Act. His amendment would be germane and, if he wants to go before the committee tomorrow or next week, we will give him that chance. However, do not expect us to take an amendment like this without consideration and without knowing how the different agencies and the administration would consider it or how anybody else would. I hasten to add that I am not necessarily against the gentleman's amendment. But it should and must be studied, and if it has merit I am sure this body will adopt it.

Now, the letter that the gentleman from West Virginia sent out about this

amendment was dated today, March 31. That is this morning. That is the first time we had any knowledge of any kind of it. Your Banking and Currency Committee was in session when we received this letter, and we were there until 12 and then came over here and did not have time to consider it. We know that the Small Business Administration looks on this amendment as something of an obstacle to the proper enforcement of the very law we will have right now, but it still may be a good amendment. I suggest, if the gentleman will come before our committee, we will give him consideration now, or if he wants to offer a new bill and a new amendment, we will give him consideration. But to bring it on the floor of the House at the last minute is just asking too much of us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. As able and as fine as the gentleman from West Virginia is, he has not consulted his colleagues about this any more than he has the committee. We would have given him a hearing on it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PATMAN. Wait just a moment. I have not finished my sentence.

Mr. MOORE. That is what I am afraid of.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me finish my sentence.

The Committee on Small Business he refers to—and I am a member of that committee, and I was not conferred with about this—the Committee on Small Business, headed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] does not endorse this amendment to my knowledge.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Not right now.

I think I would have been notified about it, but I have not been. We value his judgment highly, but this amendment should receive proper and adequate consideration by the appropriate committee of this body in full and complete hearings.

Mr. Chairman, in the gentleman's letter it says in the last paragraph—it does not say that the Committee on Small Business endorses it; it does not say that any other Member of Congress endorses it—but it says that he and the 4.7 million small businessmen in this Nation welcome your support. The gentleman from West Virginia is just asking for the support of himself and the small business organizations. But, Mr. Chairman, I invite the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that no small business organization has communicated with me or with any member, to my knowledge, to the effect that they are for this amendment. So I believe it is just the gentleman's own suggestion, and the gentleman may have a good suggestion.

I am not saying that this will not eventually have my support or the support of the committee. But I am just saying that it comes at a time when we are not in a position to give it adequate and full consideration.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have nothing to ask particularly except may I say to the gentleman from Texas that I have heard during the general debate several Members rise in support of this amendment. So there has been some support other than the support of the gentleman from West Virginia.

I am advised that I have the support of the minority on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and beyond that may I say that I, as the gentleman well knows—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, it was indeed interesting to listen to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] disclaim any knowledge of this amendment prior to today, although the gentleman says that someone took the amendment to the other body. He seemed to be aware of that, and aware of the contents of the amendment when it went over to the other body. But this has taken the gentleman by surprise today, apparently, and the gentleman claims no prior knowledge of the amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. No.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] in order to ask him if, as it has been suggested, this amendment creates a revolving fund?

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

Mr. GROSS. Of course.

Mr. MOORE. This is the point—and it follows generally along the line of the discussion of the gentleman from Texas—the gentleman is basically an artist in misleading this House of Representatives.

This amendment does not set up any revolving fund. It simply sets a \$100 million ceiling upon the amount of funds in the bill which can be used for poverty loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act. Beyond that, it preserves the remainder of the funds, for which authorization is sought here today for the operation of the regular business loan program and prevents the poverty loan program from destroying the small business loan program.

May I further state to the gentleman from Iowa, we heard that the disaster program was not going to curtail the operation of the small business loan program. I believe the gentleman from Iowa will recall that, and what happened? We closed the Small Business Administration loan program down, because it did happen, the gentleman from Texas knows that is what occurred.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the objection on the part of the gentleman from Texas to this amendment is probably just as farsighted as his suggestion that the disaster program would not ever consume all of the regular business loan fund.

This does not, in direct answer to the gentleman from Iowa, create any new revolving fund at all. It just places a dollar ceiling upon the title IV loan program so as to preserve the small business loan program.

Mr. GROSS. And the denial of the gentleman from Texas that he was unacquainted with the amendment until it came here today was an attempt, apparently, to shed his unenlightenment over the rest of the House?

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Of course.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Iowa is most nearly correct, but not absolutely correct.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I want to be absolutely correct.

Mr. MOORE. We tried for 3 days, I say to the gentleman from Iowa, to find out when the Committee on Banking and Currency was going to consider this authorization bill. But they delayed it for 3 days. Then at some hour, only known to the chairman, they called the bill up and had the Executive Director of SBA present, and no one else knew they were going to consider the bill.

I say that when others talk about the fact that this amendment would delay the funding of the Small Business Administration and the operation of that program, I can only say to you and to the Members of this House, Where has the administration been for 8 months?

Mr. GROSS. That is a good question and I assume the answer ought to come from President Johnson who is completely uninhibited when it comes to requesting less important legislation.

Mr. MOORE. And this amendment is only an insurance policy to make certain that the business loan program will continue to operate, and I know that every Member of this House desires to see this vital program maintained for the benefit of our Nation's small business community.

Otherwise, you may rest assured there is every reason to believe that we will come back to this House some day and be asking the same questions we are asking now—Why did they close down the small business loan program?

My amendment insures its operation and I ask the support of my colleagues for its passage.

Mr. GROSS. And it will in no way hamper the small business program?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is eminently correct.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, I think it will. But we ought to consider it and we can have a hearing right now before our committee. We ought to have a hearing on this before the committee I will say to the gentleman. Notification was in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when we were going to have these hearings.

The reason I brought that up about the other body is that I did not know about that, that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] had brought up his amendment, and we began to look around about what the other body had done and what others had done, and I found out after he brought up his amendment today, that it was actually suggested to the Senate committee and they did not accept it. They did accept a number of fine amendments which were suggested by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] but they did not accept this particular one.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman was well acquainted with the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. What is that?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman was well acquainted with the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. No, I was not. I do not yet know the provisions of it. You see this is a very technical amendment and we have not had an opportunity to look into it. We cannot vote for this amendment with a knowledge of what it actually contains because we do not know—it is, as I say, a technical amendment.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. What is so technical about it, I ask the gentleman from Iowa? What is so technical about saying in this bill, we want title IV of the economic opportunity act in full operation but not in excess of \$100 million so that we will have funds to continue the equally important regular small business loan program? Does that seem technical to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. GROSS. Not at all.

Mr. MOORE. That is all the amendment does.

Mr. PATMAN. This will hurt the very poorest small businessman—the very poorest small businessman.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. I supported the poverty program on the floor of this House. How in the world anybody who has an ounce of responsibility can represent to this committee that this is going to hurt the poor when it actually insures that the money authorized to help the poor will be available when they need it? I simply do not understand the last remarks of my colleague from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. That is what we want to understand.

Mr. MOORE. I am not talking about the understanding of the gentleman

from Texas. I am saying, I do not understand how the gentleman can represent to this body that the poor are going to be hurt when we would be making twice as much money available to them as he proposes under the bill before us.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the amendment be reread.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread.

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

Mr. FINO. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. Chairman, I support the Moore amendment. I think that it is common-sense to make the Economic Opportunity Act loan program a separate and limited part of the Small Business Administration program.

In doing this, we set a firm limit on the extent to which the Small Business Administration can be a pipeline of the poverty program in all its waste. If the Moore amendment is not passed, we are liable to see the SBA loan funds being drained away to support the poverty program. I am concerned that the Small Business Administration loan program do the job we set it up to do. I do not want it to be transformed into an auxiliary of the poverty program. That would be throwing good money after bad. The wastefulness and maladministration of the poverty program are well known—I do not think we should leave an open-ended amount of Small Business Administration loan funds subject to the requirements of the Economic Opportunity Act.

I read this morning that the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee feels that the poverty program should be multiplied by 5 so as to make it a \$7 billion a year program. Now I think this is a pipe dream. The Congress would not dream of voting such extravagance. What I worry about is that the poverty people will take their money where they can find it. I do not want to give them a chance to find it in the loan funds of the Small Business Administration. That program was set up to help small businessmen. It was not set up to be an auxiliary of the poverty program. I support the Moore amendment to limit the Economic Opportunity Act loan program delegated to the SBA to a loan fund of \$100 million.

I hope the Members of this House will support this amendment.

I agree with the gentleman from West Virginia that he has provided a ceiling much higher than what we had in mind for the poverty program.

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

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

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman feel that it would be better if we gave the gentleman from West Virginia a hearing, at which time we could discuss the question and go into it as we should?

The gentleman from New York did not bring this up in the committee. He is a very fine and distinguished member of our committee, but I do not believe he brought it up in the committee at all. I do not think it was discussed.

Mr. FINO. The gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of my committee, is absolutely correct. This was not brought before the committee.

But I do want to say to the chairman of the committee that this is not a very complicated amendment. It is a very clear and concise amendment. It has a purpose, and it is very clear to the Members of this House. I do not see any reason for any hearings. I think we should be happy to hear it right here and now, where all Members of the House are participating. I think it is a good amendment, and I do not see any reason why anyone should object to it.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I hope I will not be in the position of the grandmother of the little boy who had exhibited some interest in bird life. So the grandmother sent him a book. After seeing the young man she said, "Well, son, how did you like the book on penguins?"

He said, "Well, grandmother, it told me a lot more about penguins than I wanted to know."

I do not know whether we are going to have to tell ourselves more than we want to know about the matter of the financing of the SBA, but evidently this is the crux of the matter.

What are we talking about? I should like to have the help of the chairman of the committee to see if we cannot put ourselves in some kind of possession of the facts. I understand that the existing fund for the SBA, as authorized by the Congress up to date, is \$1,841 million. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HANNA. I understand under this act the total amount authorized for the SBA will now be \$1,966 million, which is an increase of \$125 million. Is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HANNA. It is my understanding that under the present law, out of the money that has been authorized, there is \$1,375 million authorized for business loans, and the \$125 million that we are putting into the authorization is going directly to this fund, and under this new law that amount will be \$1,500 million. Is that not correct?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HANNA. After July 1, 1966, we are going to have two funds. One fund will be for disaster, and there will be no limit on those funds. But under the authorization that the Congress has made, there will be set aside \$1,400 million in the second fund. This will be the fund out of which we will operate the business loans.

As I see the further wording of the bill, this is what happens to that \$1,400 million: \$400 million will be available to

SBIC. It does not necessarily have to draw that, but that will be the ceiling on what will be available. Four hundred million will be the ceiling that is available. Two hundred million dollars will be available for the State and local development companies. They may not use it, but it will be available.

So \$600 million of the \$1,400 million will not be utilized but may be utilized by those two activities. Is that correct?

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

Mr. HANNA. I wish to be sure that, if I yield, we will be talking about the same thing.

Mr. MOORE. I wish to talk about the same thing which the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. HANNA. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. That is not entirely correct, sir. In the report you will see three ceilings. You alluded to the \$400 million for SBIC. Then there would be \$200 million for State and local development companies.

Mr. HANNA. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Those funds would be outside the \$1,400 million that is available for the general operation of the agency.

Mr. HANNA. I stand corrected. The gentleman is correct. The \$1,400 million would be for all the other financing done by the SBA.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HANNA. Then I think where the gentleman stands is in this position. The gentleman's letter which went out states in the next to the last paragraph:

I propose an amendment which will establish a separate revolving fund for the Economic Opportunities Act program.

That statement raises the question, Does the gentleman want to put his amendment in the same position as the \$400 million of the SBIC and the \$200 million for State and local development companies? Is that what the gentleman wants to do?

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

Mr. HANNA. I certainly do, because I want an answer to that question.

Mr. MOORE. I thought I had answered that when he propounded his earlier question, because originally—the letter speaks for itself—the gentleman suggested a question to me at the time I was in the well, as to whether or not this was an isolation of funds which might otherwise be available for the loan program.

As a result of the gentleman's suggestion, I deleted from my amendment anything that would create a second revolving fund.

Therefore, the only thing I have done is to state that within the \$1.4 billion, there will be a ceiling of \$100 million for the operation of the title IV.

It was basically as a result of the suggestion of the gentleman from California that I deleted any reference to the revolving fund.

Mr. HANNA. This is an important point.

Mr. MOORE. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HANNA. If we did not have this correction, we would be making the amendment as suggested in your letter, and I believe that would be a mistake.

Mr. MOORE. I agree with the gentleman, because it could conceivably—because of the fact they anticipate that only \$69 million will be used—isolate \$31 million of funds which otherwise could be used for the business loan program, which the gentleman is interested in, I understand.

Mr. HANNA. I think the gentleman can understand how the House may not have been considering the point made on the basis that we are now trying to make it, unless this clarification had been brought up.

Mr. MOORE. I appreciate the manner in which the gentleman has brought this up.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] which would create a ceiling of \$100 million for economic opportunity loans. In January of this year, when I testified on behalf of S. 2729 before the Senate Subcommittee on Small Business, I suggested that the committee explore the possibility of a separate poverty loan fund. Actually this should have been set up at the time the Economic Opportunity Act was passed, but it is certainly not too late to do so now. I have not pressed the point of a separate loan fund before because I was under the impression that the poverty loans would be such a small amount of the total.

However, the figures have been revised upward of late. The \$15 million estimate for fiscal 1966 has nearly doubled to \$28 million. Fiscal 1967 figures, now available, indicate a prior projection of \$40 million has now been revised to a budget estimate of \$50 million, nearly doubling the 1966 total. It is obvious that the program is being projected forward at a highly accelerated rate. By the end of fiscal 1967, we will have at least \$69 million in outstanding loans and commitments.

I now understand that currently there is a priority listing of loans with poverty loans on top, even above loans to disaster victims. And the ordinary small businessman is at the bottom of the heap again. I am in support of the poverty loan program, but I frankly do not believe that we should take the risk of having insufficient funds in the future for our regular small businessman, by keeping both poverty loans and regular business loans in one common fund. Why should an established small businessman, his employees, and his customers be asked to sacrifice again, after the events of the past 18 months?

The \$100 million is well above the estimated demands to the end of the 1967 fiscal year. And I would remind you that the amendment contained in this bill which requires a report to the appropriate committees of Congress whenever 75 percent is outstanding in any one fund will protect against a lack of response to a sudden increase in needs. I will certainly support reasonable increases for the economic opportunity loans in the

future. I would prefer to accept the Moore amendment now than have to subject the small business community to another 3½-year wait until the situation is corrected, and funds for poverty loan purposes under SBA are handled separately. The past experience with combined funds has proven that there are too many hazards for our small business community in that type of a wait-and-see approach. I urge adoption of the Moore amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT, having resumed the chair, Mr. ICHORD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2729) to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 802, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

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

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 373, nays 0, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—373

Abbutt	Bandstra	Brown, Ohio	Cohelan	Hull	Poage
Abernethy	Baring	Broyhill, N.C.	Collier	Hungate	Poff
Adair	Bates	Broyhill, Va.	Conable	Huot	Pool
Adams	Battin	Buchanan	Conte	Hutchinson	Powell
Addabbo	Beckworth	Burke	Cooley	Ichord	Price
Albert	Belcher	Burton, Calif.	Corbett	Irwin	Pucinski
Anderson, Ill.	Bell	Byrne, Pa.	Corman	Jacobs	Quile
Anderson, Tenn.	Bennett	Byrnes, Wis.	Cramer	Jarman	Quillen
Andrews	Berry	Callahan	Culver	Jennings	Race
George W. Andrews	Betts	Callaway	Cunningham	Joelson	Randall
Andrews, Glenn	Bingham	Carey	Curtin	Johnson, Calif.	Redlin
Andrews, N. Dak.	Boggs	Casey	Curtis	Johnson, Okla.	Rees
Annuzio	Boland	Cederberg	Daddario	Jonas	Reid, Ill.
Arends	Bolton	Chamberlain	Dague	Jones, Ala.	Reid, N.Y.
Ashbrook	Bow	Clancy	Daniels	Jones, Mo.	Reifel
Ashley	Brademas	Clausen	Davis, Ga.	Jones, N.C.	Reinecke
Ashmore	Bray	Don H. Clawson, Del.	Davis, Wis.	Karsten	Resnick
Aspinall	Brock	Cleveland	Delaney	Karth	Reuss
	Brooks	Clevenger	Denton	Kastenmeier	Rhodes, Ariz.
	Broomfield		Derwinski	Kee	Rhodes, Pa.
	Brown, Calif.		Devine	Keith	Rivers, S.C.
			Dickinson	Kelly	Rivers, Alaska
			Diggs	King, Calif.	Roberts
			Dole	King, N.Y.	Robison
			Donohue	King, Utah	Rodino
			Dorn	Kirwan	Rogers, Colo.
			Dow	Kluczyński	Rogers, Fla.
			Downing	Kornegay	Rogers, Tex.
			Dulski	Krebs	Ronan
			Duncan, Oreg.	Kunkel	Roncallo
			Duncan, Tenn.	Kupferman	Rooney, Pa.
			Dwyer	Laird	Rosenthal
			Dyal	Landrum	Rostenkowski
			Edmondson	Langen	Roudebush
			Edwards, Ala.	Latta	Roush
			Edwards, Calif.	Lennon	Roybal
			Edwards, La.	Lipscomb	Ryan
			Ellsworth	Long, Md.	Satterfield
			Erlenborn	Love	St. Germain
			Everett	McClary	St. Onge
			Evins, Tenn.	McCulloch	Saylor
			Farbstein	McDade	Scheuer
			Farnsley	McDowell	Schisler
			Farnum	McEwen	Schmidhauser
			Fasell	McFall	Schneebeli
			Findley	McGrath	Schweiker
			Fino	McMillan	Secrest
			Fisher	McVicker	Selden
			Flood	Maddison	Shibley
			Fogarty	Machen	Shriver
			Foley	Mackay	Sikes
			Ford, Gerald R.	Mackie	Sisk
			Fountain	Madden	Skubitz
			Fraser	Mahon	Slack
			Friedel	Mailliard	Smith, Calif.
			Fulton, Pa.	Marsh	Smith, Va.
			Fulton, Tenn.	Martin, Ala.	Springer
			Gallagher	Martin, Mass.	Stafford
			Garmatz	Martin, Nebr.	Staggers
			Gathings	Mathias	Stalbaum
			Gialmo	Matsunaga	Stanton
			Gibbons	May	Steed
			Gilbert	Meeds	Stephens
			Gilligan	Michel	Stratton
			Gonzalez	Miller	Stubblefield
			Goodell	Mills	Sullivan
			Grabowski	Minish	Sweeney
			Gray	Mink	Talcott
			Green, Oreg.	Minshall	Taylor
			Green, Pa.	Mize	Teague, Calif.
			Greigg	Moeller	Teague, Tex.
			Grider	Monagan	Tenzer
			Griffin	Moore	Thomas
			Griffiths	Moorhead	Thompson, N.J.
			Gross	Morgan	Thomson, Wis.
			Grover	Morris	Trimble
			Gubser	Morrison	Tuck
			Gurney	Morse	Tunney
			Hagan, Ga.	Morton	Tupper
			Hagen, Calif.	Mosher	Udall
			Haley	Moss	Ullman
			Hall	Multer	Utt
			Halleck	Murphy III.	Van Deerlin
			Halpern	Murphy, N.Y.	Vanik
			Hamilton	Natcher	Vivian
			Hanley	Nedzi	Waggonner
			Hanna	Nelsen	Walker, Miss.
			Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara, Ill.	Walker, N. Mex.
			Hansen, Iowa	O'Hara, Mich.	Watson
			Hansen, Wash.	O'Konski	Weitner
			Harsha	Olsen, Mont.	White, Idaho
			Harvey, Ind.	Olsen, Minn.	White, Tex.
			Harvey, Mich.	O'Neal, Ga.	Whitener
			Hathaway	O'Neill, Mass.	Whitten
			Hawkins	Ottlinger	Widnall
			Hébert	Passman	Williams
			Hechler	Fatman	Wilson, Bob
			Helstoski	Fatten	Wolf
			Henderson	Felly	Wright
			Hicks	Pepper	Wyatt
			Hollifield	Perkins	Wydler
			Holland	Philbin	Yates
			Horton	Pickle	Young
			Hosmer	Pike	Younger
			Howard	Pirnie	Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—59

Ayres	Fallon	Purcell
Barrett	Feighan	Rooney, N.Y.
Blatnik	Flynt	Rumsfeld
Bolling	Ford	Scott
Burleson	William D.	Senner
Burton, Utah	Frelinghuysen	Sickles
Cabell	Fuqua	Smith, Iowa
Cameron	Gettys	Smith, N.Y.
Carter	Hardy	Thompson, Tex.
Celler	Hays	Todd
Chelf	Herlong	Toil
Clark	Johnson, Pa.	Tuten
Colmer	Keogh	Vigorito
Conyers	Leggett	Watkins
Craley	Long, La.	Watts
Dawson	McCarthy	Whalley
de la Garza	MacGregor	Willis
Dent	Matthews	Wilson,
Dingell	Murray	Charles H.
Dowdy	Nix	
Evans, Colo.	O'Brien	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Watkins.
 Mr. Toll with Mr. Whalley.
 Mr. Todd with Mr. Rumsfeld.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Ayres.
 Mr. Scott with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. de la Garza.
 Mr. Feighan with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mr. Burleson with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. MacGregor.
 Mr. Senner with Mr. Cabell.
 Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Tuten.
 Mr. Leggett with Mr. Watts.
 Mr. Matthews with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Blatnik.
 Mr. Hardy with Mr. Clark.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Colmer.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Vigorito.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. O'Brien.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Willis.
 Mr. Chelf with Mr. Dingell.
 Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Dawson.
 Mr. Evans with Mr. Dowdy.
 Mr. Herlong with Mr. Cameron.
 Mr. Craley with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Dent with Mr. William D. Ford.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter upon the legislation just considered.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, due to a longstanding speaking engagement

outside of Washington, I will be unable to be present this afternoon when the House considers S. 2729 so I want to take this opportunity to indicate my support for the bill. The series of natural disasters which occurred throughout the country last year demonstrated the need to separate the natural disaster loan program of the Small Business Administration from the regular loan programs so that natural disasters, such as Hurricane Betsy, do not in the future completely disrupt the regular SBA loan programs.

However, I would like to point out that just before adjournment of the first session, Congress passed special legislation replacing the funds committed for the emergency loans. However, there is still a moratorium in effect on most types of SBA loans. The reason for this moratorium is, therefore, not the disasters of last year, as many people have thought, but is instead due to the fact that the important SBA loan programs are just not being adequately funded. Of particular concern to me is the fact that the special program of loans to businesses, which are either operated by or which employ poverty-stricken people has been severely restricted even though this program was exempted from the general moratorium on SBA loans. This special program, authorized by title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act, has been restricted to just a very few areas in the United States, a ceiling of \$15,000 per loan has been imposed though the law authorized loans up to \$25,000, and the program has been administered quite restrictively in determining eligibility for loans.

I strongly urge the Bureau of the Budget and the relevant committees of the Congress to greatly increase the amount of funds budgeted for the Small Business Administration loan programs, particularly title IV loans. Though measures such as S. 2729 and other bills now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee will be of some help in dealing with the crisis situation facing SBA, the only real answer is to drastically increase the budget for the Small Business Administration.

COMPENSATION OF OVERSEAS TEACHERS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the Conference Report on H.R. 6845, to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, ask for its immediate consideration, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1347)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6845), to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered (1): That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered (1) and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 2 of the House engrossed bill, strike out line 13 and all that follows down through line 13 on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Section 5 of such Act (73 Stat. 214; Public Law 86-91; 5 U.S.C. 2353) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) On or before the 15th day of January in each calendar year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of Defense shall report to the respective Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives the following information—

"(1) The number of teachers separated from teaching positions subsequent to the close of the immediately preceding full school year;

"(2) the number of such separated teachers who returned to the United States;

"(3) the number of such separated teachers placed in positions as teachers in the United States following such separation;

"(4) the number of such separated teachers returned to positions as teachers in the United States under voluntary reciprocal interchange agreements with school jurisdictions in the United States;

"(5) the number of such separated teachers placed in positions as teachers in the United States through special placement assistance programs of the Department of Defense and the military department;

"(6) the number of such separated teachers who (A) were separated at their own request and (B) were separated involuntarily;

"(7) the number of such separated teachers who had served in teaching positions (A) three years or more and (B) five years or more;

"(8) the number of new teachers appointed to teaching positions at the beginning of the school year current at time of the report; and

"(9) the number of such new teachers obtained through voluntary reciprocal interchange agreements with school jurisdictions in the United States."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendments numbered (2), (3), and (4): That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered (2), (3), and (4) and agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,

J. H. MORRISON,

MORRIS UDALL,

H. R. GROSS,

JAMES T. BROYHILL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

MIKE MONRONEY,

RALPH W. YARBROUGH,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,

By M. M.

FRANK CARLSON,

HIRAM L. FONG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions

under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. (1): This amendment struck out subsection (c) of the first section of the House bill which contained provisions to the effect that a teacher shall not be eligible to hold a teaching position or positions overseas for any period exceeding 5 consecutive years with the exceptions (1) that any teacher who returns to the United States for not less than 1 year shall be eligible again to hold a teaching position or positions overseas for an additional period not exceeding 5 consecutive years, and (2) that the Secretary of Defense may extend such 5-year period to not more than 8 years, when necessary in the public interest in individual cases.

The House recedes from its disagreement to amendment numbered (1) and agrees to the same with an amendment which adds a new subsection (c) to section 5 of the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act requiring annual reports by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives with respect to teachers subject to such Act.

Specifically, the new subsection (c) provides that, on or before the 15th day of January of each calendar year beginning after the date of enactment of the conference agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall report to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives the following information:

(1) The number of teachers separated from teaching positions subsequent to the close of the immediately preceding full school year;

(2) The number of such separated teachers who returned to the United States;

(3) The number of such separated teachers placed in positions as teachers in the United States following such separation;

(4) The number of such separated teachers returned to positions as teachers in the United States under voluntary reciprocal interchange agreements with school jurisdictions in the United States;

(5) The number of such separated teachers placed in positions as teachers in the United States through special placement assistance programs of the Department of Defense and the military departments;

(6) The number of such separated teachers who (A) were separated at their own request and (B) were separated involuntarily;

(7) The number of such separated teachers who had served in teaching positions (A) 3 years or more and (B) 5 years or more;

(8) The number of new teachers appointed to teaching positions at the beginning of the school year current at time of the report; and

(9) The number of such new teachers obtained through voluntary reciprocal interchange agreements with school jurisdictions in the United States.

In reaching agreement with respect to amendment numbered (1), the committee of conference makes several observations with respect to the intent of such agreement.

This conference amendment requires the Secretary of Defense to report annually, to the respective Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives, certain statistical data with respect to the numbers of teachers who are appointed to overseas teaching positions, who are separated from such positions, who are returned to the United States after such separations, and who are placed in positions as teachers in the United States after such separations, as well as with respect to the number of years served by teachers in overseas teaching positions.

This amendment recommended by the committee of conference is intended, and is needed, to provide the Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service complete, accurate, and timely information each year for the exercise of their legislative oversight responsibilities with respect to the programs for the improvement and revitalization of the overseas dependents school system and its corps of teachers which are to be placed in effect by the Secretary of Defense as set forth hereafter.

This part of the conference agreement was adopted in the light of strong and persuasive reports from the Department of Defense, the three military departments, and organizations of teachers that the "rotation" system provided by subsection (c) of the first section of the House bill is unworkable. To operate any plan or program of rotating employees between Federal positions overseas and in the United States, there must be a reasonable number of positions of the kind involved not only in overseas areas but within the 50 States. The military departments have over 6,000 teaching positions that must be filled overseas, whereas the Government operates only a relatively few schools in the United States. It is clear that the number of possible vacancies in federally operated schools within the United States would be completely inadequate to support a rotation program.

The managers on the part of the House feel, however—and conferees for the Senate expressed agreement—that the fundamental rotation principle involved in subsection (c) of the first section of the bill, as passed by the House, is sound and desirable and that its purpose should be implemented to the extent possible. An alternative to contribute to the achievement of those purposes, developed in negotiations with representatives of the Department of Defense, was considered favorably by the Committee of Conference. In the judgment of the managers on the part of the House, this alternative will provide policies and procedures that are eminently sound, workable, and in the interest of the Government and the teachers concerned.

To this end, the managers on the part of the House asked and received assurance that the Department of Defense will place in effect the following programs:

(1) In order to strengthen the overseas dependents school systems of the military departments; to facilitate the recruitment of qualified teachers into such systems; to provide, for teachers who return to the United States, necessary assistance for their placement in suitable teaching positions under school jurisdictions within the United States; and to maintain among such teachers a familiarity with American customs, beliefs, and culture, the Secretary of Defense will establish and maintain a program of negotiating voluntary reciprocal agreements with school jurisdictions in the United States, under which agreements qualified teachers will be made available by such school jurisdictions for assignment to teaching positions for specified periods of time and, in exchange, such teachers will be offered suitable teaching employment upon their return to the United States from such teaching positions.

(2) To assist teachers desiring to return to the United States to teach, the Secretary of Defense will establish and maintain a program under which teachers may file applications with the Department of Defense listing their qualifications, their teaching experience, and their preference of location for teaching in the United States, which applications will be made available to appropriate school jurisdictions in the United States, and also will include in this program procedures under which teachers will receive priority in appointments to positions of teachers in schools situated on Armed Forces bases in the United States.

(3) To provide for the development and maintenance of teaching skills and scholarly attainments which are necessary to facilitate the interchange of fully qualified teachers between overseas teaching positions and positions of teachers under school jurisdictions in the United States, and to justify recognition of length of service and the granting of appropriate levels of compensation and other rights and prerequisites for teachers interchanged, the Secretary of Defense will place in effect a program, consistent with standards and practices in appropriate school jurisdictions in the United States, to encourage and enhance professional development of teachers in overseas teaching positions. Among other matters, consideration will be given, in this program, to activities such as—

(A) The performance by teachers of post-graduate work directly related to their field of teaching;

(B) Participation by teachers in research projects;

(C) Organization of, or participation in, by teachers of professional workshops or institutions;

(D) Structured educational travel by teachers;

(E) University lecturing by teachers during summer months;

(F) Other professional activities by teachers approved by the Secretary of Defense; and

(G) Periodic performance of professional development activities by a teacher as a condition of advancement in salary and continued employment in overseas teaching positions.

Amendments Nos. (2), (3), and (4): Section 2 of the House engrossed bill provided that the amendments made by the House engrossed bill shall become effective as of the beginning of the first school year beginning after the date of enactment of the bill or which is in progress on such date of enactment, whichever first occurs. Amendments Nos. (2), (3), and (4) modified such section 2 so as to provide an effective date of the first day of the first pay period beginning after such date of enactment.

The House recedes.

TOM MURRAY,
J. H. MORRISON,
MORRIS UDALL,
H. R. GROSS,
JAMES T. BROYHILL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. UDALL (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the gentleman from Arizona tell us the differences between the bill that passed the House and the bill as passed by the other body?

Mr. UDALL. As the gentleman from Michigan will recall, we passed this bill last August. The other body passed it with two differences. The House version had a mandatory rotation feature. With certain exceptions overseas teachers would have to return to this country and teach for at least 1 year before they

could return to a position overseas. The other body struck out this mandatory rotation provision.

Mr. Speaker, the second change was that their version of the bill would have made it effective last September, at the beginning of the current school year. The version of the other body makes the bill effective on the first pay period after enactment, which would be some time during the month of April, if the version of the other body were accepted.

In the conference, essentially, we accepted the provisions of the other body in both respects, the effective date, for one, and under the conference report that effective date will be the first pay period after enactment. But in accepting the elimination of the mandatory overseas rotation feature by the other body we agreed on language in the report and we worked out very carefully, in consultation with the Department of Defense, a voluntary system under which they will encourage the program of placing these teachers in schools in the United States, and they are to report to the Senate and the House committees annually.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to certain teachers who have been overseas for an extended period of time, they will report how many are involved in that category, and also report how many have been overseas for a brief period of time, as well as precisely what they have done with respect to setting up this voluntary system of rotation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I still believe that mandatory rotation would have been desirable. I admit that there was some administrative problem involved, and a problem which could have presented some difficulty, inasmuch as the overseas dependents school system has really no connection with any school system in this country. So there was no place where these teachers from overseas could have been automatically placed in a school system in this country.

I do feel that the proposal that has been worked out by the conferees, if administered in good faith, will probably achieve the objectives that many of us felt were necessary.

I am particularly pleased that there is this annual reporting system to the House and Senate committees.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I fully agree with the gentleman's suggestion. I believe the House has won substantially what it sought, and that is some assurance that we will not have teachers overseas who stay there for years and years, and lose contact with groups in this country engaged in education and politics, in science, and in the atmosphere of this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that under this agreement we have reached with the Department of Defense, the language we have written into the report, we have achieved substantially what we sought to achieve. I will say in this connection that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] has had a most constructive attitude throughout the consideration of this legislation, and I do not believe we could have worked out this legislation in the form it is now, and

have resolved this problem and have cured this great inequity that exists, with respect to the overseas teachers, without the gentleman's support, and I want to thank the gentleman for it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. UDALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to join with the distinguished minority leader in the remarks that he has made, and say that as one of the conferees on this bill I was disappointed in that there was not some mandatory rotation written into the legislation.

It does contain some mandatory provisions. However, I believe the gentleman from Arizona will agree that it is the understanding that the working of this bill will be carefully watched, and, if in the future it is necessary to come to the House with some form of mandatory legislation, we will undertake its enactment.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman from Iowa has stated my position. We have discussed it along these lines and I believe that we will be able to work out something with the Department of Defense which in good faith they will be able to carry out.

However, Mr. Speaker, if there should be any difficulty in the future, as chairman of the subcommittee which originated this legislation, it would certainly be my intention to pursue it further, and perhaps write some provisions that would be mandatory.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, with the gentleman yield further?

Mr. UDALL. I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe I can speak for the two conferees from our side, and say that the gentleman from Arizona was very cooperative with all of us—myself, and the two of them—and took a very constructive attitude in trying to resolve the problem favorably so that we could get this legislation back to the House of Representatives.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for his generous statement.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman not only kept us informed, but the gentleman sat down with us to work out some of these problems I wish to compliment him for his effort in making this legislation a reality.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman from Michigan has brought my day to a very pleasant close, and I thank the gentleman for his very generous remarks.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee which considered the original House bill, providing for equitable salary increases and adjustment for overseas teachers, I am pleased with the conference report, and urge its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF APRIL 4

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader about the program for the remainder of the week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader, we have finished the legislative program for this week and at the conclusion of the announcement of the program, I shall ask that the House adjourn over to Monday.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar Day.

Also on Monday there are 19 bills to be considered under suspension of the rules. Of course, these bills may not be called up in the order in which I announce them, but as we have them listed these bills are as follows:

1. H.R. 14122: Federal Salary and Fringe Benefits Act of 1966.
2. H.J. Res. 997: Supporting U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India.
3. H.R. 1791: Great Salt Lake Lands, Utah.
4. S. Con. Res. 71: Regarding invitation for the 1972 Winter Olympic Games in Utah.
5. H.J. Res. 837: Proclaim State and Municipal Bond Week.
6. H.R. 13365: To authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile. (Amended.)

Mr. Speaker, the succeeding bills numbered 7 to 18 on this list all deal with stockpile disposals and related matters, and are as follows:

7. H.R. 13367: To authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile. (Amended.)
8. H.R. 13368: To authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.
9. H.R. 13369: To authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile. (Amended.)
10. H.R. 13371: To authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.
11. H.R. 13373: To authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.
12. H.R. 13578: To authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile.
13. H.R. 13579: To authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile.
14. H.R. 13580: To authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.
15. H.R. 13663: To authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile.

16. H.R. 13774: To authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile.

17. S. 1488: To authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile.

18. S. 2642: To authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes. (Amended.)

Then No. 19—S. 2573—validating extension of 1955 leave year of certain Yosemite National Park employees.

Tuesday: The Private Calendar will be called and the Department of the Interior Appropriation, 1967, will be considered.

Wednesday and the balance of the week:

The Post Office Department and Treasury Department Appropriation, 1967.

H. Res. 803—authorizing certain travel and investigations by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservations, which I now make, that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the foregoing, the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS], has advised that his committee has unanimously reported a number of bills which he hopes to call up under unanimous consent next week. We do not know exactly which day these bills might be called up, but he has asked me to announce them for the information of the Members.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Do I understand that these bills that the distinguished majority leader is referring to have been unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes, they were all unanimously reported. Most of them are extensions of dates that are expiring. They include the following bills:

H.R. 8376: Suspension of duty on cork insulation.

H.R. 10998: Suspension of duty on heptanoic acid.

H.R. 11653: Suspension of duty on natural graphite.

H.R. 12262: Suspension of duty on shoe lathes.

H.R. 12328: Suspension of duty on tanning extracts.

H.R. 12461: Suspension of duty on istle.

H.R. 12463: Suspension and reduction of duty on chicory.

H.R. 12657: Suspension of duty on alumina and bauxite.

H.R. 12864: Suspension of duty on personal and household effects.

H.R. 12997: Suspension of duty on electrodes for producing aluminum.

H.R. 8188. Deductions for contributions for judicial reform.

Of course, these bills which were all reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means will be brought up, if they are brought up, under a unanimous consent request, and Members will have time to discuss them under their reservations of objections.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further program to announce at this time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman repeat the agreements that have been reached as to the procedure on Monday and Tuesday?

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad that the gentleman from Michigan has mentioned that.

Under the unanimous consent order heretofore agreed to, rollcall votes on Monday and Tuesday, except on procedural matters and rules, will be put over until Wednesday of next week. This arrangement is made because of the Jewish holy days.

The unanimous consent agreement does not apply to quorum calls, which will be in order on Monday and Tuesday.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. May I inquire briefly as to the nature of this last mentioned bill, if I understood correctly, which has to do with contributions for judicial reform, which will be called up by unanimous consent, is from the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. ALBERT. That is one of the bills on the list which the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] gave me.

Mr. GROSS. But it is from the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. ALBERT. It was on the list. I do not know any of the details about it. I suggest that the gentleman direct his questions to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader, yield for a question?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Under the unanimous consent request that has been heretofore granted by the House to put all votes over, about which we had some colloquy yesterday, is it the belief of the majority leader, and will it be required by the leadership, that should objections be made and an automatic vote on any bill brought about which it is understood is to be put over, that that objection would have to be again made on Wednesday next, or would it automatically come up for a vote once it is put over under this agreement?

Mr. ALBERT. Under an automatic rollcall, that would be tantamount to the leadership infringing upon the prerogatives of the House. The House is in charge of the situation on those votes, and the House will be in charge when we meet again after the Holy Days on Wednesday. It depends on whether a majority is present, if that is the objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, let me phrase the question in another way and state a corollary, so to speak, thereof. If an objection was not made on Monday or Tuesday next, in view of the unanimous consent agreement into which we have heretofore entered, could one then make the request on Wednesday next when we reconvene for voting purposes for the

first time as an objection to any bill that had passed either on Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. ALBERT. Not if it had gone to final passage.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think the answer there would be, as I understood the question, that any bill which went through on Monday or Tuesday without any question being raised as to a rollcall vote would undoubtedly be approved by the House, and therefore you could not bring it up again on Wednesday.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I think we are encroaching on the prerogatives of the Speaker in discussing parliamentary questions. But the answer to the first question, I think, is clear, that the House would be in control on Wednesday, as to whether we would have an automatic rollcall vote.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I assure the gentleman that it is not the intention of the gentleman from Missouri to encroach upon the prerogatives of the Speaker. What I am trying to do is to see that the prerogatives of the individual elected Members of the House are not encroached upon. It seems to me rather strange that if an objection is made on one of these days which we have in our magnanimity granted because of certain religious reasons and others and will have votes of record on those days put over, and that a person was sick or stricken down, away on official business, in a hospital, or otherwise, that he, not being able to be there, would have to arrange for someone else to again make the objection, having once made it a matter of record during those times in which we will not be voting?

Mr. ALBERT. I have stated the rule as I understand it. The gentleman might address his inquiry to the Chair.

Mr. HALL. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the inquiry has been addressed to the Chair in times past and a ruling has been made. That is why I was trying to clear up the program at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, APRIL 4, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WATERSHED FUNDS

Mr. TRIMBLE. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, a short 30 years ago the Congress provided to the people of the United States a valuable tool with which to begin effective measures to stop the erosion that was eating away our soil and silting up our streams, reservoirs, lakes, and harbors.

Since the Soil Conservation Service was established in 1935, the Congress has enacted several new authorities to give people more specialized tools for installing soil and water conservation practices.

Nowhere is there more impressive and dramatic example of how farmers and ranchers and other landowners took advantage of those tools than in Arkansas.

And nowhere can be found greater enthusiasm for and participation in applying programs and practices to develop our soil and water resources for greater benefit than in Arkansas.

All the farm and ranch land in the State is covered by soil conservation districts. All the soil conservation districts have signed modernized agreements with the Department of Agriculture.

Arkansas landowners are disturbed deeply by budget recommendations to reduce certain funds of the Soil Conservation Service, the agency that gives indispensable technical help in soil and water work.

In the 3d Congressional District which I am honored to represent, landowners, and operators are most perplexed by this nagging threat to the great progress they have made in this work.

With the tools provided by the Congress, landowners of our Congressional District, through their soil conservation districts, applied for, planned, and completed the Six Mile Creek Pilot Watershed Project in the 1950's.

Through the provision of Public Law 566, soil conservation district cooperators in our congressional district applied for, planned, and undertook construction of four small watershed projects.

And now, under authority of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, soil conservation districts, watershed districts and county judges of our congressional district are sponsoring the Arkansas River Valley Resource Conservation and Development Project—a comprehensive program to conserve, develop, and utilize natural resources of the valley.

I am sure that any number of my colleagues here can attest to similar initiative, industry, and foresight demonstrated by the landowners in their States who made good use of the tools provided by Congress.

I am especially disturbed by the proposal to reduce the item for soil surveys by \$3.6 million, and the limitations for watershed planning and watershed construction starts.

The proposal to reduce soil survey acreage from 52 to 35 million acres and the number of soil scientists by about

400 is unwise, for soil surveys are the key to the entire conservation program. The budget proposes a limitation of 50 authorizations for watershed project planning assistance in 1967 compared to a current rate of 100. I oppose this. I also oppose the budget proposal to limit the number of new watershed project construction starts to 35, as compared to a current rate of 80.

The landowners are engaged in a war that men must win. It is no wonder that farmers, ranchers, and others throughout the land are appalled by proposals to withdraw support when we ought to be increasing it.

It will be sad, indeed, if after 30 years of successfully promoting a universally beneficial program we succumb apathetically to a cut in our budget.

I prefer to believe and to act otherwise, and I urge my fellow Congressmen to join me.

TEXAS CREDIT UNIONS HONOR ONE OF FOUNDERS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is always a happy occasion to see an old friend honored, especially one who has so unselfishly served the public. One such man is Mr. H. B. Yates, of Dallas, who is retiring after 35 years as a strong, dynamic leader of the credit union movement in Texas.

Mr. Yates has been my friend for many years, and it was with pride that I saw in the recent edition of the Texas Credit Union League Bulletin a moving tribute to a man who has done more for credit unions in Texas than any other one man.

I commend the following article to my colleagues:

YATES ELECTION A GREAT VICTORY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This editorial first appeared in the June 1953 issue of the Bulletin. It has since become history as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It seems appropriate to present it again on the retirement of H. B. Yates.)

Honor and glory have come to Texas through the election of a Texas credit unionist to the presidency of the Credit Union National Association.

Natural pride arises in the hearts of Texans when they realize that such a man as H. B. Yates is a product of Texas. To become outstanding in the credit union movement, Texans have applied themselves diligently and their efforts have been successful through the guidance of leaders like Yates. Although Texans have a tendency to be somewhat loud and vociferous about their accomplishments, this is generally a subterfuge to disguise the humility in their hearts. This humility and realization that in order to make that long, hard, uphill financial pull, we all need a helping hand, has made credit union philosophy readily accepted in Texas.

Great though this victory may be for Texas, greater still is it for the credit union movement as a whole. Often it has been said the only danger we face is from within, that this philosophy of the brotherhood of man

that we subscribe to may be weakened by selfishness and greed.

Under the leadership of H. B. Yates, we may be assured that these temptations will be warded off. Yates has long been a man of firm conviction, and a zealous proponent of credit union philosophy. In the face of opposition he has steadfastly defended his beliefs. At the risk of personal degradation, he has promoted the welfare of the credit union member.

All of us in this movement can be certain that with H. B. Yates as our president, that the thinking of our leadership will be clear, that our leader will be militant, that the bulwarks of this movement will be strengthened, and that our philosophy will be protected, so that we may continue to improve our service to our fellow man.

TALL TEXAN RETIRES

"Tall, slim, somber, thoroughgoing Texan."

This was the way H. B. Yates was described in the pages of the Bulletin in December 1955 when he was appointed as managing director of the Credit Union National Association.

Intervening years have only changed this man to broaden his knowledge and hone his sharp mentality.

Many thoughts came to mind as he retired in February as president of the Dallas Teachers Credit Union.

Looking back there are but few facets of the credit union movement, in Texas, in the Western Hemisphere, in the world, that have not been influenced by the touch of this giant in credit union circles, H. B. Yates.

His accomplishments are so numerous, it is difficult to mention them all. In January 1931 he was one of the 13 teachers who contributed \$5 each to organize the Dallas Teachers Credit Union. He became its first president and served in that capacity until January 1966. Meanwhile this credit union had become the largest in the State with 15,085 members and \$18,344,207 in assets.

A true disciple of credit union tenets, Yates spread the ideals by organizing other credit unions. His first was the Fort Worth Teachers Credit Union.

In 1934 he assisted in organizing the Texas Credit Union League. He served as a director from 1941 to 1956, and as president from 1942 to 1949.

He was also instrumental in organizing Member Mutual Insurance Co. in 1952. He was elected as secretary and served until 1956 when he resigned.

On the national scene, he served as a director of the Credit Union National Association from 1942 to 1956. He was a vice president and secretary and attained the presidency in 1953 and held this position until 1955. That year he became managing director of CUNA until he resigned in 1957.

He is one of the few men who has two conference rooms named after him.

When the Texas Credit Union League completed its new building, its conference room became the Yates Room. In January 1966 the membership of the Dallas Teachers Credit Union voted that "the conference room at the Dallas Teachers Credit Union be named the H. B. Yates Room in permanent appreciation of the 35 years of dedicated service which Mr. Yates has rendered the Dallas Teachers Credit Union and that a portrait of Mr. Yates be permanently displayed in this room."

To accomplish these notable deeds must have taken some time. And indeed this is true. It took some 74 years to mold this servant of man. His birthplace was Trenton, Tenn., in 1891. He earned a B.A. degree from Tennessee University and an M.A. from Columbia University and embarked on a career as a teacher. For 37 years he taught economics, history, and civics, meanwhile finding some time to coach a track team. In 1952 he retired as a teacher in Dallas.

So, now he retires from his last active connection with the credit union movement.

But we know that his vast treasury of knowledge and experience will still be available to the credit union movement and his fellow men for whom he has expressed in action his high regard.

To the tall, the slim, the somber, the thoroughgoing Texan, we express our deep appreciation for years of dedicated service.

REASONABLE INTEREST RATES CAN PROVIDE US WITH GUNS PLUS BUTTER WITHOUT INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, my Republican colleagues have expressed great concern about prices, wages, and what they like to describe as inflation.

Now to set the record straight, it should be noted that both the Republican and the Democratic Parties are opposed to inflation. Neither party has a monopoly on protecting the public interest in this area.

At the same time, I do not believe that the great majority of the Democratic Members of this body share the trembling and fearful approach to prosperity as evidenced by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Frankly, I feel that this country is big enough and strong enough to withstand the great benefits of prosperity without falling into the trap of inflation.

However, I am sure that my distinguished Republican friends are quite serious in their concern over prices. With this in mind, I would like to call their attention to the effect of interest rates on all prices in the economy.

Interest rates are something that we all have to pay. The cost of money is reflected in every item in the economy from a simple pair of work shoes to a super deluxe Cadillac. It is reflected in the Federal Budget and in every local and State budget.

Interest rates now take \$13 billion annually out of the national budget. Interest rates are the biggest single item in the cost of a house—more than the lumber, the land, the workmanship combined. The impact of higher and higher interest rates is growing daily throughout the economy.

So I ask my Republican friends who have expressed such concern about prices to join me in this crusade to keep interest rates down. Frankly, I was surprised that so many of the leading Republican Members rose to defend the Federal Reserve Board when it raised interest rates by 3½ percent last December. Certainly that December interest rate increase has done more than anything else to put heavy upward pressure on the price of every item in the economy. The threat of inflation now is caused by the Federal Reserve Board's shocking interest rate increase in December 1965. If the Republican Party is indeed serious about holding down prices, then I submit that it must be

equally serious about holding down interest rates.

WHAT PRESIDENT A. LINCOLN SAID ABOUT MONEY POWER

President Abraham Lincoln made the following statement:

The money power has established a more vicious form of universal slavery over the American people than ever was established over the American Negro.

GUNS PLUS BUTTER TIMES REASONABLE INTEREST RATES DETERMINE THE ACHIEVEMENT OF GREAT SOCIETY PROGRAMS—WHAT LINCOLN SAID ABOUT THE MONEY POWER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as every housewife who has tried to balance her checkbook at the end of the month knows, mathematics is an exact science. Buying what one wants and needs, whether in the individual home or in the Nation, demands careful planning and budgeting. Although I am not a mathematician, I propose for the consideration of the House a new mathematical formula to assist us in our legislative deliberations.

The formula is as follows:

G plus B times RI equals GS

I am firmly convinced that the application of this formula as a guide in our efforts will aid greatly in maintaining our present prosperity and insure a proper rate of national growth. Simply translated the formula provides that "G" equals guns; "B" equals butter; "RI" are reasonable interest rates and "GS" stands for the Great Society programs. In other words the imaginative and needed programs for domestic growth—the Great Society programs—can be maintained in spite of our involvement in Vietnam if we can prevent inflationary rises in interest rates from placing the costs of these programs beyond the reach of the national budget.

Over the course of the next few weeks it is my intention to discuss in the House the necessity of giving appropriate consideration to the formula here proposed. Its application may mean the difference between the success and failure of important domestic programs. It will mean the difference between whether young people will be able to find decent homes or be forced to accept substandard conditions; whether schools will be built or classrooms will be overcrowded; whether communities and regions will be restored or will have to sink back into the decay of poverty.

I am in my 38th year in this House, and I am convinced that if we can control interest rates we can achieve the economic and social goals of the Great Society. I am equally convinced that the House will act to protect the best interests of the people.

WHAT A. LINCOLN SAID ABOUT MONEY POWER

President Abraham Lincoln in a direct quote attributed to him stated:

The money power has established a more vicious form of universal slavery over the American people than ever was established over the American Negro.

CURTAILMENT OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE'S AUDIT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. MINSHALL. 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. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress with a long-established voting record in favor of economy and as a member of the Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee closely involved in charting military expenditures, I am disturbed by any attempt to curtail or hamper the General Accounting Office's audit of defense contracts.

GAO has established a formidable record of ferreting out instances of waste, duplication, and even occasional corruption in the Federal Executive Establishment. It was created by the Congress as official watchdog over departmental and agency operations and has paid for itself many times over in the hundreds of millions of dollars it has saved American taxpayers.

As a former member of the House Committee on Government Operations, I have always taken pride in the committee's role in reviewing the manner in which taxpayers' money is spent. The experience I gained in keeping postaudit checks on the executive branch during my 4 years on the Government Operations Committee has been invaluable to me in carrying out my Appropriations Committee assignments. On both committees my colleagues and I have relied heavily on information contained in the factual reports supplied by GAO.

As a member of the Defense Subcommittee, I am thoroughly familiar with the Pentagon's sensitivity in the area of economy. The Secretary of Defense has shown no hesitancy in proclaiming the savings his cost-accounting methods are producing. But neither the Secretary or his aids have a corner on efficiency or integrity in the matter of uncovering conditions in defense procurement which could be corrected to the benefit of both the military and the civilian taxpayer. I could not agree less with the Secretary that GAO is duplicating his auditing processes at the Pentagon.

There is further the matter of the public's right to know involved in the proposal to limit the authority of the GAO. I agree that the rights of the contractor should be protected, but I find nothing to indicate unreasonable or arbitrary action by GAO in the past. As my colleagues, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD], state in their additional views to House Report No. 1334:

The public's right to know the facts—not conjecture—must always be considered; and

when cases are responsibly reported, the public interest is paramount.

The Department of Defense in recent years has crept more and more into a shell of secrecy, not warranted by either national security or public interest. I can view the latest attempt to stifle necessary information regarding defense expenditures as a bold attempt to remove the people of this country from a realization of how their tax money is being spent. If there is waste in their Military Establishment, it should be disclosed and eliminated. The task of Congress and of responsible press media will be considerably hampered in this area if the report is approved by the Government Operations Committee is adopted.

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial carried in Tuesday's Cleveland Press, which succinctly summarizes the pertinent arguments against the proposal:

SAVE THE GAO

For 45 years the General Accounting Office, headed by the Comptroller General of the United States, has been one of the best friends the taxpayers ever had.

This office is responsible only to Congress. It has broad power to investigate and audit agencies of the Federal Government. It has issued thousands of reports and saved or recovered many millions of taxpayer dollars. Its very presence is a guard against waste.

Now suddenly the House Government Operations Committee is out to cripple GAO's usefulness to the taxpayers. This was reported yesterday by Scripps-Howard Writer Jack Steele.

This committee already has pressured the former acting comptroller into agreeing to restrictions in his reports of overspending, especially in the Defense Department. It accomplished this before the new Comptroller General, Elmer B. Staats, could take office.

The committee objects to "critical words or phrases" in GAO reports, to identifying contractors, to making public its reports before Government officials or contractors have seen them, to making so many reports.

In short, the committee has buckled to complaints of the very people Congress created the GAO to investigate. It proposes to put shackles on the GAO.

In its report, the House committee begins by calling the GAO the watchdog for Congress, agrees it is an indispensable source of information for Congress, says it has done an outstanding job and so on. But the net of the report is to quiet the bark of the watchdog, reduce its indispensable role and hamper its ability to do an outstanding job.

The outcry from other Members of Congress—and from the taxpayers—should rattle the Capitol dome, and force the House Government Operations Committee into red-faced, high-tailed retreat.

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on an address delivered Tuesday in Chicago to the annual convention of the National Associa-

tion of Broadcasters by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. E. William Henry.

According to press reports of his talk and from portions of Mr. Henry's talk inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 29—the same day of his address, incidentally—he took the broadcasting industry to task for their continued acceptance of cigarette advertising.

Mr. Henry said:

From the cigarette advertising presently being carried on radio and television stations, no one would ever know that a major public controversy is in progress as to the harmful effects of cigarette smoking. One could never guess from such advertising that the great bulk of medical opinion, including a Surgeon General's report, has concluded that there is an adverse casual relationship between cigarette smoking and health. Despite all this, the sign on broadcasting's door for cigarette advertisers reads "Business as usual."

Chairman Henry then castigated the broadcasters for their lack of restraint and suggested that self-regulation in the broadcast industry should protect the public from cigarette commercials.

Has Chairman Henry so little to do, as head of one of our Government's major agencies, which has some troubles of its own in respect to broadcasting and proposed promulgations of rules relating to broadcasting and community antenna television—if my mail is any indication, that now he wants to assume the authority and responsibility delegated to the Federal Trade Commission? I had thought that up to Tuesday and Mr. Henry's speech in Chicago that the FTC was the Federal agency responsible for regulating advertising on radio and television.

Is Chairman Henry not aware that the Congress of the United States, which established the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Trade Commission and from whence comes the authority of these agencies, has considered the question of cigarette advertising? In two lengthy hearings, in both the House and Senate committees, the subject of cigarette advertising was discussed at great length. Is he not aware that the question was discussed fully in both Houses of the Congress during the 1st session of the 89th Congress? Is he unaware that the Congress, after great and due deliberation, passed a law which specifically prevented the FTC and others from adopting any requirements on cigarette advertising, other than that already in effect, for a period of 4 years?

Does Chairman Henry now presume to willfully ignore the expressed intent of the Congress? Would he neglect and purposely violate the intent of the Congress? Would he superimpose his own will and judgment over that of the majority of the Members of Congress?

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest to the body that Chairman E. William Henry might better spend his time and his energy on matters and problems relating to the Federal Communications Commission and take off his Batman costume.

PROPOSALS TO EXTEND THE ENROLLMENT PERIOD FOR MEDICAL CARE NEED IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome those of my colleagues who have joined me in bipartisan sponsorship of legislation to extend the enrollment period for the supplementary medical insurance program under Medicare from March 31 to June 30, 1966. Since I first introduced such legislation, H.R. 12778, on February 10, no less than 19 of my colleagues in the House have recognized the inadequacy of the present deadline by introducing measures identical or similar to mine. In addition, 25 Members of the Senate have followed the lead of Senator J. CALIB BOGGS, of Delaware, who first introduced such legislation in that body February 7.

There can be no question of the necessity of this legislation. Although over 16 million of the 19 million persons eligible for this program have enrolled to date, 1 million eligibles have refused to join and almost 2 million have not yet been informed of the potential benefits.

Not only is there a need to reach those who have not yet been contacted but there is also a need to give those persons rejecting the program additional time to consider their decision. It is quite possible that a number of persons in this last group were too pressed by the impending deadline to make a well-informed decision on whether or not to enroll.

Of the various extension dates which have been proposed, I believe June 30, 1966, to be the least arbitrary. Since the existing act provides that coverage will begin July 1, 1966, for those who enroll during the first period, a considerable period of bureaucratic confusion could be avoided by terminating the enrollment period prior to this date. Furthermore, an additional 90-day period seems an adequate length of time in which to contact the uninformed 2 million eligibles.

Since today is the final day provided by the existing act for enrollment in the supplementary medical insurance program, it is imperative that we move quickly to consider the extension of this enrollment period. It is my understanding that administration officials have not taken a position on the extension proposals because they did not want to undermine the concerted effort to make the established deadline by holding out hope for additional time. That deadline has now arrived and I ask my colleagues to join me in requesting immediate hearings by the Committee on Ways and Means in order that the enrollment period be reopened as soon as possible.

BILL TO EXTEND DEADLINE FOR MEDICARE ENROLLMENT

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which would extend the March 31, 1966, deadline relative to medicare through August 31, 1966, and provide that anyone who files during any month within the allowed period will have coverage from the first day of the following month.

Under the present law those persons who reached the age of 65 in 1965 or earlier were required to enroll in the medicare program by March 31, 1966, in order to be eligible for the medicare benefits. The office of the Social Security Commissioner informs me that there are 19 million eligible for medicare, but only 16 million have signed up for the program. Of the remaining, 1 million have declined to enroll and 2 million have not been heard from. It is my view that those who have not yet enrolled should not be penalized and miss the benefits of the program because of an arbitrary deadline. Moreover, another 1 million persons, who declined to participate in medicare, should be given ample time to reconsider. The Social Security Commissioner reports that about 500,000 men and women who first declined enrollment in the medicare program, later changed their minds.

A PROGRAM TO COMBAT ALCOHOLISM

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, 1966, I introduced a series of four bills designed to combat and control the shocking problem of drug addiction and drug abusers which seriously affects New York City and the Nation. Today, I have introduced a bill designed to fight an equally severe problem—alcoholism. My bill would provide for a comprehensive program of research together with Federal grants-in-aid to the States for the treatment, rehabilitation, education, and prevention of alcoholism.

Under the bill, an Office of Alcoholism Control under the Surgeon General would be established to administer a program of matching grants to the States. In addition, the Office of Alcoholism Control would administer a program of research, training, and demonstration projects to universities and other institutions and would coordinate various alcoholic

programs presently conducted by different agencies. The bill provides for a nine-man Alcoholism Advisory Council for the purpose of advising the Director of the Office of Alcoholism Control and to review project grants and programs of the Office. Moreover, the Council would have the power to make recommendations on dealing with alcoholism.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, who has recently introduced legislation in this field in the Senate, is keenly aware of the need for Federal help in this area. Senator JAVITS, recognizing alcoholism as the fourth most serious health problem in the United States, stated on January 25, 1966:

There are an estimated 5 to 6 million alcoholics in the Nation—1 out of every 15 Americans who drink. Roughly, 250,000 persons each year join the ranks of alcoholics. * * * Alcoholism is a major menace. Yet while we expend some \$380 annually to treat each tuberculosis patient, only 16 cents is spent on the average each year for treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics.

It is a known fact that alcoholism shortens life. Alcoholics have a death rate two and one-half times that of the normal population. There are 70 million people in this country who drink. Drinking presents no problem to some 65 million of these, but, according to the National Council on Alcoholism, Inc., as to an estimated 5,015,000 of them drinking has become enough of a problem to interfere with successful, happy living. These are the alcoholics.

I define the term "alcoholic" to mean any person who chronically and habitually uses or is dependent upon alcoholic beverages to the extent that he has lost power of self-control with respect to use of such beverages or who by reason of alcoholism endangers the health, safety, or welfare of himself or others.

Contrary to general belief, the great majority of the alcoholic population of 5,015,000 is not the visible skid-row type of alcoholic found in the Monday morning lineups, on the Bowery, in the jails, and in the city hospitals. Some 97 percent of all alcoholics are to be found in the homes, factories, offices, and communities of America.

There are many disastrous effects of alcoholism which are not easily reflected and appreciated by a perusal of alcoholic statistics. For example, what of the family of the afflicted individual? It is not possible for the breadwinner of the family to become afflicted with the disease of alcoholism without the entire family unit feeling the impact. In most cases where the father or mother or both are victims of alcoholism, there is a total breakdown in the family unit concept. Children are faced with the ruins. They are left to shift for themselves. It is not surprising that so many children of alcoholics become delinquents and eventually alcoholics themselves.

In another sense, alcoholism is highly impractical in that it is extremely costly. There have been conservative estimates that the cost to business and industry from absenteeism, inefficiency, and accidents resulting from alcoholism rates as high as \$2 billion annually. In addition, the loss of valuable personnel who fall

victims to alcoholism after years of investment in their training is costing industry an astronomical amount every year, not to mention the \$432 million per annum reflected in lost wages because of absenteeism resulting from alcoholism.

Notwithstanding the dreadful consequences of alcoholism, relatively little governmental effort or money has been expended to deal with this problem. Efforts in the States, while helpful, have not met the need. The majority of the States have taken the significant legislative step of recognizing alcoholism as a medical problem and have provided some State funds for alcoholic treatment, education, and research. The fact remains, however, that the States need Federal help badly. For example, in New York State alone it is estimated that there are currently 700,000 alcoholics, and yet New York State's budget now, although high by comparison, is approximately \$1 million.

The New York State Mental Hygiene Department presently operates 2 alcoholic treatment units in New York State hospitals; a 70-bed unit at Central Islip, Long Island, and one for 60 patients in Rochester, N.Y. Both are for men only. The department plans to establish 3 more units this year; a women's unit at Central Islip and two more for men, one in New York City and another upstate. The department hopes ultimately to establish a treatment unit in each of the 19 State hospitals. In addition to financial problems, it must have trained personnel such as recreational and occupational therapists and psychologists.

The alcoholic problem is of concern to the Nation and of particular concern to New York City. The city has the largest number of alcoholics in the country, some 258,000, as of 1963, and the number is on the rise. Most of them, according to the National Council on Alcoholism, are receiving no treatment whatsoever. The time has come for a comprehensive Federal program to deal with alcoholism. We must provide substantial money, aid, and support to the States to assist them in strengthening their present programs and initiating new ones. This bill, I believe, would be a major step in that direction.

I include a copy of the bill:

H.R. 14197

A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the control of alcoholism

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 "Alcoholism Control Act of 1966".

OFFICE OF ALCOHOLISM CONTROL

SEC. 2. (a) (1) There is hereby authorized to be established, within the Office of the Surgeon General, an Office of Alcoholism Control (hereinafter referred to as the "Office").

(2) The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed in accordance with the civil service laws.

(b) It shall be the duty and function of the Office to—

(1) administer the programs authorized by sections 3 and 4 of this Act;

(2) assist the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General, in the planning and carrying on of any activities which relate to alcoholism, its con-

trol, prevention, treatment, or cure, and with respect to which such Secretary or the Surgeon General has or assumes any duty, function, or responsibility;

(3) collect, from other Federal agencies as well as from other sources, data relating to alcoholism, its control, prevention, treatment, and cure;

(4) prepare, publish, and disseminate educational materials dealing with the control, prevention, treatment, and cure of alcoholism; and

(5) in discharging duties, functions, and responsibilities, to cooperate with and coordinate its programs and activities with the programs and activities of other Federal agencies which have or assume any duty, function, or responsibility, for or relating to, alcoholism, its control, prevention, treatment, or cure.

GRANT TO STATES

SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of enabling the Director to make grants under this section to States for the purpose of providing programs of alcoholism control, research into the causes and effects of alcoholism and means whereby its victims may be treated, cured, and rehabilitated, and of providing programs for the treatment, cure, and rehabilitation of alcoholics, there is authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, \$9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

(b) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for any fiscal year, the Director shall reserve an amount (not in excess of 2 per centum of such sums) which he shall allot among Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, in accordance with their respective needs for funds to carry out the purposes of this section. From the remainder of such sums the Director shall allot to each other State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the population of such States bears to the total of the populations of all of the States of the United States.

(2) The amount of any State's allotment under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year which the Director determines will not be required for such fiscal year in carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under subsection (c) shall be available for the reallocation from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Director may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such paragraph for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Director estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall similarly be reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallocated to a State under this paragraph during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) shall be deemed a part of its allotment under paragraph (1) for such year.

(3) The amount of each allotment to any State for any fiscal year under this subsection shall be available to such State, if such State has a plan approved by the Director under subsection (c) in effect on the first day of such fiscal year, to pay not more than 75 per centum nor less than 50 per centum, of the total cost of carrying out the State plan. In the case of any State, which on such first day does not have such a plan and has not previously received a planning grant under this sentence, the Director may pay to such State not more than \$35,000, nor less than \$10,000, for the purpose of enabling such State to prepare a plan under this

section and establish an alcoholism control program, and any amount so paid shall be charged to the allotment of the State to which it is paid.

(c) (1) Any State which desires to receive a grant under this section (other than a grant authorized under the last sentence of subsection (b) (3)) must prepare a State plan which is approved by the Director pursuant to this subsection.

(2) The Director shall approve a State plan under this section if he finds that such plan—

(A) establishes or designates a single State agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State agency") as the sole agency for administering or supervising the administration of the plan, which agency shall be the agency primarily responsible for the coordination of State programs and activities related to alcoholism or alcoholism control;

(B) provides for such financial participation by the State or communities therein with respect to activities and projects under the plan as the Director may by regulation prescribe in order to assure continuation of desirable activities and projects after termination of Federal financial support under this section;

(C) provides for development of programs and activities for carrying out the purposes of this section (as set forth in subsection (a)), including the furnishing of consultative, technical, or information services to public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations engaged in activities relating to alcoholism or alcoholism control, and for coordinating the activities of such agencies and organizations to the extent feasible;

(D) provides for consultation with and utilization, pursuant to agreement with the head thereof, of the services and facilities of appropriate State or local public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations in the administration of the plan and in the development of such programs and activities;

(E) provides such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Director shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan; and

(F) provides that the State agency will make such reports to the Director, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable him to perform his functions under this section and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Director may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(3) (A) The Secretary shall not finally disapprove any State plan, or any modification thereof submitted under this section without first affording the State reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(B) Whenever the Director, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of a State plan approved under this subsection, finds that—

(i) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of paragraph (2), or

(ii) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Director shall notify such State agency that no further payments to the State under this section (or, in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments shall be made to such State under this section (or payments shall

be limited to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(C) A State which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Director under paragraph (2) or (3) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Director, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Director thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Director or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Director may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Director as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Director to take further evidence, and the Director may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Director shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subparagraph shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Director's action.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section the Director shall refuse to make a grant for any fiscal year to any State for the purpose of carrying out a plan of such State approved under subsection (c), if the Director finds, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such plan, that a lesser sum of State and local funds will be expended on the alcoholism control program of such State during such year than was expended on such program for the preceding fiscal year. Any final action by the Director under this subsection may be appealed by any State dissatisfied by such action in the same manner as that provided under subsection (c) (3).

(e) Payments of grants under this section may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Director may determine.

(f) As used in this section, the term "State" means a State, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands.

RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 4. (1) The Director is authorized to make grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution, or to engage by contract the services of any such agency, organization, institution, or of any individual—

(A) to conduct research into the causes and effects of alcoholism, the means which may be employed for its control, prevention, treatment, and cure, such research to include a study and evaluation of biochemical, pharmacological, sociocultural, and psychological factors which are, or may be, significant to an understanding of alcoholism, its causes and effects, or its control, prevention, treatment, and cure;

(B) to provide training of professional and technical personnel in the approaches, methods, and techniques for the proper treatment and prevention of alcoholism and the rehabilitation of alcoholics;

(C) to provide appropriate fellowships for graduate study in social work, the behavioral sciences, chemistry, and biology, and medical residences and internships for qualified individuals desiring to receive specialized training in the prevention or treatment of alcoholism or the rehabilitation of alcoholics; and

(D) to establish and conduct demonstration projects to develop and evaluate new techniques, approaches, and methods in the treatment and prevention of alcoholism and the rehabilitation of alcoholics, such projects to include development of specialized courses relating to alcoholism in medical colleges and graduate schools of social work and behavioral science.

(2) In making grants and entering into contracts to carry out the provisions of paragraph (1), the Director shall impose such conditions, limitations, or other provisions as may be appropriate to assure that no individual shall be made the subject of any research, which is carried out, in whole or in part, with funds provided under this section, unless such individual explicitly agrees to become the subject of such research.

(b)(1) To the extent he deems it appropriate, the Director shall require the recipient of any grant or contract under his section to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the project for which such grant or contract was made.

(2) Payments under this section pursuant to a grant or contract may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Director may determine.

(c) The Director shall make no grant or contract under this section in any State which has established or designated a State agency for purposes of section 3(c)(2)(A) unless the Director has consulted with such State agency regarding such grant or contract.

(d) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, \$12,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and the following fiscal year.

ALCOHOLISM ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 5. (a) For the purpose of advising the Director on matters bearing on his responsibilities under this Act and of reviewing all project grants proposed to be made under section 3, there is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Alcoholism Advisory Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") to consist of nine individuals to be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") without regard to the civil service laws. Members of the Council shall be selected from persons who are not otherwise in the full-time employ of the United States and who are skilled in medicine, psychology, government, law or law enforcement, social work, public health, or education, or who have demonstrated particular interest in the special problems of alcoholism.

(b) Each member of the Council shall hold office for a term of three years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment,

three at the end of the first year, three at the end of the second year, and three at the end of the third year after the date of appointment. No individual shall be eligible to be appointed as a member of the Council after he has served as a member of the Council for two terms.

(c) Members of the Council shall, while attending meetings or conferences of the Council or otherwise engaged on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$75 per diem, including travel time, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(d) The Council shall report not less often than once each fiscal year to the Secretary and to the Congress on the work of the Office and other Federal agencies in the field of alcoholism.

(e) (1) Not less often than once each fiscal year, the Council shall submit to the Secretary and to the Congress a report containing full and complete information on (1) the work and activities of the Office, (2) the work and activities relating to alcoholism of other agencies of the Federal Government, (3) and the work and activities relating to alcoholism of the States, and the role assistance provided under this Act has played in such work and activities. The Council may include in any such report such suggestions and recommendations as it deems advisable, including suggestions and recommendations which would encourage and assist local communities in the establishment and expansion of alcoholism control facilities. The first such report submitted shall cover the period beginning on the date of the establishment of the Office and ending as short a time before the making of such report as is feasible, and each following report shall cover the period beginning with the day following the last day covered by the preceding report and ending as short a time before the making of such report as is feasible.

(2) In addition to the annual report, the Council is authorized to submit to the Secretary and to the Congress such reports, containing such information and such recommendations, as the Council deems advisable.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "alcoholic" means any person who chronically and habitually uses or is dependent upon alcoholic beverages to the extent that he has lost power of self-control with respect to use of such beverages, or who by reason of alcoholism endangers the health, safety, or welfare of himself or others.

(b) The term "alcoholic beverage" includes alcoholic spirits, liquors, wines, beer, and every liquid or fluid, patented or not, containing alcoholic spirits, wine or beer which is capable of being consumed by human beings and produces intoxication in any form or in any degree.

(c) The term "alcoholism" means any condition of abnormal behavior or illness resulting directly or indirectly from the chronic and habitual use of or dependence upon alcoholic beverages to the extent of loss of power of self-control over their use.

WE SHOULD SHORTEN POLITICAL CAMPAIGN TIME RATHER THAN REDUCE THE NUMBER OF ELECTIONS

Mrs. REID of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I testified against increasing the terms of Representatives in Congress from 2 to 4 years. To minimize the well-known waste of time, energy, and money spent on prolonged campaigns, I advocate reducing the length of political campaigns rather than the number of campaigns.

The current British elections provide some good lessons about campaign practices and election procedures.

Columnist James J. Kilpatrick in the Washington Evening Star has made some useful observations.

I recommend that Members pass these suggestions along to their State legislators who are probably considering ideas to improve and shorten our prolonged, exacerbating, and wasteful political campaigns:

The custom is to regard the British as slow and decorous fellows, famed for the leisurely pace and the long view. By contrast with the brisk Americans, who of course are men of action, the British are thought to be thinkers and cud chewers. We might imagine that their elections, like their cricket games, are at once interminable and incomprehensible, and broken only by recess for tea.

The picture is wholly false. Consider, if you please, the admirable timetable of the British elections this week.

First off, it was not even certain that Britain would have an election until the Queen's proclamation dissolving the Parliament. That was on March 10. Parties then had precisely 8 days to nominate their candidates. Two weeks, mind you, just 2 weeks, were then provided for campaigning. On Thursday, the voters go to the polls. On April 18, members of the new Parliament meet to elect a speaker. The Parliament itself will open April 21. Six weeks in all, and the job is over and done with.

Contrast that crisp procedure with elections to the U.S. Congress. The even-numbered years begin in January with announcements, timid or bold, that candidates are thinking of responding to the urgings of their friends. February brings the beaming faces, peering like crocuses through the snow. It is late spring before the lists are complete. Then follows the prolonged period of the primary campaign, the summer doldrums, then another campaign, finally in November the election. In January, the new Congress assembles.

In the course of this stupefying process, both candidates and voters are exhausted. After the first week, nothing new is said; no vote is changed; the speeches get worse, and the respect of the voter declines. By election day, the candidates have indigestion and the voters have earaches. For days on end, nothing sensible has been said. Why Americans are wedded to these endurance contests, no man can say, but the hoary rituals go on. It is a fair measure of the superior maturity of the British people that, while they listen to politicians, they don't listen to them long.

Our system suffers by contrast with the British system in at least three other ways.

Until the surgeons of the Supreme Court stropped up their scalpels 2 years ago in *Wesberry v. Sanders*, our congressional districts varied fantastically in size. The situation is far from corrected today. Yet the British manage to keep each of their 630 constituencies at about 56,000 population through the firm ministrations of an official

commission. The system works as perfectly as the Buckingham guards in close-order drill. Meanwhile, we sputter along in a tangle of lawsuits and special legislative sessions.

Under the British system, every candidate for Commons must post a filing fee of \$420. If he polls as much as 12½ percent of the vote, his fee is returned; if not, his fee is forfeited. The idea is to put a penalty on the crackpots and publicity seekers. As one reads the debates of Commons, it is clear that the rule has not functioned with total effectiveness, but the principle is sound.

For a third point, the British have managed to control campaign spending in ways that have eluded us here. Our own elections have become recurring scandals. How much EDWARD KENNEDY spent in his senatorial campaign, no man really knows, but some of the Boston writers put the total at close to \$1 million. Brother BOBBY doubtless spent as much. Outlays in many a House race run to \$100,000 or more. As a device for controlling spending, the Corrupt Practices Act is a farce. The ludicrous reports filed after each election have not even taken value.

The British have demonstrated that campaign spending can be controlled. Candidates can spend either 2 cents or 2.5 cents per voter, depending upon the constituency, plus \$450 as a basic sum, plus \$280 for personal expenses. Every shilling has to be accounted for. No supplementary spending can be concealed in bogus "volunteer committees." And in practice these limitations are both enforced and respected.

Doubtless the brevity of the British campaigns contributes to this commendable system. It would be marvelous to see the English schedule emulated here. If the States prohibited announcements prior to September 15, allowed 3 weeks for a primary, then 3 more weeks for a general election campaign, the whole body politic would benefit thereby. The long-suffering voter would be spared 10,000 banalities; the candidates would find their expenses diminished; and the prospect might bring the election of superior men.

The British have their shortcomings, in the cooking of vegetables and the grilling of Rhodesia, but when it comes to running elections, they can teach us some useful lessons.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION SITUATION IN INDIANA

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of some of my colleagues who for some reason or other have not had occasion to contact the SBA offices in their respective States, as Indiana's only Congressman on the House Small Business Committee, I would like to direct a portion of my remarks to the SBA situation in Indiana. I believe it is representative of the problem facing the SBA loan program throughout the Nation.

Since the House Small Business Committee is not a standing committee, it was necessary in this instance for the House Banking and Currency Committee to consider this bill. At this time it seems appropriate to compliment the members of the Banking and Currency

Committee for the attention they have given S. 2729 in reporting it to us today.

Essentially the thing that made this legislation necessary was through no fault of the Small Business Administration, nor is it a reflection on any poorly administered loans. SBA policy, as far as I am able to determine, is above reproach. The SBA ran out of money. It is just that simple, and we are here today to do something about it, I am happy to say.

Because of the tremendous number of disaster loan applications last year the SBA had no other choice but to curtail commercial loans, which it did in October of last year.

When I contacted the SBA office in Indiana last January, I found to my amazement that the office might just as well not have been in existence. I learned that there were 531 loans outstanding, without a dime to loan. I might point out, too, that since there were no funds available the loan applications have been slow in coming in. It is obvious that Hoosier small businesses have been seeking financial help elsewhere since October of last year.

In January, I also learned that there were approximately 16 loan applications that had been approved but were being held up because of insufficient funds. The total dollar figure on these 16 loan applications was in the neighborhood of \$825,000. It is not known, unfortunately, how many jobs the \$825,000 would have helped to create.

I am confident that the thing which happened last year, as it relates to the draining off of business loan funds to disaster loan funds, will not recur. The establishment of two separate funds, and the increase in the ceilings, is a logical and sensible solution to the problem and I invite my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 2729. I am sure this legislation will provide a real boost to the recently lagging interest in small business, not only for Indiana but for the Nation as well.

RHODESIA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on March 8 one of the Members of this House attacked U.S. policy toward the Smith regime in Rhodesia. Among the objects of the attack were the British Government, the State Department "gang," all the governments of independent African nations, the American press, double standard liberals, and do-gooders.

The Member's speech and a report he presented on Rhodesia contain many errors. I would like to deal with a few of these errors.

First. The statement indicts the State Department because the United States has agreed to support our British ally in its attempt to topple the illegal Smith government through economic sanctions. It states:

The Socialist government of Prime Minister Wilson is not helping us in Vietnam.

Yet the British Government has supported us more firmly on the issue of Vietnam than

any of our other NATO allies. Prime Minister Wilson has stood by us in spite of the fact that a large segment of the British public opinion is against the U.S. course in Vietnam.

Second. It is claimed:

Southern Rhodesia is a model nation for peace, stability, racial harmony with * * * increasing rather than decreasing efforts toward understanding between the races.

The racial peace of Rhodesia is the racial peace of Mississippi and South Africa. It is the peace of silent, coerced blacks and white supremacists.

In "The White Tribes of Africa," the well-known British journalist Richard West writes:

Coon, kaffir, munt (from Muntu, meaning a man) and nigger are the words commonly used by white Southern Rhodesians about their black fellow citizens. * * * The whites and blacks in Salisbury scarcely mix at all. The only whites to visit the black townships are policemen, officials, and social workers. The mass of the white population talk to no blacks except their servants.

The racial peace alleged is so brutally obtained that the Rhodesian Bar Association was forced to protest the high-handed habits of the police force.

The stability is preserved through police-state methods. According to Nathan Shamuyarira, a Rhodesian African now studying at Princeton and the former editor of the banned African Daily News published in Salisbury, all or most Africans not living on the land must live in segregated townships clustered on the outside of the principal towns. These townships are surrounded by a security belt of vacant land, useful for moving troops and armored cars to strategic positions. A wire fence frequently encloses the area, which is penetrated by one access road. Water and electricity emanate from a central point in white hands outside the area. When a strike or protest threatens, the access road is blocked, food supplies are halted, and troops are moved into the township. In the center of the ghetto one usually finds a police station protected by a wire enclosure.

Mr. Shamuyarira also tells of three young Englishmen who deserted from the Rhodesian police force late last year and who stunned English audiences with descriptions of their training to provoke, disperse, and if necessary fire on groups of Africans who have gathered to demonstrate. In Salisbury or Bulawayo any group of more than 12 Africans is dispersed with dogs or tear gas.

Only last week the Amnesty International Organization reported that 1,100 Africans are being held in Rhodesian detention camps and prisons. The Smith regime has since expelled three workers of this organization from Rhodesia, including the granddaughter of historian Arnold Toynbee. Miss Toynbee said that she had been told she could stay in Rhodesia if she informed the police of the activities of African nationalists and white sympathizers.

The Rhodesian Government, like the Government in South Africa, has found it necessary to pass increasingly stringent laws with stiffer penalties. These laws have repressed not only Africans,

but also whites who dissent from the Government's policies.

The Government has passed the Law-and-Order Maintenance Act, the Unlawful Organization Act, and other repressive legislation. Under these laws, political dissent is banned, persons are jailed or exiled, all public meetings are forbidden unless approved by the police, and persons are put to death for throwing gasoline bombs or Molotov cocktails. The Preservation of Constitutional Government Act, for example, provides for sentences of up to 20 years for organizing groups, either inside or outside the country, whose aim is to overthrow the Government by unconstitutional means. The ironic thing about this act is that it was passed by Smith's party in 1963, and now Smith himself could be charged with violating this act.

The Smith regime's restrictions on freedom also include press censorship. Rhodesia's two daily newspapers, which do not support Smith, used to be published daily with large amounts of blank space. The December issue of the monthly Central African Examiner carried the following message on its cover:

In terms of the Emergency Power (Censorship of Publications) Order 1965, all material in this newspaper has been subject to Government censorship.

Lower down the page was the following:

Special Christmas do-it-yourself issue. Lots of space in which you can write what you want to read instead of what we want you to read.

Virtually every page had large blank spaces. But even blank spaces became too threatening to the Smith regime, and it is now illegal to publish newspapers with open spaces.

John Parker, news editor of the Sunday Mail in Rhodesia, has been in and out of prison for refusing to divulge sources of a story the government disliked. Eric Robins, a reporter for Time-Life, was declared a "prohibited immigrant" by the Smith regime.

Third. Next it is claimed:

The Smith regime is secure. It has the broad support of the European minority.

With such harsh laws against political dissent, it is not surprising that little open opposition appears against the ruling party and its policies. Nonetheless, some of the more outspoken members of the press have been joined by courageous church officials in protesting what is happening in Rhodesia.

On November 28 Catholic priests in Rhodesia circulated copies of a pastoral letter which called attention to the dangers of placing nationalism, race, or economics above a concern for man. The letter refuted the idea that white silence has meant consent. Rather, the silence is a silence of "fear, disappointment, and helplessness," it said. The letter condemned Smith for declaring independence and said that the country's racial policies were leading to future trouble.

The Catholic statement followed by 2 days a document circulated by the important Christian Council of Rhodesia, which counts among its constituents the Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian, and

Congregationalist churches. The statement read in part:

We judge the proclamation of a new constitution of Rhodesia by a group of ministers, without the assent of Parliament, or of the Crown, to be an unlawful act. . . . We regret the great blow delivered by this act to the concept of constitutional law brought to Africa by a Western civilization nurtured in Christianity. . . . We believe that it is a betrayal of principle if those who condemn this act as wrong now remain silent. . . . We note that the intimidation of both black and white is increasing in many insidious ways, and as a result more people than ever are afraid to exercise their right of freedom of speech. . . . We are deeply concerned that information is frequently suppressed, a particularly serious instance of which is the means by which people are taken away from their homes, while it is an offense for friends to make known their whereabouts.

Further opposition to the Smith regime is indicated by the formation of a secret Rhodesian shadow cabinet opposed to the Unilateral Declaration of Independence. This was made known last February 5 in the New York Times, and was confirmed by a Smith regime attack on the shadow cabinet.

Fourth. The statement goes on to say:

The Rhodesian people proclaimed that independence in a proper manner.

Which people proclaimed that independence? Certainly not the 4 million Africans; they were never asked to participate in a referendum. Certainly not the British Government which informed Smith, immediately after the Unilateral Declaration of Independence, that he and his Ministers were, as of then, private persons with no legal authority in Rhodesia and which directed all Rhodesians to remain loyal to the Queen and to recognize her authority.

Was it done in a "proper" manner? Not a single nation in the world has recognized Rhodesian independence. That, in itself, is an adequate judgment on the validity of the regime.

To be specific, the United Kingdom Government and our own administration have not taken a stand against Rhodesian independence per se—but against this unilateral act declared in the absence of certain guarantees. These guarantees were clearly enunciated by the British Commonwealth Office on October 9, 1965. The five principles without which there could be no independence were:

First, the principle and intention of unimpeded progress to majority rule, already enshrined in the 1961 constitution, would have to be maintained and guaranteed;

Second, guarantees were required against retrogressive amendments of the constitution;

Third, immediate improvement in the political status of the African population was demanded;

Fourth, progress had to be made toward ending racial discrimination—particularly in the landholding patterns; and

Fifth, the British Government would need to be satisfied that any basis proposed for independence was acceptable to the people of Rhodesia as a whole.

Not one of these principles was seriously accepted by the Smith regime.

Hence, independence was not obtained in a proper manner, but as an act of rebellion.

Fifth. In its conclusion, the statement asserts:

As to the vote and the right of citizenship, the American liberal is adept at speaking in clichés and one-man, one-vote arguments which really do not say much. The Rhodesian has laid down no stricter criteria for the African than we have for the franchise in our Nation.

The right to vote may appear to be a cliché to some. It certainly is news to me that it is a liberal cliché. I had always understood it to mean that, through the vote and the election of representatives, men were able to protect their vital interests and further their welfare. And that is exactly what is at stake in Rhodesia. Disenfranchisement of the African majority is calculated to keep them in a servile position in the society. As former Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams said in a speech last December 16:

We naturally have a stake in what is happening in Southern Rhodesia because of our traditional belief that government should be based on consent of the governed and that all men are created equal.

The great schism between white and black Rhodesia represents more than the franchise question. The discrimination which rankles deepest among Africans is the pattern of land ownership. Four million Africans have forty-four million acres reserved by law for them. The African lands are characterized as being in areas of low rainfall, remote from roads, towns, and railroads, and of generally poorer quality than European land. The government, moreover, has never displayed much interest in agricultural extension programs to better the lot of African farmers.

Education is another area of great discrimination. The Europeans comprise only 6 percent of the total population in Rhodesia. And yet half of the expenditures for education in 1965-66 were spent on the Europeans. The average expenditure per pupil was 10 times as great for a European child as an African child.

The Rhodesian Government has made very little effort to provide secondary and higher education for the African people. Of the 643,592 Africans in school, only 11,495 of these were in secondary school and only 1,042 of those enrolled were preparing to receive graduation certificates.

A country of 4 million people producing only 1,000 secondary school graduates in a year. So low a record of achievement is difficult to find elsewhere in Africa. The Rhodesian regime has made it clear that it will allow only "civilized" Africans any participation in the political and social decisions of the country. But by denying secondary and higher education to the African population, the regime forever dooms the Africans to remain outside participation in the system.

Sixth. Finally, it is urged that—

The Rhodesian whites have a right to say a great deal about the future of their country

without meddling from do-gooders who have no resolution except chaos.

But the only chaos in Rhodesia right now is that which has been brought on by UDI. If the Smith government wants a real order and stability, let it negotiate with Britain on the basis of the five principles laid down by Prime Minister Wilson.

The statement suggests that the House Foreign Affairs Committee send a fact-finding delegation to Rhodesia to analyze the situation there. It quotes Prime Minister Smith as saying, "We have nothing to hide," when asked if Rhodesia would receive a congressional delegation.

I am sure the Prime Minister of the illegal government is willing to welcome Congressmen who he knows are sympathetic to his cause of minority rule. But the people who have been critical of the Smith regime have not fared so well. In January three Members of the British Parliament were attacked by hoodlums from the white community at a public meeting in Salisbury. One of the M.P.'s then left the country, and the other two were ordered to leave. Subsequently, a scheduled visit by British Commonwealth Secretary Arthur Bottomley was canceled, because Prime Minister Smith would not guarantee Mr. Bottomley's safety while in Rhodesia.

I personally would be happy to see a delegation, appointed by Chairman O'HARA, of the African Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, visit Rhodesia. But this delegation should be free to talk to all political groups in Rhodesia, including the African nationalist leaders, and not just the Government officials.

I strongly urge the U.S. Government to energetically pursue a course which will bring majority rule to the country of Rhodesia. Majority rule does not have to happen today or next week. But there must be assurance to the African population that this will occur within a reasonable period of time.

The fact that the Smith regime is unwilling to come to an agreement on this with the British Government and instead made a unilateral declaration of independence from Great Britain is the reason I do not feel the Smith regime sincerely intends to work toward this goal.

For the present, I believe the United States should back our British ally in her policies designed to end the Rhodesian rebellion. If, after a few months, the present sanctions prove to be ineffective in toppling the Smith government, we should examine the possibility of taking further measures.

FOREIGN AID AND FAMILY PLANNING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose today to bring to the attention of the House and the Nation at large some disturbing facts about U.S.

Government support of birth control programs abroad through foreign aid funds.

Almost daily the press carries a fresh account of U.S. activities in population control. Last December, for example, the New York Times headlined: "Birth Control Now a Major Part of U.S. Aid."

Mr. Speaker, I submit that any action programs which the Agency for International Development is supporting, or plans to support, in the area of population control are clearly outside the legislative authority granted the Agency by Congress.

Let me make my position clear: I am not opposed to the Federal Government fostering, sponsoring, or financing programs of family planning. It is my belief, for example, that the Office of Economic Opportunity has the right to support family planning programs on the local level when the consensus of local opinion is favorable.

I am, however, opposed to the unauthorized activities which have been carried on by AID. These programs have not been authorized by Congress, but simply established by bureaucratic fiat within the Agency itself. Whether or not one is an eager sponsor of birth control, it should be evident that when the United States is aggressively promoting population control abroad, the matter should rightly be subject to congressional consideration and authorization.

The reasons why I believe Congress should fully debate the desirability of such a program in our foreign assistance will be the subject of a subsequent address to the House. Today I want to document my contention that AID has been guilty of going beyond its legislative authority in providing support for birth control programs abroad. Let us review some legislative history:

In 1963 the Senate passed an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 which said:

Funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into problems of controlling population growth and to provide technical and other assistance to cooperating countries in carrying out programs of population control.

The House bill did not contain a similar provision and the House conferees were strongly opposed to the Senate amendment. The managers on the part of the House agreed to a modification of the language that restricted AID by providing that "funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into problems of population growth."

This provision was accepted by the House conferees because the population problems of the developing countries appeared to be such that research on those problems appeared to be warranted. But agreement was reached only on the understanding that no other authority was given to AID to act in the field of population control.

There were, however, early signs that AID intended to interpret the amendment to suit its own purposes.

In April 1964, the then Deputy U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress,

Agency for International Development, William Rogers, made a speech before the Western Hemisphere Conference of the International Planned Parenthood Federation in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

In that address, he stated that:

The U.S. Congress adopted the Fulbright amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act. This amendment enabled AID to fulfill requests from Latin American Nations with respect to demographic aspects of development. This we are ready to do. Our efforts will be concentrated in the fields of information, training and research. We intend to cooperate closely with all responsible segments of society, church, private, and public organizations; and will constantly reflect the fact that such matters are in the last analysis the choice and initiative of each individual family.

We intend to cooperate closely with national governments, indigenous scientific institutions, and educational institutions while respecting their particular cultures and moral values.

It appeared to me from these remarks of Mr. Rogers that the Agency for International Development was planning action programs under the so-called Fulbright amendment. For otherwise he would not have emphasized the element of choice for individual families. Research, it appeared, would not have required the consideration of such factors.

Other sources also found Mr. Rogers' speech a new departure. The Vision newsletter, a periodical devoted to Latin American affairs, termed his speech "a sharp reversal from past U.S. policy."

For that reason on May 13, 1964, I wrote to both Assistant Secretary of State Dutton and Director of Congressional Liaison for AID, Craig Raupe. In that letter I stated:

On the face of it, Mr. Rogers remarks would indicate that the Agency for International Development has gone beyond the intent of Congress in its offer of assistance to Latin American countries.

That same letter asked for a report on current and proposed U.S. assistance in the area of population growth and control, and a restatement of U.S. policy on the population control question.

The reply to this letter came from Mr. Raupe on June 8, 1964. In it he assured me that the programs spoken of by Mr. Rogers were "carefully within the purpose and intent" of the amendment.

The letter further explained:

In Latin America there is little, if any, basic structure for programs of research in population problems—personnel, background information, and research tools. Some effort toward the creation of institutions of study is essential if there is to be progress in research by Latin Americans. Personnel will have to be trained, information supplied, and research tools developed if these institutions are to be reasonably competent. The "information, training, and institution building" to which Mr. Rogers referred are those which are meaningful research efforts.

In the light of subsequent events, it is significant to note that Mr. Raupe justifies the statements of Mr. Rogers in the light of the Fulbright amendment. There is no indication that the Agency considered itself to have residual authority in this area from any other provision of the Foreign Assistance Act.

In the meantime, I had had an opportunity to quiz the then Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Thomas C. Mann, on the issue. He was appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee during hearings on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964. Our colloquy follows:

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, in order to make it very clear that not all of us associate ourselves with the gentleman from New York on the question and method of controlling this population explosion, I want an affirmation that nowhere in this legislation has AID been given the authority to promote control of population growth by scientific devices. May I bluntly ask you the question: Is any money being spent for that purpose?

Mr. MANN. No; it is not. What we do do is talk about it. It is a problem. We discuss it. As I said, Mr. ZABLOCKI, we work principally with private concerns who are largely engaged in an educational problem. I don't know of any money—

Mr. ZABLOCKI. What concerns do you deal with?

Do you subsidize them? Do you give them money?

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. In what ways do you work with them?

Mr. MANN. Excuse me, sir. There is one item of \$100,000 for research in demographic problems which has been given to an organization, Celade, in Chile, I am told. It is a U.N.-sponsored organization. This is for research.

From the Secretary's answer it seemed clear that the executive branch agreed that there was no authority anywhere in the Foreign Assistance Act to support programs promoting the control of population growth.

Satisfied by this assurance, unfortunately I did not catch the brief reference by the AID Administrator, Mr. Bell, when he came before the Foreign Affairs Committee in February 1965, to action programs being conducted by AID.

At that time he mentioned that Taiwan and Korea had significant family planning programs underway. What he failed to add was that the U.S. taxpayers were, in part, paying for those programs. The Agency had permitted the governments of those countries to use the currencies generated by the sale of Public Law 480 products to be used for family planning purposes.

Mr. Bell obviously sought to dispel any apprehensions that a policy change had occurred in AID on the population control issue when he said:

The population field, as distinct from the food field, is not a field in which AID has any major activities. While I expect our activities will gradually grow, I foresee no big change in the immediate future.

It seems significant that only a month later, in a speech at Michigan State University, Dr. Philip R. Lee, Director of Health Services, Office of Technical Cooperation and Research, AID, was leaving a quite different impression.

In that speech, Dr. Lee was outlining the new Government organization which was being set up inside the Agency for International Development in order to administer action programs in population control. He said:

We are prepared to entertain requests for technical assistance * * *. We are pre-

pared to receive and consider requests for commodity assistance. The AID will not consider requests for contraceptive devices or equipment for manufacture of contraceptives. Experience has made it clear that the cost of these latter items is not a stumbling block in countries that are developing effective programs. Other items could be provided by AID, such as vehicles and education equipment for use in maternal and child health and family planning programs. We are also prepared to receive requests to assist in local currency financing of such programs.

A university audience, it seems, could learn more about U.S. policy on birth control assistance abroad than could Members of the U.S. Congress.

I did not learn of Dr. Lee's speech until fall 1965. I immediately sent a letter to Mr. William C. Gibbons, director of the AID Congressional Liaison, asking for an explanation. In a reply dated October 29, Mr. Gibbons informed me that the contents of Dr. Lee's message had been made known to the staff of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

When the information finally was received I was on my way to southeast Asia as the chairman of a study mission. It was not possible to reply to Mr. Gibbons' letter until December 27.

In the interim, the White House Conference on International Cooperation was held. At that conference a Committee on Population submitted its report and AID officials outlined a broad program of assistance to family planning abroad.

Among the speakers at that committee meeting was Dr. Edgar Berman, a consultant to AID. At the close of the meeting, a member of my staff who had attended asked Dr. Berman under what authority the Agency for International Development was promoting action programs in population control. He replied "The Fulbright amendment." When it was explained that the Fulbright amendment restricted AID to research only, he shrugged his shoulders and said only that AID's lawyers must have found some authority.

In my letter of December 27 to Mr. Gibbons I challenged this:

All this activity would seem to be without any congressional authorization. As you know, the Foreign Assistance Act restricts U.S. activity to "research into problems of population growth." I am sure you will agree that recent activities and announced plans by AID go far beyond research.

Therefore, I would appreciate knowing what authority and justification AID has for its family planning programs. It would appear that these steps have been taken without Congressional approval and in clear violation of the stipulation made in the Foreign Assistance Act.

The reply to that letter came from Administrator Bell himself, more than a month later, on January 28, 1966. At this point, I request permission to include the text of the letter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1966.

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZABLOCKI: Mr. William Gibbons has passed me your letter of December 27 concerning AID activity in the popu-

lation field. It arrived while I was on an inspection trip in Vietnam and other southeast Asian countries.

In keeping with section 211 of the Foreign Assistance Act, which provides for the promotion of economic development " * * * with emphasis upon assisting the development of human resources * * *," we have long assisted the developing countries in improving their maternal and child health facilities and the work of their statistics offices and census bureaus. Section 251 of the Foreign Assistance Act provides similar authority with specific reference to Latin America. Development loan assistance, which is also available for this purpose, is provided for in sections 201 and 251 of the act.

Section 241 of the Foreign Assistance Act, entitled "Development Research," covers programs of research and analysis. In 1963, Congress amended section 241 to provide specifically for "research into problems of population growth." This subsection was added on the recommendation of the Senate to encourage research in the field and to provide explicit authority for it. The original Senate amendment provided for "technical and other assistance" in addition to research. The conference committee deleted that reference, which went beyond the general subject matter of section 241. We have not interpreted the action of the conference committee as a legislative repeal or restriction on the general authority contained in other sections of the law.

Since 1963, AID has contributed to a number of research projects in problems of population growth, which are being conducted at Pittsburgh University, Notre Dame University, and other institutions here and in Latin America.

Sections 211 and 251 of the Foreign Assistance Act have provided the principal statutory authorities for AID's response to the guidance from President Johnson last year when he said in his state of the Union message that "I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion of world population and the growing scarcity of world resources." In March 1965, I instructed all AID missions that they should consider requests from host governments for assistance in family planning. I stressed that such assistance must be additive to the host country's own efforts and assistance from other sources. I stated that such requests to AID would be handled, as in any other field, on a case-by-case basis and that we would be prepared to entertain requests for technical assistance and local currency, as well as for commodity assistance, such as vehicles and education equipment for use in maternal and child health and family planning programs. I stressed that AID would not consider requests for contraceptive devices or equipment for their manufacture.

I made two other very important stipulations; namely that, in no case would a family planning program be a condition for U.S. assistance; and that AID does not advocate any particular method of family regulation and requires that, in family planning programs supported by AID, every family have complete freedom of choice in this regard.

As you know, President Johnson reasserted his views on the importance of family planning on at least two other public occasions during 1965 and again in his recent state of the Union message for 1966. In his June 25 address on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations he urged the entire world to "face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of the world." At the end of August, in a letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations, on the occasion of the U.N. Population Conference, President Johnson reiterated his June 25 remarks and added his hope "that your great assemblage of population experts will con-

tribute significantly to the knowledge necessary to solve this transcendent problem which, together with man's search for peace, constitutes our greatest challenge." Then, on January 12, the President recommended that Congress give "a new and daring direction to our foreign aid program designed to make a maximum attack on hunger and disease and ignorance in those countries that are determined to help themselves—and to help those nations that are trying to control population growth," both through our research and through funds earmarked to help their efforts.

During 1965 we received both formal and informal requests for assistance from a number of countries. For example, Turkey has asked for a loan to purchase vehicles to transport family planning workers and for education equipment and materials. They also requested the services of a demographer and training grants for midwives and other family planning workers. Honduras is seeking training, education materials and help with the costs of initiating family planning services in rural health centers. South Korea is receiving local currency to support health and family planning clinics. The Republic of China on Taiwan continues to utilize local currency balances (which remained after the AID program there terminated last year) for an extensive family planning program. In addition, we are currently reviewing requests for technical assistance, vehicles, education materials, and training for Pakistan, India, and Tunisia.

We are also assisting selected American and foreign institutions to build up their facilities to train doctors and public health workers, both American and foreign, in family planning problems, so as to equip them for work in the developing countries. Johns Hopkins, the University of North Carolina, the Children's Bureau, the Census Bureau, and selected institutions in Latin America and Asia are among those receiving such contracts.

While I have described our activity in the population field in some detail, this is only part of a broad spectrum of health activities, combating malnutrition among infants, controlling or eradicating debilitating and killer diseases, and other efforts to improve health facilities in the developing countries. These health activities complement other AID efforts to help expand food production and, in many other ways, to further economic and social progress in the developing countries.

I should, of course, be happy to discuss your questions further with you before the hearings, and I do intend to testify on these matters.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. BELL.

With the receipt of Mr. Bell's letter it became clear that AID was ignoring the legislative history of the Foreign Assistance Act in an attempt to give an aura of legality to its actions in fostering birth control programs abroad.

No longer was the Fulbright amendment being cited by AID officials. Now authority was being found in section 211 of the Foreign Assistance Act, a section providing for promoting economic development "with emphasis upon assisting the development of human resources."

My review of section 211 had indicated that nowhere in the legislative history of that provision is birth control aid mentioned or provided for. Further, it seems an utterly cynical interpretation of the phrase "development of human resources" to promote the prevention of human beings.

On this basis, I replied to Administrator Bell on February 16:

FEBRUARY 16, 1966.

MR. DAVID E. BELL,
Department of State,
Agency for International Development,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BELL: This is in further reference to your letter of January 28 concerning AID activity in the population field.

Contrary to the interpretation by AID, it was the understanding of the House conferees in 1963 that the limitation of the original Senate amendment on aid to family planning precluded the Federal Government from expending any foreign aid funds in this field, save for research. The justification of AID's actions by citing section 211 is entirely inappropriate. The section calls for the development of human resources, not the prevention of human beings.

It is my conclusion, therefore, that the Agency has been guilty of a grave misuse of authority in providing any aid, other than research assistance, in the population field. Such a sweeping change in the focus of U.S. aid efforts should have been subject to congressional debate and vote. Unfortunately, this has not been the case.

I note in the press that a program of birth control aid to Pakistan is awaiting formal approval, the first time the United States has provided direct material assistance to another country for birth control work. It is my belief that no final decision should be given on this program unless, and until, Congress has given its approval to U.S. participation in this sensitive and important area.

As you know, I have long been a supporter of foreign aid. On many occasions I have taken the floor of the House to defend your Agency and its predecessors against attack.

But my enthusiasm ebbs significantly when I am confronted with what appears to be a deliberate flaunting of congressional will. If AID cannot be trusted to carry out the intent of the legislative branch in this one small area, can it be trusted to look after the massive economic development program for which it has been given responsibility by Congress?

I await your reply on this matter.

Yours sincerely,

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Member of Congress.

Subsequently, AID has informed my office that there are no specific documents linking birth control authority to section 211. As proof of the Agency's contention that it has had authority to fund birth control programs under existing legislation, AID has sent me a memorandum, dated November 25, 1963, for Mr. Robert Komer at the White House from Lester E. Gordon, Acting Assistant Administrator for Program, at AID. The memo contains no data for the President on three amendments which were to be considered in the House-Senate Conference on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. Section (b) of that memo has to do with the birth control amendment. It says:

(b) Birth control amendment: A Senate amendment proposed by Senator FULBRIGHT would authorize the use of funds for research on population growth and technical and other assistance for programs of population control. The language would confer no authority not now in the legislation. House conferees are likely to oppose the provision. The executive branch has been, and we believe should remain, neutral.

While this memo supports the contention of AID that it has had authority,

it gives no clue to the central issue of when and where this authority was bestowed on the Agency.

AID also has provided me with a memorandum which attempts to explain why Members of Congress were not informed of the new action policies of the Agency, initiated by the airgram of early 1965. I include that memorandum at this point:

[Limited official use]

Drafted: January 23, 1965.

Initialed: January 23, 1965.

Action memorandum for the Administrator through Executive Secretary Dr. Hollis B. Chenery, AA/PC.

From Robert S. Smith, AA/PC.

Problem: Draft airgram on population programs.

Discussion: Attached for your approval is the airgram on population programs, which was prepared by Philip Lee and myself, following your guidance and the two executive staff meetings in December. It has been cleared by: Dr. Baumgartner, and Messrs. Hutchinson, Poats, Rogers, Macomber, Waters, Chenery, Gibbons, Farmer, and Moynihan of AID, and by Richard N. Gardner on behalf of State. A number of minor changes were suggested during the clearance process, including your own of January 18, and they have been incorporated. At Fred Simmons' suggestion, I also sent a copy for information to Francis Bator, although we assumed that you personally intend to clear the airgram with the White House before it goes out.

You will recall that during the executive staff meetings we considered the need for congressional liaison and for discussions with key religious leaders before circulating the airgram. It is Bill Gibbons' opinion that the reference to population problems in the state of the Union message—and the congressional reaction thereto—makes it unnecessary to take any further soundings now. Dr. Ben Duffy, who was of considerable help to Phil and me in drafting the airgram, is equally satisfied that there is no need for special discussions of the airgram's content with religious leaders. Bill Rogers, who had originally raised this point, accepts Dr. Duffy's opinion.

The airgram is unclassified.

Mike Moynihan's comments on the draft are attached for your information. I have told Mike that I understood it was your wish to keep this particular message in "low key" but that more detailed information will be made available over time to missions and other appropriation places. For instance, Phil Lee and I attended a meeting at the Bureau of the Budget last week to share information with other Government agencies on programs and plans in this field.

Recommendation 1: That you approve this airgram.

Approved _____
Disapproved _____
Date _____

As you will observe, the message is prepared as an AID airgram. Several people in State have suggested that it would be useful to follow this up with a brief joint State-AID circular-classified, if necessary—encouraging each Ambassador to get together with his AID mission director to work out policies and procedures for dealing with governments on population program matters. If you agree, I should be glad to work this out with State.

Recommendation 2: That a separate joint State-AID message follow this one.

Approved _____
Disapproved _____
Date _____

Recently I met with Mr. Bell and Mr. Gibbons to discuss this matter further.

At that meeting Mr. Bell contended that the Agency had always considered that it had the authority to support birth control abroad, and that past legal opinions from the Agency counsel had made this clear. We agreed that AID would provide me with memorandums stating this, dating back to 1962.

Subsequently, Mr. Farmer, AID's chief counsel, has contacted my office to explain that no such documents can be found. In the light of this eventuality—and the other data which I have provided, some conclusions seem clear:

First, Congress never gave the Agency for International Development any authority to use U.S. funds to support, finance, or foster in any way any kind of programs in the field of population control other than simple research.

Second, the action programs in which AID has engaged during the past few months are unauthorized and outside the scope of the congressionally-given authority of the Agency.

Third, if the Agency wishes to continue these programs then it must request authority from Congress. This most sensitive issue cannot be resolved by bureaucratic fiat. It can only be resolved in open hearings and open debate in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the issues involved here go far beyond simply whether one is for or against birth control. They strike to the heart of our American Constitutional processes. This is clearly a case in which the executive branch is legislating in an important area which should be decided by the elected representatives of the people.

If AID wants authority to support family planning programs abroad, it should request such authority in the Foreign Assistance Act Amendments of 1966. Surely the agency should not fear the consequences of open discussion of this issue.

If the agency is allowed to operate under this highly questionable, latter-day, self-interpretation of the law, however, the Congress will have, in effect, given AID a blank check to do whatever it wishes so long as it cares to justify the actions as promoting the development of human resources.

Under such an interpretation, for example, AID conceivably could finance programs of eugenic sterilization or euthanasia—just so it could be justified in terms of economic progress.

For example, the Washington Post of Sunday, March 13, carried a news item about a scientist who proposes a search for two chemicals—the first to sterilize the entire population and a second to reverse the process and allow a couple which was given Government permission to have a baby.

The news story quoted Dr. Alan Guttmacher, president of the Planned Parenthood-World Population, as saying that he had a gloomy foreboding that such a plan might be necessary for some emerging nations which have burgeoning populations.

Clearly, U.S. support for such a program would be possible, without congressional approval, if the erroneous AID in-

terpretation of the Foreign Assistance Act is allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker, it would appear to me that the Agency for International Development would appreciate the opportunity to legitimize its programs by bringing to Congress an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which would provide it with clear-cut authority to fund family planning abroad.

I hereby invite such an amendment to the bill.

If AID is unwilling to look for such an amendment, it will indicate two things: First, the agency feels it does not need Congress and can, by its own authority and the wisdom of its own counsels, read permissions into the foreign aid bill which Congress never intended. And second, that we in the Congress must amend the foreign aid bill to provide guidance to AID on this question. I, for one, stand ready to assist in this effort.

MOVING THE DEFENSE LANGUAGE SCHOOL, EAST COAST BRANCH, TO EL PASO, TEX., WILL SERIOUSLY IMPAIR AMERICA'S ALREADY SLENDER DEFENSE LANGUAGE CAPABILITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the House a situation that I believe has grave implications for the Nation's defense posture—and that has resulted from a serious malfunction of the administrative machinery of the Defense Department.

It is a situation that cries out for urgent and immediate action. And I am hopeful that by bringing this matter to the attention of this House and to the attention of the American people we can get the relief we need more effectively than we have so far been able to get it in any other way.

Last December, Mr. Speaker, as Members will recall the Department of Defense issued its annual list of obsolete and unnecessary military bases to be shut down. Included in this list were a number of Strategic Air Command bases, those utilizing the B-47 bomber, and some of the earlier versions of the B-52. One of these was the SAC base at Biggs Air Force Base in El Paso, Tex.

Also included in this Defense real estate list, however, was another announcement. It provided that the Defense Language School, East Coast Branch, now located in Anacostia, would be moved to the Army's Fort Bliss, also located in El Paso, Tex.

It so happens that at the time this Defense Department announcement was made, Mr. Speaker, I was on the high seas as a Naval Reserve officer on annual training duty. I heard of the base closing announcement. I did not, however, hear about the proposed switch of the Defense Language School to El Paso, although, as I subsequently learned, the matter was mentioned in the Washington Post in Jerry Kluttz' column, on December 11, 1965.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the Kluttz article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 11, 1965]

POLITICS SENSED IN SHIFT OF CAPITAL AGENCY TO TEXAS

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Employees at Defense Language Institute in Anacostia have raised some interesting points as to why the agency is to be transferred to Fort Bliss, Tex. Defense Secretary McNamara announced the transfer along with numerous other base closings and cutbacks earlier this week.

Agency employees say flatly that the transfer was an afterthought; that it was ordered at the last minute, and that key Pentagon officials weren't even told of the transfer until a few hours before the McNamara directive was made public.

They also contend—with ample justification—that the transfer can't possibly be defended as an economy move as no cuts are planned in the 956 military and 319-man civilian staffs. The costs of moving the employees, their families and personal belongings along with school equipment to Fort Bliss will run up into many thousands of dollars.

These and other points have aroused suspicions that perhaps Texas politics was behind the transfer. This much is known: Air Force was ordered to close Biggs AFB, a SAC base in Texas. Biggs is in El Paso near Fort Bliss. The Army's Bliss will be expanded to include Biggs.

But Army will have no ready tenants for the Biggs facilities when Air Force vacates them, and El Paso, as to be expected, was anxious to maintain or expand the Federal payroll there. So was Representative RICHARD WHITE, Democrat, of Texas, a first-term Member of Congress who voted for many of the planks in the President's Great Society legislative program.

In any event, a late decision was made to move the Language Institute and its staff from here to El Paso, along with the Army Aviation Materiel Laboratory at Fort Eustis, Va., which has 120 military and 230 civilians, and the Air Force English Language Training School at Lackland, Tex., which has 544 military and 180 civilians.

Interestingly enough, Defense doesn't propose to abolish a single military or civilian job in the three units to be transferred there. On the contrary, some of the activities may be expanded after they are settled at Bliss.

It was not until later on that I learned about this proposed change, after Congress reconvened. I was tremendously interested in the proposal because, in addition to my membership on the House Armed Services Committee, and my membership in the Naval Reserve, it so happens that I had the opportunity of serving as a Japanese language and intelligence specialist in the Navy in the Pacific for 4 years during World War II, and, for a time, also attended the Navy's Japanese Language School at the University of Colorado, in Boulder, Colo. Besides that, I was recalled to active duty in the Navy during the Korean war, first as a student and later as an instructor in the Naval Intelligence School, located across the river in Anacostia. It was this Naval Intelligence School Mr. Speaker, that administered the operations of another Navy school, also located in those temporary buildings in Anacostia, the Navy Language School—which was the forerunner of the present Defense Lan-

guage School, East Coast Branch. It just got integrated within the Defense Department in those years since 1953 when I was over there.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that on the basis of my own experience in defense intelligence and language matters, I am frankly appalled at the proposed transfer of these facilities to El Paso, Tex. Let me say that in my judgment this move will seriously jeopardize the defense capabilities of the United States.

And let me say further, Mr. Speaker, that my own investigation of this matter has satisfied me that the decision for this move, with such sweeping implications for the effective operation of our Nation's defense intelligence establishment, was made by the Department of Defense purely as a real estate transaction without ever getting the prior approval of the top intelligence officials of the armed services.

Mr. Speaker, I was so concerned about this matter that I undertook at first to take it up directly with the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, during our committee's hearings on U.S. military posture. At that time, some 3 or 4 weeks ago, I asked Mr. McNamara to advise me of the reasons why locating the language school in El Paso, Tex., will contribute to the more effective discharge of the intelligence functions of the armed services. To date I have heard precisely nothing from the Secretary.

I am sure the reason he has not been able to answer me is that the shift from Anacostia to El Paso clearly does not and obviously cannot contribute to the more effective discharge of our military intelligence mission. On the contrary it is a move that will clearly impair our defense language capability, something which is even more crucial as we become more deeply involved in Asia, and thus will seriously jeopardize the defense capabilities of the United States.

The reason for this is very simple. The success of our defense language program depends, as I know from my own experience, first of all on the quality of the teaching faculty available. The faculty of our Defense Language School is almost entirely civilian in nature. They are recruited from a wide variety of cultural and ethnic backgrounds. Obviously the Washington area is one of the best possible areas for recruiting civilian faculty of this type. People qualified in a wide variety of foreign languages and steeped in a large number of foreign cultures are available in the Washington area.

But it is perfectly obvious if we move this school to El Paso, Tex., the most westerly point of that great State, and on the Mexican border, the chances of retaining many of these people to live and work in that area will be very slight indeed. We will be gutting the heart of our vital language program.

I might also point out, Mr. Speaker, that since these language teachers are teachers, they are naturally also interested in the availability of opportunities for professional training and advancement in their particular field of learning. They may be working on their master's

or doctor's degrees. They may need a great library available to them in the immediate area. Obviously all these facilities of great interest to the academic community are available in abundance in the Washington area. They are certainly not available in El Paso. The only college in the area, I am advised, is Texas Western College. There are 14 members on the faculty of this college in the department of foreign languages. All but two of these faculty members are concerned with the Spanish language. The nearest institution that could conceivably serve the academic needs and interests of the Defense Language School faculty would be the University of Texas. But that is 600 miles away from El Paso, far too far for any language instructor to travel.

Another important aspect of any successful language training program is to give to the students themselves maximum opportunity to use the language with people to whom the language is native. Of course, the best opportunity for doing this is in the country of the language itself. The next best opportunity is in a cosmopolitan area like Washington where there are people from many different countries, for which many different languages are native. Students at a Defense Language School in Washington thus have the opportunity to converse in foreign languages with military and embassy persons from a vast number of different countries. They have the chance to eat in a large number of restaurants staffed by people who are natives of a wide number of countries.

El Paso will doubtless provide such an opportunity for Spanish language students. But what about Russian? What about Chinese? What about Vietnamese, or Indonesian, or the various African dialects? In those terms El Paso would prove a desert. There would be nothing to keep the faculty in touch with their own cultures. They will be leaving in droves. The students will have no opportunity to use their language outside of class. I cannot think of a better way to gut the whole language program.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the situation is even more potentially damaging than this. At the present time I am informed that some nine languages are now being taught at Anacostia. The balance of the languages required by our military people, military assistance people, prospective attachés and intelligence experts, are now being taught in the Washington area under contract, either with civilian institutions such as the Berlitz Language School, or other Government agencies such as the Foreign Service Institute. If and when the Defense Language School is transferred to Texas, however, the school itself will then become responsible for teaching all of the languages involved itself, some 43 languages in all, so I am advised. In other words, the recruiting requirements of the school will increase for language faculty use dramatically at the very moment when the obstacles to recruiting and retaining properly qualified native teachers will become, as I have already indicated, almost insurmountable. Clearly this kind of thing just does not make sense. And

no wonder the service intelligence chiefs were not asked for their opinion on the proposed move.

But the most startling fact in this whole business, as I have discovered, is that this damaging and sweeping decision to move the language school to a site that will seriously impair our language or intelligence capability was not made as a result of recommendations from our top service intelligence leaders. It was made, incredibly, by the real estate people of the Defense Department. The intelligence heads of the service were never consulted, I am informed. And they never gave their approval for the move nor were they given an opportunity to comment on the grave harm which this real estate transaction would do to one of our Nation's most important intelligence capabilities.

Briggs Air Force Base in El Paso, a Strategic Air Command installation, was closed down last fall as part of the overall action in shutting down obsolete and unnecessary installations. Apparently in an effort to ease the economic impact of this closing—a concern, I might add, which we in New York State have not seen exercised with regard to our State—the real estate people looked around for anything they could find to move into the El Paso area. The Defense Language School, with 300 to 400 military and civilian personnel assigned, is located in obsolete, temporary buildings in Anacostia. The District of Columbia has no Congressman of its own, and hence nobody would be likely to scream if some installation were moved out of Anacostia. So, although not a single job was to be cut, and though the shift itself would cost thousands of dollars, and the further costs of transporting military personnel who are about to be sent overseas back and forth between El Paso for their language training, and Washington for their intelligence training, their diplomatic briefings, their military assistance training, could prove to be staggering, they directed the switch from Anacostia to Fort Bliss in El Paso, nearby the closed Briggs Air Force Base installation, just as though the Defense Language School were a Hawk installation or an ammunition dump.

But the Nation's language capability, in a moment of grave national emergency, is not something that should be left to some real estate officer to administer.

Traditionally, we in the United States have never been very good at learning foreign languages. We have preferred to let other people around the world learn our language instead, and on the whole a lot of them have done just that. But in time of war we have found ourselves seriously deficient in penetrating the enemy's tongue. That is what happened in the war against Japan, and we had to undertake a massive, crash program to make up for our deficiency. Now we face the same problem with regard to Russian, Chinese, and the languages of southeast Asia. And I have very grave doubts whether even today we have an adequate capability and an adequate reserve in these key languages of the Orient.

Surely this is not the time for us to take any possible chances with undercutting our language capability even further. The move of the Defense Language School out of the Washington area to El Paso, Tex., must be halted as a matter of top defense security priority. Before any move is made the intelligence community must be fully consulted by the Defense Department and a decision made on the basis of language and intelligence factors, not as a simple matter of shuffling parcels of real estate.

Mr. Speaker, the relocation of the Defense Language School out of the Washington area to El Paso, Tex., is a matter of top defense security priority, and before this move is made the intelligence community must be fully consulted by the Department of Defense, and a decision ultimately made on the basis of language and intelligence factors, and not as a simple matter of shuffling parcels of real estate.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, who represents the El Paso, Tex., area in this House so ably, and who was advised in advance that these remarks were going to be made here this afternoon.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for advising me in advance of these remarks, and I am happy that the gentleman from New York has given me the opportunity to extol the value of a move that will consolidate these activities.

I hope the gentleman has the opportunity to visit El Paso. I am sure that the gentleman would be surprised.

Mr. Speaker, it is one of the quirks of fate that I have this opportunity to reply to the gentleman. The gentleman spoke of his having been in the intelligence service. It is a very unusual situation that he who trained in the language facilities of World War II should be speaking at a time when I, in defense of this particular move, am a man who was trained in the Marine Corps, and served as a Japanese interpreter during World War II with the Fleet Marine Force.

Mr. STRATTON. I might say to the gentleman from Texas that I am not passing judgment upon El Paso, Tex., and I do not presume to do so. I am sure it is a very wonderful place.

The point that I am making is, first of all, I just do not think that it has the facilities that could attract the kind of faculty that we need for this kind of school, and keep the faculty. I am sure there is no place in my district probably that could really do this job, either. This is a very specialized type of situation. I believe there are very few places that could do the job any better than it is being done right here in the Washington area.

Mr. Speaker, the other point that I am trying to make is that this move, on the basis of my information, was made by real estate experts. I am sure that if the gentleman were associated with the intelligence operations in World War II, the gentleman knows enough about

this to realize that these decisions are so important that they can only be made by intelligence personnel, and not by real estate experts.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. If the gentleman will allow me to address myself to some of the points which he has mentioned, I believe I might throw some light on some of the gentleman's questions.

In El Paso County we have an exceptionally fine military base, Fort Bliss, and a top-notch air base, Biggs Air Force Base. We have been, and are proud of both installations. El Paso traditionally is a military city, and our reputation is that we have the best community-military relationship in the world. We work at extending southwestern hospitality.

Mr. Speaker, we were sorrowed when the fine B-52 base was phased out by advances in technology. This base contains extensive buildings to accommodate any military mission. It would be a tragic waste of facilities to leave this well-established base idle.

Mr. STRATTON. Let me just say to the gentleman at this point that we have had a lot of fine facilities closed down in New York State too, and I share the gentleman's concern with respect to the waste of these empty bases lying around.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. This is why we were highly pleased when the Department of Defense announced that these fine facilities would be used.

Mr. Speaker, Fort Bliss, contiguous to Biggs, is now to take over the command of the air base, and the Defense Language Institute will consolidate some of its facilities and parts here. It is infrequent that two problems can be wedded into one ideal solution. The Defense Department has wanted to consolidate and expand its facilities. Now their operations are far-flung. One unit is now crowded into inadequate quarters at Anacostia Annex in Washington, D.C., and this is to be transferred, the English Training Facility.

Mr. STRATTON. Let me say to the gentleman, as I would like to try to respond to his points—and I am sure he may want to say more on his own time—but let me say when you talk about the inadequate facilities of the Defense Language School, I have indicated that they are inadequate. There is no question about that. But I can assure the gentleman that the Defense Language School exhibited no interest in this move, and was not consulted and did not support it. And, as a matter of fact, the proposed consolidation to which the gentleman from Texas refers to, if Mr. Klutts' column in the Washington Post for December 11 is authentic, includes not only the Air Force English Language Training School at Lackland Air Force Base, as the gentleman has referred to, but also apparently to try to bring in some other personnel to the gentleman's district, the Army Aviation Materiel Laboratory at Fort Eustis, Va., which has no relation to language. It is known that the Air Force installation is a language school. But let me point out that this English Language School is a school designed to teach English. This is not a school which will have available

to it the kind of people from diverse ethnological and national backgrounds who are natives in the language that has to be taught to our personnel, if they are going to have to go over to Vietnam or Indochina, or into other areas of the world and actually find out what is going on.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. As to that point, sir, let me say this.

So crowded are the present accommodations that two universities have had to train the overflow, and these will be transferred. So that by consolidation greater long-range economy and efficiency can be effected for our country. No one can deny that greater efficiency and long-range economy will result from such consolidation. These facilities that they will occupy will well accommodate all their activities and any future expansion. This cannot be said of any of their present facilities. Fort Bliss in El Paso will become the language center of the United States.

By joining the staffs and students of the Air Force English Language School with the Defense Language Institute, equipment can be shared and a greater scholarly exchange facilitated among the personnel.

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman is talking about facilities in terms of buildings. This is my whole point. You have the buildings there—there is no doubt about that. You have the buildings in the Brooklyn Navy Yard too and maybe it would be better to use those buildings up there. Because, certainly, you have diverse language groups in the city of New York. But what academic facilities are there in the gentleman's area?

Mr. WHITE of Texas. If the gentleman will give me a few minutes here, I will get to that very point and show you what I am speaking of.

Mr. STRATTON. Well, as I say, I am sure the gentleman can defend his district on his own time but I want to give him a chance to respond.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. If the gentleman will give me just a few minutes, I think I can get to the very heart of what you are talking about, sir.

There are other reasons why this is an ideal choice. El Paso, Tex., is the logical site for unifying the language programs. We have been a bilingual community for many years. It is located on the border of Mexico. We are oriented internationally. Our relationships with Mexico, our familiarity with and utility of a foreign language make us particularly receptive to this type of institution. Our college and the university system have already made plans to coordinate their programs and increase their facilities for the accommodation of this language institute. Our chamber of commerce and many civic groups have already made full preparations to blend these new residents into the full community. When these new people come, they will be delighted with this wonderful Southwest climate and the charm of an established culture which is over 300 years old. Our communities were visited by people even before the landing of the

Pilgrims on Plymouth Rock on the eastern part of the country.

More than this, Fort Bliss is the missile training base for the entire free world, and soldiers of all lands and languages have trained there for years.

Mr. STRATTON. How many Russian soldiers do you have training there? I wonder if the gentleman would answer that question.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. How many Russian soldiers do they have in Washington, D.C., sir?

If the gentleman will let me continue—they have teachers.

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman is suggesting because there are foreign soldiers training in the gentleman's district that, therefore, the languages that need to be taught will be available for the students to converse. The fact of the matter in the whole point is that the languages that we need are not, for example, to pick one language—Spanish—we have plenty of instruction in that language. The languages we need are in those vital areas where we cannot penetrate, for example, Russia, China, Vietnam—in areas of that kind. I am afraid we are not going to find very many Russians or Poles or Czechs, for example, to take lessons in the gentleman's district.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. You will find every foreign language of the free world freely spoken by the people at Fort Bliss.

Mr. STRATTON. But it is the other world that I think we have to be concerned with. We would not want to have our students training in a place where they could not discuss in these languages the way they can in the Washington area.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Let me give you an example. The German Air Force Surface-to-Air Missile School from Aachen, Germany, is presently located at Fort Bliss, adjoining the Biggs facilities. The school has a German-speaking staff of 280, and train approximately 1,200 German students annually.

Will the gentleman not let me illustrate.

When they visit our homes they will enjoy the warmest hospitality and the accommodations of this base program.

Many thousand foreign troops are in the United States.

I am proud to say we have made many friends. I have trained in Japanese. I was in a Japanese language school just as the gentleman was and I know you cannot learn a language unless you talk to people—you cannot just talk to the teachers.

Mr. STRATTON. That is right.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. When we captured prisoners we talk to the prisoners. I recognize that you cannot learn a language just by talking to teachers. You have to talk in the vernacular and here you have an opportunity to talk to people in the vernacular—talking to people who come from all parts of the free world and they are at Fort Bliss.

Mr. STRATTON. I think the gentleman is missing the point. I hope in the language field of our defense capabilities, we are not fighting the last war. We do not need Japanese. We do not need German very much. The languages we

are short on are those not of the free world but the languages of the countries behind the Iron Curtain. Those are the languages that we have to concentrate on. Those are not the languages you are going to find in a military installation. You have to get into an area like Washington or some other cosmopolitan area where you have the people who have grown up in those areas and who know the languages, but who fortunately have chosen freedom instead of staying under Communist rule and who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain. That is what you have here in the Washington area that you do not have in the area that the gentleman is talking about.

The other point, if I may say to the gentleman again, is that a college, a school, or a university, as I am sure the gentleman knows, is not bricks and mortar. It is the people who make it up, the faculty and the teachers. The point is that unless you can provide a cosmopolitan atmosphere, unless you can provide an existing university, not a small college that is going to expand from a faculty of two in non-Spanish languages to something larger, you are not going to get these people to stay. They can be employed here, in New York, or somewhere else, and we will transfer this school to Texas and then go from 9 languages to 43 at the very time that it will be almost impossible to get native teachers to sign up for duty in the gentleman's area.

I admit the fine climate there, but it is not the climate for the kind of intellectual development that we need in this school.

MAXFIELD PARRISH DIES AT 95

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I bring to the attention of the House, the death yesterday of the great American Artist Maxfield Parrish, who for 71 years, lived in Plainfield, N.H.

Mr. Parrish lived for 95 full and happy years, one of the most famous and popular artists in American history.

In tribute to the memory of this distinguished resident of my district, I offer at this point the fine obituary published by the New York Times:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 31, 1966]
MAXFIELD PARRISH, PAINTER AND ILLUSTRATOR,
DIES AT 95

PLAINFIELD, N.H., March 30.—Maxfield Parrish, the painter and illustrator whose lush vistas, fairytale castles and good-humored caricatures made him one of the most popular and successful artists in the first two decades of the century, died early today in his sleep. He was 95 years old and had been ill for several weeks.

Mr. Parrish is survived by three sons, John Parrish, of Plainfield; Maxfield Parrish, Jr., of Lexington, Mass.; and Stephen Par-

rish 2d, of Miami; a daughter, Jean Parrish, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., and nine grandchildren.

A POPULAR CHARMER

The dawns were rose colored and the twilight silver. The girls against backdrops of imperishable rocks appeared imperishable, ethereal. The skies were a sleek dreamy blue—a "Parrish blue."

Maxfield Parrish painted scenes of vivid colors, gracefully draped figures, humorous gnomes and romantic, nostalgic settings. His book illustrations and calendars and murals charmed the public and placed him among Americans as one of the most popular painters ever born and trained in the country.

"I'm hopelessly commonplace," he told a visitor 2 years ago when, after decades of near oblivion, his painting was revived. "How can these avant garde people get any fun out of my work?"

At the same time, the small ruddy artist, with faded blue eyes and a mane of dazzling white hair, said that the sudden appreciation of his work at an exhibition in Bennington College and then at New York's Gallery of Modern Art appeared a bit "highbrow."

"I've always considered myself strictly a popular artist," he said.

And yet audiences and critics were quickly drawn once again to Mr. Parrish's work, mainly because of the pop art vogue. Lawrence Alloway (a father of pop art), who co-sponsored the exhibition, said that "behind a screen of high technique, Parrish is master of the cliché, of the image of the moment."

"SUPERB TECHNICIAN"

To John Canaday, art critic of the New York Times, "Mr. Parrish (was) reestablished as a superb technician and a considerable wit as well as a first-rate storyteller, an artist of sufficient accomplishment to deserve a new showing."

His exhibition was the occasion not only for "highbrow" study but also for mass nostalgia, on the part of men and women who had either grown up on storybooks he had illustrated—"The Arabian Nights," and Kenneth Grahame's "The Golden Age," among the most popular—or who had hung his paintings.

College generations of the 1920's and into the 1930's recalled that before "Maxfield Parrish" became a synonym for conservative sentimentalism in art no dormitory room occupied by a student with any pretension to culture was complete Parrish's "The Garden of Allah," amid a maze of crew oars, fencing foils, and mooseheads.

FAMOUS "OLD KING COLE"

They also recalled Mr. Parrish's work through his advertising illustrations for such products as Flisk tires, Edison Mazda light bulbs, and Jell-O. The caption for a 1921 Jell-O said, "The king and queen might eat hereof and noblemen besides." Here Parrish's adeptness as a commercial artist and his taste for medieval themes, recurrent in his work, come together, wrote Mr. Alloway, curator of the Guggenheim Museum here.

In many of his mural decorations, too, Mr. Parrish depicted in humorous and colorful detail a never-never world, such as his 1909 painting for the Pied Piper Bar of the Sheraton Palace in San Francisco, his "Sing a Song of Sixpence" for the Hotel Sherman in Chicago and his "Lute Players" for the University of Rochester's School of Music.

But his most famous mural is the 28-foot-long "Old King Cole," which was hung in the bar of the Knickerbocker Hotel in 1920. It is now at the St. Regis.

The mural shows a bespectacled King Cole sitting on his throne in the center. Two jesters flank him, the fiddlers three are off to the left, and there is an assortment of recumbent pages. On the king's face is a smile of happy expectancy, no doubt concerning his pipe and his bowl, which is being

brought in from the right. For "Old King Cole," Mr. Parrish received \$50,000.

Maxfield Frederick Parrish was born on July 25, 1870, into a Philadelphia Quaker family. From his father, Stephen, a noted etcher and painter, he received early training and encouragement in art.

As a youth Mr. Parrish showed a great interest in machinery and mechanics. "A mechanic who paints," was his self-description, and his father once said, "Fred is more an artisan than an artist."

WENT TO HAVERFORD COLLEGE

From 1888 to 1891 he studied at Haverford College in Pennsylvania and for the next 3 years at the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts. He also studied under Howard Pyle, who illustrated the Robin Hood stories and a series of Arthurian legends.

After his marriage in 1895 to Lydia Austin of Philadelphia, Mr. Parrish moved from Philadelphia to New Hampshire and made his permanent home there. Because of poor health, however, he lived for a time in the Adirondacks, in Arizona, and in Italy.

In April 1895, Parrish sold a cover to Harper's Weekly, and he soon attracted lucrative assignments for illustrations from Century magazine, St. Nicholas, Scribner's, Ladies Home Journal and others.

His romantic pictures of a dreamlike world brought him to the attention of children's book publishers and his illustrations became highly popular among youngsters. For Eugene Field's "Poems of Childhood," (Scribner, 1904) he created one of his most admired pictures, "The Dinky Bird," in which a child swinging from the limb of the Amfufala tree appears to fly through space.

TO PLEASE MASS AUDIENCE

Before his stay in the Adirondacks, Mr. Parrish did most of his work with pen and ink. But the cold, dry air of Saranac, where he was at a sanitarium, froze the ink as he tried to work on the veranda. He turned to oils, and with the change came an almost immediate desire to work only in color.

Working largely on a commission basis, Mr. Parrish painted to please a mass audience. At the same time, however, he met the esthetic standards of the early 20th century and won admission to the Society of American Artists for his work "The Sandman."

Mr. Parrish's wit and good-humored caricature is seen in "The Tourist," and his taste for lush settings is apparent in such works as "The Land of Make-Believe" and "The Garden of Allah."

"He has combined the photographic vision with the pre-Raphaelite feeling," wrote Hubert von Herkomer, who was a professor of art at Oxford University. "He has a strong sense of romance. He can be modern, medieval or classic."

One observer noted that "Parrish uses only three or four basic colors, getting the different tones he wants by glazing one upon the other. This is how he gets those dreamy blues, hazy purples and sun-flecked golds. The over-all impression, when you view a Parrish picture is that you're looking into and through the painting, not just at it."

Many years later some critics found coyness, artificiality, and sentimental gushings in Mr. Parrish's work. His reputation declined in the thirties, during which he illustrated a series of highly popular calendars for the Brown & Bigelow Co. of St. Paul.

Mr. Parrish had a low regard for the abstractionists, who flourished after the war, and called their work "scribbles."

HONORED BY ARCHITECTS

Among Parrish's honors were an LL.D. degree from Haverford College, conferred in 1914, and a doctor of fine arts from the University of New Hampshire, awarded in 1954. The Architectural League of New York City gave him its gold medal in 1917.

The artist and his wife, who compiled "Slave Songs of the Georgia Sea Islands," resided for many years on a hillside estate in Plainfield that resembled in some ways a Parrish painting. The artist did much of the construction himself. Mrs. Parrish died in 1953.

In recent years, the artist rarely painted, but he still collected royalties on his popular calendars.

Two years ago, walking his visitor back to the car, he hummed tunelessly (a habit during conversational lulls) and squinted at the late afternoon sky. At the suggestion that its brilliance was reminiscent of the skies in his own paintings, a "Parrish blue," he shook his head.

"No, my skies were bluer," he said. "Too blue. I've exaggerated. Well, I'm only 93 and I'll get around to changing that some day."

STOP ALLIED AID TO RED CHINA

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it was recently announced that a group of European companies, headed by a West German firm, has arranged to construct a large steel plant in Communist China. The plant will consist of hot and cold rolling mills and steel rail and tube production facilities. It is valued at \$150 million.

This is not simply a private transaction. Behind it stands the Government of West Germany, which has given a credit guarantee amounting to \$87 million.

This steel deal is the largest single industrial plant delivery ever made to Communist China by the West. It poses a dangerous threat to our security, in view of the fact that Red China is the most aggressive nation in the world today. This plant will significantly increase her capacity to make steel and to make war. The steel casings this plant will produce can be used to make bombs, missiles, artillery, guns, and bullets which the Communists can use in Vietnam and in the future aggressive ventures in Asia.

Press reports say that our Government was informed of this transaction several weeks ago, but made no attempt to stop it. I realize that we have had many problems in the past in trying to restrain our European allies from trading with Communist countries. But in this case, I think we could have done more because of the considerable leverage we have with West Germany. Some 225,000 American troops are stationed in West Germany today, protecting her from possible attack by the Soviet Union. In addition, West Germany wants to obtain a share of control of NATO's nuclear weapons. Any nation that depends upon our protection to this extent could be expected to respond sympathetically to strong representations by our Government in a matter of such importance.

I therefore urge that the Department of State protest this deal in the strongest possible terms, to the Government of

West Germany and to the other governments whose private industries are involved in the consortium: France, Britain, Italy, and Switzerland. We should make it clear that if they expect to receive our aid, they cannot give substantial aid to the war-making power of our enemies.

If this approach fails, I believe Congress itself must enact stronger protections against trade in strategic goods by countries which receive our military and economic aid. I have in the past urged that we act to prevent our allies from trading in strategic materials with North Vietnam and the prohibition should apply to shipments to Communist China, as well. Red China is the chief supplier of weapons to the forces fighting against us in Vietnam. Our soldiers should not be jeopardized by equipment supplied by our allies.

THE STORY OF AMERICAN LABOR—PART III

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues part III of "All This Happened: The Story of American Labor."

This part of the series appeared in the March 18, 1966, edition of the Seafarers Log of the Seafarers International Union.

The first two parts appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 29, 1966, at page 7195.

ALL THIS HAPPENED: THE STORY OF AMERICAN LABOR—PART III

The unbridled antiunion violence of the 1870's as exemplified in the bloody suppression of the long strike in the coal fields and the great strike on the Nation's railroads, the "Molly Maguire" hangings and the "Baltimore massacre" of railroad workers, set the tone of the labor-management struggle in the United States for years to come. Powerful corporations grew increasingly callous in destroying workers' organizations, making increasing use of State and Federal Governments and troops, State and Federal courts, and the local and national press to suppress the legitimate aims of labor. Much strife still lay ahead, such as the "Haymarket Square massacre" of workers in Chicago, the bloody Homestead strike against the Carnegie Steel Corp., in Pennsylvania, and the famous Pullman strike against the Pullman Railroad Car Co.

Labor progress during this period was slow—but steady. American labor organizations faced increasingly bitter and powerful opposition. At the same time they still had many untraveled pathways to explore in the search for dignity of labor. At times these paths led to a dead end, at other times labor took what proved to be wrong turnings. Gradually, however, labor organizations grew and labor action became more and more effective. The years ahead were to see the rise of the Knights of Labor, the American Federation of Labor, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations—which were destined to combine into the present-day AFL-CIO.

While the giant corporations—often aided by the Government, the courts and the press—were suppressing American workers in the coalfields, the railroad industry and elsewhere, a new labor organization, first formed secretly in 1869 by Philadelphia tailors, was gaining strength and growing in membership—Knights of Labor.

The Knights incorporated a new idea into American trade unionism. It was not organized on a craft basis. Membership was open to every worker, skilled or unskilled, male or female, white or Negro. The motto of the Knights of Labor was "An injury to one is the concern of all," meaning every worker had an obligation to support every other worker in redressing his grievances. Unfortunately, however, the Knights of Labor did not stick to this ideal of militant trade unionism—turning instead to vague panaceas of social reform to improve the worker's lot. However under the banner of "An injury to one is the concern of all," and singing the militant song of the Knights:

"Storm the fort, ye knights of labor,
Battle for your cause:
Equal rights for every neighbor
Down with tyrant laws."

American workers flocked to the Knights of Labor in unprecedented numbers. By 1885 the Knights could boast several hundred thousand members. The high point of the Knights of Labor's influence came in that same year.

In 1884 another cycle of economic depression hit the United States—although not as serious or as long-lasting as previous depressions had been. American industrialists, however, as usual seized the opportunity to slash wages to the bone. Strikes broke out spontaneously among rank-and-file members to which the Knights had to give unwilling support. Surprisingly (for the times), many of these strikes ended victoriously for the workers, including a walkout against the Wabash Railroad which threatened Jay Gould's Union Pacific Railroad. These victories were to prove temporary, however, serving only to harden the resolve of American industrialists to destroy labor by any means necessary. Just 1 year after this high point the Knights of Labor was to be destroyed—another victim of the infamous Haymarket Square massacre.

Aroused by soaring business profits in which they did not share despite long and exhausting shifts in the Nation's factories, more and more American workers had begun calling for the 8-hour day. Hopes for leadership in achieving the 8-hour day led more than 600,000 workers to join the Knights of Labor. The first test of the new campaign came in 1886 in Chicago when over 60,000 workers walked off the job on May 1 to demonstrate for their cause. The city's big businessmen acted predictably—the Knights of Labor did not.

When the walkout began, Chicago's meat packer industrialists immediately called on the friendly police force to crack down hard on the 8-hour day demonstrators. The police complied with swinging nightsticks—turning peaceful parades into free-for-all riots. Outside the McCormick Harvester Works plant a workers' rally was in progress. Suddenly the plant's gates flew open and out charged armed scabs, Pinkerton finks and other assorted thugs who attacked the assembled workers. Chicago police who were on hand fired into the workers, killing 6 and wounding 20. The next night several thousands workers assembled at Haymarket Square to protest this antilabor violence. They were to be addressed by several noted anarchist speakers. It was raining and the crowd was down to about 500 listeners when suddenly there was an explosion. Someone had set off a bomb at the back of the Square. The police immediately opened fire on the assembled workers. Some armed workers returned the fire. Eleven were killed and

about 200 wounded in Haymarket Square that night.

Chicago's big industrialists wanted the hides of the pro-labor anarchists and the police complied by arresting eight anarchist leaders—several who were on the speakers' stand when the bomb was thrown. There was no proof that they were involved with the bombing, but the jury was packed against them and local newspapers screamed daily for a guilty verdict. Five were sentenced to die on the gallows and three received life sentences. Big business followed up immediately with a violent antilabor campaign which cost labor most of the gains it had already won. The Knights of Labor, which had remained passive during these and subsequent attacks on its own members, were repudiated by American workers. Its place was taken by a new organization—the American Federation of Labor—organized in 1886 and led by Samuel Gompers.

The AFL was a return to craft unionism, limiting membership to skilled workers organized in craft unions. But within these limits, it rejected panaceas and future utopias and vowed instead to fight for immediate gains "by negotiation if possible, by direct action if necessary." "We are fighting," announced one of Gompers' aids, "only for immediate objects—objects that can be realized in a few years." A fair day's wage for a fair day's work was the goal. "We don't want pie in the sky," explained an AFL union leader.

Gompers quickly got the AFL on a sound financial footing to assure survival through a long strike or economic depression. AFL officials were full-time professionals—experts at organizing a plant, a strike or a boycott, negotiating a contract or settling disputes. The AFL preferred to win demands through negotiation but did not shun strikes—always keeping in mind that the strike was labor's ultimate weapon.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], in his effort to continue the popular school milk program during the coming and succeeding years at the same full level as in previous years by introducing H.R. 14203.

For years we have been subsidizing a milk program for our children. It is a popular program with parents, children, and farmers. It makes the perfect food available cheaply to our youngsters at the time when their growing bodies need it. At the same time, it helps the farmer by removing or reducing surplus milk.

In 1966, we authorized \$103 million to be appropriated for this program. The President's budget asks only \$21 million for this program, a cut of \$82 million or four-fifths of the 1966 budget.

While we must eliminate every unnecessary item of cost from our budget, we must not do this at the expense of needy children. We must not deprive children from poor homes of their only source of milk. At present, these poor children depend on this program for their milk.

My bill would provide a permanent school milk program for children at the same full level as in previous years. The bill authorizes \$110 million to be appropriated for next year; \$115 million the following year and \$120 million for each year thereafter. The gradual increase in funds takes care of the increasing number of schoolchildren.

This is a good bill and I am hopeful that it will be supported by the Congress.

COMMISSIONER ROBERT BARTLEY ACCEPTS THE SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN GOLD MEDAL IN BEHALF OF THE FAMILY OF THE LATE SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN AT BONHAM, TEXAS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my wife and I were very pleased to be present in Bonham, March 18, when the Speaker Sam Rayburn Gold Medal "for services rendered to the people of the United States" was presented to his two beloved sisters, Mrs. W. A. Thomas and Mrs. S. E. Bartley, in behalf of and in the presence of the members of the distinguished Rayburn family. Also present were faithful former employees, public officials, and many friends of the late Speaker. Attorney Buster Cole of Bonham was master of ceremonies. Rev. William Cheatham gave the invocation. The welcome address was given by City Commissioner Gene Danner. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, who sponsored the legislation, eloquently reviewed the honors paid, recognition given and accomplishments of Speaker Rayburn. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Robert A. Wallace referred to the many virtues of Speaker Rayburn and the benefits derived therefrom by the people of our Nation. The benediction was given by Rev. Jack Carson.

The impressive presentation of the medal was made by Miss Eva Adams, Director of the Mint, at the beautiful and historic Rayburn Library. The medal is only the 11th of its kind authorized by Congress for some one other than a President of the United States. The occasion was a most inspiring, meaningful, and uplifting one. I commend the reading of the remarks of Commissioner Bartley to each of you. Commissioner Bartley ably and accurately described some of the ways by which Speaker Rayburn reached the many sound decisions for which he was and is noted. His statement was particularly significant to my wife and me because of our long association with this highly respected and very remarkable man. I served in Congress with Speaker Rayburn about 19 years and was on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of which he had been chairman.

Speaker Rayburn possessed an abundance of great qualities. He was honest,

able, and fearless. He was patient, studious, cautious, and courteous. Never was he one to waste words. One of his great qualities was the directness with which he could approach a question or an issue. One reason he could do this no doubt was because of a faculty Commissioner Bartley referred to in his concluding sentence:

Renowned as a great Speaker, one key to his success is that he was a great listener.

The above-mentioned remarks of Commissioner Bartley follow:

ACCEPTANCE REMARKS OF ROBERT T. BARTLEY, NEPHEW OF THE LATE SAM RAYBURN AND A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, MARCH 18, 1966

It is my happy privilege to accept this medal on behalf of the family of Sam Rayburn and to serve as the conduit to its permanent home, the Sam Rayburn Library.

I would like to emphasize one point made by Secretary Bob Wallace. You will recall he said: "Here in Bonham, Sam Rayburn continually sought opinions of people in all walks of life to help guide his thought and direct his actions."

Sam Rayburn had his own Gallup poll before anybody ever heard of Gallup. When the word got out that "Mr. Sam will be home this weekend," relatives and friends from all over the Fourth District dropped whatever other plans they had and would drop by and say "hello."

Those of us in Washington fortunate enough to be close to him could sometimes anticipate when he might simply say "Get me a reservation." We could, as he would have said "Feel a trip coming on." No one ever thought—or would have dared to ask "to where?" All knew, that if by train, it was Denison, or if by air, Love Field.

The clues to these sometimes apparent sudden trips had a familiar pattern.

As an important issue began to stir—as more and more leaders in Government or in industry and commerce just had to see Mr. Sam or the Speaker for a few minutes—as these pressures began to build and as the issues began to sharpen and the time for decision grew nearer and if one could catch a fleeting wistful look in his eyes, we would start listening for those welcome words "Get me a reservation."

I say they were welcome words because we knew that when he returned to Washington, he would return with his decision and would be ready, willing, and able to assume the leadership. And when he started to lead, the pressure let up and the people he wanted to see started showing up and things began to move.

What caused this wonderful thing that happened to him—and to the country—on these brief visits to Bonham?

In his words: "Down home they'll give it to you with the bark off." When he'd come back he'd say "My people think this is the right thing to do." He was looking for what they thought was best for our country. By the time he got off the train or plane in Washington, he had his decision. That is the wonderful thing that happened on those visits back home with his folks.

Renowned as a great Speaker, one key to his success is that he was a great listener.

NEED FOR TOTAL MANPOWER UTILIZATION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in his manpower report to the Nation on March 8, 1966, President Johnson declared:

A manpower policy must be based on belief in the value of the individual and in the promise of welcome change.

A manpower policy should lead us to a society in which every person has full opportunity to develop his—or her—earning powers, where no willing worker lacks a job, and where no useful talent lacks an opportunity.

However, the President recognized how much we have failed to implement such a policy when he declared:

Certain groups in the Nation have not fully shared in the benefits of our unprecedented economic expansion. Nonwhite workers constitute 11 percent of our labor force; 20 percent of our unemployed and nearly 25 percent of our long-term unemployed suffer the double disadvantages of lower educational attainment and lingering discrimination.

The unemployment rate for Negroes was still 7 percent in February. It was down from 9 percent a year earlier and from nearly 13 percent in February 1961. But we cannot be satisfied when 1 out of every 14 Negro workers is without a job.

The need for total manpower utilization in our country is apparent. The waste of manpower which is inherent in racial discrimination in employment should be abhorrent to us all.

While the laws are being written, there are some who are of their own accord and under the free enterprise system rendering a great service to young Negro men and women all over the country. One such person is Richard V. Clarke, president of Richard Clarke Associates, Inc. Starting out with a small employment agency called Hallmark Employment Agency, in my congressional district of Harlem, Mr. Clarke achieved rapid and unusual success in the pilot placement of Negroes. Word of mouth of his efficiency and productivity quickly spread to members of the Nation's business community and he was soon acting as a consultant to most of the largest businesses in New York City, Chicago, Rochester, Atlanta, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles.

This young man has not performed his excellent service out of some do-gooding motivation, but rather has done precisely, what every other businessman in this economy has sought to do—run a good business for profit while still serving his community, his city, and his Nation. I frequently said that we need more Negroes in business. Richard Clarke is an outstanding example of the reasons why. He is an unqualified success and I am proud that as one of my constituents, he has achieved so much in such a remarkably short time.

I call your attention to two articles printed about Mr. Clarke's operation in the New York Times Sunday issue of February 6, 1966, and Advertising Age, February 7, 1966. I also am including a letter from the second vice president of one of the largest banks in America to a prospective client which demonstrates the confidence the business community has in this capable young man:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1966]

SEARCH ON FOR NEGRO TALENT

The drive to recruit qualified Negro candidates for employment in business and industry has led to publication of "Opportunities for the College Grad," by Richard Clarke Associates, Inc., a New York firm specializing in the placement of members of ethnic minorities. The pamphlet contains "help wanted" advertisements by cooperating firms designed to attract qualified Negroes in June's graduating class. Over 90,000 copies have been mailed to students, colleges, and firms.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1966]

NEGROES PLEASE APPLY

(By Olive Evans)

Last May, when business and industry recruiting of college seniors was at its height, some companies reported a reluctance on the part of Negro students to sign up for job interviews on campus. Albert Barlow, a vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank in New York, told the New York Times: "I don't think we've convinced the students of our sincerity. We may have to overcome their suspicion by reaching them much earlier, in the classroom."

A move to do just that is now underway. Ninety thousand copies of "Opportunities for the College Grad" have been mailed to students, colleges, and business and professional organizations all over the Nation. This brochure is designed to reach the qualified Negro college senior, early in the period of his career decisionmaking.

All of its 13 full-page ads, which will appear only in this publication, in essence bear the same message: "We are interested in considering you for employment." Short articles, in addition to the ads, brief the job-seeker on the practical matters of writing the résumé and letter of application, the technique of the interview, and "How to Use Your College Placement Office."

Through all advice runs the recurrent theme of reassurance that Negro candidates will be considered if they are qualified. Three "Profiles of Success" outline the encouraging case histories of three Negroes who achieved eminence in the career of their choice.

"Opportunities for the College Grad" can lay the groundwork for the recruiter who is coming to the campus and substitute for the one who will not get there. Conceivably the concept might broaden the scope of recruiting for all companies, campuses, and candidates.

[From Advertising Age, Feb. 7, 1966]

THIRTEEN ADVERTISERS SEEK NEGRO EMPLOYEES VIA RECRUITING BROCHURE

New York, February 1.—Thirteen national advertisers have bought space in a job recruiting brochure mailed to Negro college seniors by a company specializing in minority group personnel placement.

Richard Clarke, head of Richard Clarke Associates, said the brochure is being distributed to approximately 90,000 Negro students, chiefly in Negro colleges, and is intended to convince them that things are changing and that the companies are sincere in their offers of career opportunities.

The brochure advertisers, who paid \$1,500 per black and white page, are Eastern Air Lines, Xerox Corp., Air Reduction Co. (Aircor), Hoffmann-LaRoche, Inc., F. W. Woolworth Co., American Oil Co., American Brake Shoe Co., Bristol-Myers, Singer Co., J. C. Penney Co., Celanese Corp. of America, Equitable Life Assurance Society, and IBM. Fifteen

pages of the 44-page brochure contain résumé forms to be forwarded to the Clarke office here.

The ads, tailored to reflect the advertisers' interest in nondiscriminatory hiring, carry headlines such as: "If You're Interested in People, Places, and a Prestige Job, Eastern Is Interested in You"; "Do You Speak Our Language?" (Aircor); "We've Grown Because We Discriminate (Hoffman-LaRoche)". Copy in this ad explains: "We're experts at discriminating between those who perform and those who don't." The Bristol-Myers ad states that "typical openings might be for the college man or woman with a B.S. or Ph. D. in chemical engineering, B.S. or Ph. D. in pharmacology, etc."

In his foreword, Mr. Clarke writes: "Industry is no longer indifferent to the employment of Negroes. In every way they can, many firms are earnestly trying to encourage recent college graduates to apply for positions. If you begin to believe that things are changing and you act on this belief, then you need not be doomed to a lifetime of little in the land of plenty."

Mr. Clarke said the idea for the brochure came to him after he read a survey by the Harvard School of Business Administration that found Negroes do not respond to want ads in white newspapers. He wrote letters to between 1,200 and 1,400 heads of major companies, setting forth his plan and including material to indicate the probable degree of success. He said the response pleased him and added that a number of advertisers indicated they would make use of the brochure next year. "They wanted to see how it would work this year," he said. Mr. Clarke added that he plans to publish the brochure annually.

Since 1964, Mr. Clarke's organization has conducted opportunity center meetings in New York and Chicago where top corporations send recruiters to interview Negroes for management positions. The 1966 session is scheduled for June, on a date to be announced.

FEBRUARY 15, 1966.

DEAR MR. KELLOGG: The booklet to which you refer, "Opportunities for the College Grad," can be obtained from Mr. Richard Clarke, of Richard Clarke Associates, 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Clarke who is well known to the Chase Manhattan Bank, has been a pathfinder in the identification of the college educated Negro. Mr. Clarke has been a leader in convincing industry that there is a vast potential within this group. I am sure that he will agree with me that now that industry is becoming increasingly aware of the great contributions Negroes can make, the continuing job is for us to sell the Negro of our sincerity.

Sincerely,

ALBERT H. BARLOW,
Second Vice President.

THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 proposes to break new ground in various ways to assure better nutrition for our children. A case in point, and one that interests me particularly, is the pilot breakfast program. I believe there is a particular need for this kind of program in many

areas—especially in rural areas and low-income urban areas. Children attending rural schools frequently travel long distances by bus or, in mountain areas with few roads, have a long walk. Even if they have had a fairly decent breakfast, it is a long time until lunch.

In downtown low-income residential areas, it is not uncommon for parents to have to leave for work an hour or more before the children go off to school. This means the children pretty much shift for themselves in terms of getting breakfast and more than a few just will not bother.

I think the importance of this type of program was well stated in a recent publication, "Education: An Answer to Poverty," issued jointly by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education. The publication states flatly:

Hungry children are nonlearning children.

And then goes on to say:

Scientific studies have shown conclusively that the process of learning virtually ends when a human being becomes uncomfortably hungry. When a child appears at school in the morning having had little or no breakfast, he might just as well have stayed at home. The teacher's effort is wasted. The curriculum, the long hours of professional preparation, the value of textbooks and teaching aids are lost upon him. Similarly, a child without lunch loses most of the value of a school afternoon. A hungry child not only injures himself, but his discomfort may subtly disturb the teaching of a whole class.

That is blunt language but I think few would take exception to it. In our pursuit of excellence in education we have to start with the first essential since time began—good nutrition.

COMMUNITY ANTENNA TELEVISION SYSTEMS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, for several years a dispute has existed between certain of the television broadcasters of the United States and the operators of community antenna television systems, which developed as a means of providing to the public a more satisfactory method of viewing the broadcasters' efforts. Rugged terrain, electrical interference, and long distances from transmitting stations made it necessary for homeowners to invest substantial sums of money in television antenna installations in order to receive broadcast signals, often with less than satisfactory results. Even in our cities, people who live in apartments or in areas where there are many tall buildings, experience difficulty in receiving programs from their local stations.

Community antenna systems by improving and extending reception have provided a substantial service both to the broadcasters and to the public.

In the beginning, broadcasters welcomed the CATV systems, but in recent years they have had second thoughts. The FCC, until last year denied it had jurisdiction over the CATV industry, but has now had second thoughts. Congress has come close to legislation to regulate the CATV industry, but had second thoughts.

The broadcasting and CATV were directed to iron out their differences and bring back a consensus approach to legislation. Committees worked at the task, and reached tentative agreements, but second thoughts again prevailed.

With all the second thoughts about this industry, it is distressing to me that those who have sought most avidly to regulate it have not directed some of their second thoughts to the people who benefit from the service. The public endorsement of CATV in areas it serves must be recognized.

Mr. Speaker, I am offering today what I believe to be a reasonable legislative approach to the problem of providing the greatest possible diversity of program material to the American public.

This bill will provide adequate protection for the broadcaster, and the people beyond the present service areas of CATV by requiring the CATV to make the local station available on the cable and not duplicate its programs from another source at the same time. It will provide for an equality of reception not generally available in most of the country, and it will also make it possible to provide services to the public not adaptable to or provided by broadcasting.

By providing for the continued growth and development of both broadcasting and reception services, we will be enriching the lot of the public, and not catering to the economic desires of the industries which have been unable to reach agreement. I believe this to be a true consumer bill which merits the sincere and immediate attention of this body.

For the convenience of those interested in the contents of my bill I have attached the following analysis of the bill:

ANALYSIS OF CATV BILL

This bill contains a concise definition of a community antenna television system (CATV) and confers upon the Commission specifically defined authority to regulate CATV in specified respects.

A

The first section of the bill would amend section 3 of the Communications Act by revising two definitions and adding a new definition. Section 3(h) defines the terms "common carrier" and "carrier." The bill retains the present definition and adds to it the proviso that a community antenna television system is not deemed to be a "common carrier." Section (o) defines "broadcasting." Again the bill retains the present definition and adds to it the proviso that a community antenna television system is not deemed to be engaged in "broadcasting."

Section 3(gg) is new; it defines "community antenna television system." The definition makes it clear that the act is applicable only to a CATV system which receives signals from at least one television broadcast station whose transmitter is located more than 30 miles from the main post office in which the community antenna system is located. In other words, if a CATV (1) only receives television signals from stations located within 30 miles of the system;

or (2) if it only originates its own television programs; or (3) if it only receives or originates audio programs, or any combination of these three elements, no FCC jurisdiction would exist.¹

The reasons for the exclusions are patent. So far as program origination is concerned, there are only a few instances where CATV systems originate their own programs. Moreover, there is a serious doubt as to whether Congress can constitutionally authorize regulation of a communications medium—i.e., origination of program material—where there is no factual need for regulation based on inherent scarcity of facilities such as exists in the case of radio frequencies. Since there is no evidence of a pressing problem in program origination by CATV systems and since substantial constitutional problems are involved in a system of regulation of program origination by CATV systems, NCTA urges that the matter be left in status quo unless and until it becomes a matter of pressing urgency.

So far as audio programs are concerned, somewhat the same policy considerations obtain. While the same constitutional objection may not be present as in the case of program origination, NCTA is not aware of any problems caused by audio reception on CATV systems. Congress should not be called upon to act in a vacuum. If events at a later date seem to call for remedial action, Congress can at that time fashion an appropriate remedy.

B

Section 2 adds a new section 331 to the Communications Act. It gives the Commission authority to "issue orders, make rules and regulations, and prescribe such conditions or restrictions with respect to the technical characteristics and operation of community antenna television systems to the extent necessary to carry out the purposes of the act with due regard to both the establishment and maintenance of broadcast services and the provision for multiple reception services." Under this grant of authority, the Commission can make reasonable rules and regulations regarding technical characteristics of CATV systems so as to make sure that they cause no interference to radio services. The Commission can also make reasonable rules and regulations with respect to reception of signals on CATV systems and the protection to be accorded television stations where these regulations are necessary to the maintenance of broadcast services and do not impair the essential function of CATV systems in providing a multiplicity of reception services.

The grant of authority to the Commission is specifically limited in four respects, as follows:

1. The Commission may not require any CATV system to receive on its system signals of a television broadcast station whose transmitter is located more than 30 miles from the main post office of the community in which the CATV system is located. The CATV system may choose to receive such signals; the Commission cannot compel such conduct.

2. The Commission cannot require a CATV system to receive on its system the signals of a television broadcast station which originates fewer than 10 hours per week of its own programs. This proviso is directed at stations such as translators and satellites which originate fewer than 10 hours per week of their own programs. Such stations are not true media of local self-expression. A channel on a CATV system is a valuable

communications medium. It should not be wasted by a Commission requirement that it be used for a translator or satellite which has little or no programming of its own.

3. The Commission cannot compel a CATV system to receive the signals of a television broadcast station which duplicates in whole or in substantial part (i.e., more than 75 percent) the programs of another television broadcast station received by such CATV system. This proviso differs in two respects from the previous one. In the first place, this proviso is directed at a station which originates at least 10 hours per week of its own programs. Hence, the Commission under proviso 2 could require its reception if the station were within 30 miles from the CATV system. Secondly, the CATV would nevertheless be excused from receiving the programs of such a station if it were, in effect, a semisatellite—i.e., one which duplicated in substantial part (i.e., more than 75 percent) the programs of another television broadcast station; i.e., provided that the signals of the parent are actually received by such CATV system. It would obviously be a wastage of facilities to require the CATV system to receive both the parent and semisatellite.

4. The Commission cannot prohibit a CATV system from receiving any signals it desires. This judgment is left to the CATV operator and its subscribers. The Commission, however, in its role of protecting a local television broadcast station (i.e., one whose transmitter is within 30 miles of the main post office of the community in which the CATV system is located) could require that the programs of a distant television broadcast station (i.e., one whose transmitter is more than 30 miles away) may not be received on the CATV system if and when the CATV system is receiving the same program on a simultaneous basis from the local station.

COVERAGE OF MINISTERS—A NEW APPROACH

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. McVICKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill which I hope will facilitate and make more equitable the coverage of ministers under social security. As you know, the coverage of ministers is unique—ministers who are really "employees" are covered as "self-employed" and must pay the higher tax which is imposed on that group.

The bill I introduce today would provide that a minister who is an "employee" may be treated as one for coverage and tax purposes. My bill would retain the wholly voluntary nature of the system with the decision as to coverage left to the individual minister and the decision as to whether he will be treated as an employee or as self-employed to be jointly decided by him and the church he serves.

If the church and the minister jointly file a certificate of coverage as an employee, the minister will pay his share of the tax and the church an equal amount for the employer share. A minister earning at the maximum that can be taxed under the old-age, survivors, and disability system—namely \$6,600 a

year—would pay \$254.10 a year as an employee. If this same minister is covered as a self-employed individual, he would have to pay a tax of \$382.80 a year. The tax rates for employees and self-employed are the same for the new hospital insurance program medicare. The minister who changes churches reverts to his previous condition as to coverage. If his new church wishes him to be covered as an employee another joint certificate is filed and employee coverage continues.

You will recall that the coverage of ministers in the 1954 amendments as self-employed originated because of congressional concern that to impose a tax on a church on a compulsory basis might constitute a violation of the separation of church and state. The establishment of this fiction—calling an individual self-employed who really is not—is not only unfair to the individual minister, who must pay 1½ times the taxes he would pay as an employee, but it has, in my judgment, inhibited some ministers in electing coverage. The time limit for ministers to elect coverage has been extended by legislation four times by Congress but still some 50,000 and, perhaps as many as 80,000, ministers are not protected by the system.

The recent Advisory Council on Social Security which reported to the Congress last year stated:

The Council is not now recommending any change in the coverage provisions for ministers. While the Council believes there are better methods of covering ministers, the improvements it has considered tend to be offset by the problems created by a drastic change from a method which has been known and used over a number of years. The Council recommends that the Social Security Administration explore further whether it would be feasible to change to a plan under which ministers employed by churches or other nonprofit organizations would be covered as employees, and to develop methods of minimizing the transitional problems.

I know that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Committee on Ways and Means will examine this bill in the spirit of the Advisory Council report.

MR. WILLIAM C. WELCH

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take note of the advancement to a higher position with the Veterans' Administration of our longtime VA congressional liaison director, Mr. William C. Welch. It is my understanding that he has been assigned to the Advisory Council of the Administrator, in which post, I am confident he will serve with the same efficiency and distinction he brought to his work here on the hill.

Bill, as most of us knew him, was uniquely equipped to serve in the ca-

¹ Sec. 3(gg) does not provide for a specific exemption of small-sized CATV systems. The Commission, however, in sec. 331(b) has been given the authority to exempt any CATV system in whole or in part where such action is desirable because of the size or nature of the system so exempted.

capacity of VA congressional liaison man. In the first place, he was himself a combat veteran. That ought always to be a primary requisite for such a job. Second, having served for a number of years as a congressional staff aid before he took his job with the VA, he knew Congress, Congressmen, their staff personnel, and the congressional manner of operation as very few departmental personnel can ever know it.

In my three terms of congressional service, I have dealt with a great number of so-called liaison officers, but none who did his job as effectively as Bill. Not only did he render effective service to the Members of Congress and their staffs, but also, he rendered a very real service to untold hundreds of deserving veterans and their dependents without once ever compromising the good name or the basic laws and regulations of the Veterans' Administration or the Administrator.

Our loss here on the Hill is the Administrator's gain and I hope that the Administrator will welcome to his Advisory Council this highly qualified young man and will give great weight to his counsel in matters relating to the Congress. I am confident that the Administrator does not have within his organization anyone capable of sounder advice on this subject.

A BILL SEEKING CONGRESSIONAL CONSENT FOR THE GREAT LAKES BASIN COMPACT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill to give congressional consent to the Great Lakes Basin Compact.

This legislation proposes that the States of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin be given consent to form a consultative and recommendatory agency to cooperate with the Federal Government in the development, the use, and the conservation of the resources of the Great Lakes.

These States and the Canadian Provinces which border this great body of lakes have been concerned for some time over the welfare and proper development of this basin.

The Great Lakes Commission, established in 1955, has been working to carry out these aims. But the Commission now needs congressional recognition to enable it to do its job with more authority.

The Commission is, I feel, a good example of the progress that States are making in the field of interstate cooperation on problems common to geographic areas or regions. This cooperation already has proved beneficial to the member States, and will be of benefit to the entire country.

For who knows better the problems of the Great Lakes than those States which border them?

WATERSHED PLANNING AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. STRATTON. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced House Joint Resolution 1007 with the intent of indicating that Congress does not want a limitation imposed on the number of watershed planning authorizations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, as long as authorizations are within the fiscal limitations of the appropriations in Public Law 89-316. This is an area of great concern to me and to the people of the Seventh Iowa District.

One of the characteristics that has made America great is the willingness of its people to cooperate with one another in solving mutual problems and taking advantage of common opportunities.

This quality is nowhere more evident than in the joining of landowners, communities, and governments to safeguard and improve our land and water resources. It is our responsibility in the Congress to make certain that the Federal contribution to these local resource efforts is strong.

I am particularly proud of the intense conservation activity in small watershed projects in my district in Iowa. Thirty-seven local communities there have requested help of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service in meeting conservation and flood prevention needs. Of these, 27 have been approved for planning help; 23 projects are now in operation, and in 3 of them all structural measures have been completed. The projects cover nearly 900,000 acres.

In addition to individual landowners and the conservation districts that they have organized, several other groups are cooperating in sponsoring these projects. In nearly every project the county board of supervisors is a cosponsor. The cities of Audubon, Hamburg, and Council Bluffs are adding their efforts to projects around them. The State highway commission is a sponsor of the Mill-Picayune project. Many other local groups are participating.

The friendly spirit of mutual cooperation by these individuals and groups is making a success of resource improvement in the watersheds in my district. Effective Federal support through the Soil Conservation Service also is a vital factor in that success. To make sure that SCS assistance effectively complements local initiative and support, I urge your consideration as Members of Congress to see that adequate funds for watershed work are provided to SCS.

The appropriation levels in the fiscal 1967 budget estimates are not adequate for the job. They would serve only to increase the already sizable backlog in both planning and construction of watershed projects. Delay stifles the local initiative that is so important. I fully support the recommendations of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts that \$78.5 million be provided for watershed protection and \$10 million for assistance in watershed planning.

I feel that a strong watershed program is fully justified, because impressive achievements in improved land use and flood prevention are already making their mark on the communities involved. They are bringing added benefits in restoring natural beauty to the countryside and greatly enlarging outdoor recreation opportunities. Wildlife habitat has improved. Property values have increased because of the resource improvement.

Another benefit that is plainly in evidence is the new level of community pride wherever these projects are being installed.

I am continually impressed by the unselfish efforts and cooperative attitude of all concerned in the watershed program, and urge increased Federal participation in helping them care for our resources.

Last session, Congress appropriated \$5,721,000 to help finance the planning of watershed projects under the U.S. Soil Conservation Service program during fiscal year 1966. These funds, to be matched by about \$2.7 million from State and local sources, are needed to provide the technical assistance required in drafting plans for construction of watersheds at a future date.

In appropriating these funds, Congress said nothing about limiting the number of new watershed planning authorizations for fiscal year 1966. Instead, it was clearly the intent of Congress that SCS should spend these funds for the continued progress of its watershed planning program.

Nevertheless, despite the lack of any authority from Congress, the Bureau of the Budget has imposed an arbitrary, hard-and-fast limitation on SCS, restricting the number of new watershed planning authorizations in fiscal year 1966 to no more than 100. This limitation appears in the fiscal year 1967 budget under the heading "1966 estimate." In fact, however, this estimate of 100 new planning authorizations is a strict limitation and SCS has been notified of this.

If the planning limitation for fiscal year 1966 is not removed, SCS will be hamstrung in providing planning assistance for worthwhile new watershed projects. According to its latest count, SCS has approved 90 requests for planning authorization during fiscal year 1966. Thus, if the Budget Bureau limitation remains, only 10 more new watershed projects will get planning authorization between now and June 30. Without the Budget Bureau limitation, SCS would approve as many as 30 new planning authorizations before the end of fiscal year 1966.

In short, the Budget Bureau limitation threatens to keep about 20 local watershed projects from receiving planning authorization this fiscal year. If these projects do not obtain planning assistance, some of them probably will never become a reality. This would be grossly unfair to the local people who have spent, on the average, about 2 or 3 years of preliminary planning for their watershed projects.

If we continue to delay work on these watershed projects, local interest will wane and we will be hard pressed to stir up interest at some time in the distant future. At the present time we have a backlog of almost 1,200 watershed projects and about 200 more requests are received each year. If we cut the program to 35 new planning authorizations we will be fighting a losing battle.

Present surveys indicate there are 8,000 small watersheds in need of project type help to solve local problems. How can we possibly solve this whole matter of soil and water conservation if we pinch the wrong pennies.

Moreover, the Budget Bureau also has imposed even more severe project limitations, on the SCS watershed program for fiscal year 1967. These limitations, which also appear in the new budget as "estimates," would restrict SCS to providing only 50 new planning authorizations and approving construction for only 35 new watersheds during fiscal year 1967. If these limitations are not lifted, the scope of the SCS watershed program would be virtually cut in half.

I hope immediate action will be taken by this body.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE FEDERATION OF JEWISH WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS OF MARYLAND

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, to serve one's fellow man is a mark of humanity. To organize in order to better serve one's community is evidence of a collective desire to help. It was in that spirit that the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations of Maryland had its genesis a half century ago.

In 1916, there were many women's organizations in Baltimore, Md., composed of patriotic Americans of the Jewish faith. As a result of the foresight of Mrs. Jacob M. Moses, 29 such groups formed the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations in order to realize the mutual benefits of cooperation and exchange of viewpoints.

The basic concept of this splendid federation is that all forms of local social work are manifestations of the community obligation to care for those within its group who may require assistance and also to lend its support to other civic and philanthropic causes.

The federation's efforts were geared toward the Red Cross, USO, U.S. defense and savings bond drives, Gray Ladies, civil defense, and other worthwhile endeavors.

By the end of the first decade of existence, the federation had grown to 41 member organizations and had firmly established itself as a clearinghouse to which all Jewish women's organizations could come for interchange and focus of ideas.

With the formation of the United Nations, the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations of Maryland pledged its support of the U.N.'s high purpose. The federation concerned itself with the situations in the strategically important Middle East and the maintenance of the State of Israel.

Cultural pursuits loom large on the federation's agenda. It has instituted the giving of a music award to winners of the professional auditions of the Jewish Community Center in the city of Baltimore. The federation can also take justifiable pride in the important part it played in connection with the restoration of the Lloyd Street Synagogue, the third oldest synagogue in the United States.

Today, the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations of Maryland is composed of 76 constituent organizations, with a total membership of 38,000 women. The federation is dedicated to the continued awareness of this group of American women, to assist them with their problems, to aid and help others and their communities.

The present officers merit full well our sincere congratulations for guiding the affairs of the federation so successfully. They are: Mrs. Jerome S. Cardin, president; Mrs. Le Roy F. Kappelman, Mrs. Benjamin C. Glass, and Mrs. Bernard Soroka, vice presidents; Mrs. Herbert Goldman, recording secretary; Mrs. Harry Bear, and Mrs. Nathan G. Mannes, corresponding secretaries; and Mrs. Mark L. Seven, treasurer.

In the first 50 years, the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations of Maryland established an outstanding record of achievement and service to its member organizations, the Jewish community, and to my city, State, and our Nation. The federation looks forward to the challenges of the future with renewed inspiration, increased strength, and dedicated hearts.

I know that my colleagues in the Congress will join me in expressing our felicitation on the occasion of the golden anniversary of the federation and wishing its members continued success in the years ahead.

NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL WEEK

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined with my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER], in sponsorship of a joint resolution to designate the second week of May each year as National School Safety Patrol Week.

Certainly, the passage of this joint resolution would promote the cause of traffic safety and give due recognition to the school safety patrol programs and its members who have served in this important work over the past 40 years.

I would like, at the same time, to urge others in this body to join with me in an additional effort to promote traffic safety, not just as it relates to our schools and children but to every citizen of this Nation.

At this time committees in both Houses of the Congress are studying the problem of traffic safety and its many ramifications.

Fortunately for this Nation they are examining possible solutions to the horrible murder by motor in America which snuffs out the lives of 50,000 Americans annually.

These hearings give us a precious opportunity. And we must not let it pass. It is the opportunity for a complete and thorough research of accident causation. It is the opportunity to dissect all the evidence currently available, the opportunity to discover that which is not.

It is the opportunity to correlate that which is known concerning vehicle safety, highway engineering, enforcement regulations, other safety problems and the mystery of the relationship between the driver, the car, and the accident.

To provide this undertaking I have asked the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to establish a Presidential Study Commission. Its task would be to gather all known facts regarding the American driver, to correlate this information into a single analysis and to make recommendations on its findings.

In so doing the Commission would be directed to utilize the vast technical resources available to seek out any missing evidence which might be relevant to that tragic triangle—the driver, the vehicle, and the accident.

The Commission would be further directed to work through every source and with every institution in both the public and private sector.

It would specifically be directed to discover driver-related factors contributing to accidents.

It is not enough that highways be improved. Drivers still run off the road.

It is not enough that cars be equipped with safety features because there are too many unsafe drivers.

It is not enough that drivers are arrested for speeding and other traffic violations when too many drivers are not physically or mentally competent to use our highways.

It is not enough to require a teenager to pass an examination to secure an operator's permit and then never again require a reexamination to determine if he is still competent to operate an auto-

mobile, which too often is a missile of death on the road.

We can and do in many instances require operators to bring to standard faulty vehicles with faulty brakes, headlights, and other equipment.

But what we have not done is protect ourselves from drivers who are not up to standard themselves; drivers with faulty vision, faulty reflexes, faulty judgment, and other factors which make them not only unsafe drivers but potential roadway killers.

No, safety improvement of equipment is not enough. We must insure that the 100 million Americans who guide the 90 million vehicles on our roadways today are as safe as we can possibly demand.

We must make a meaningful move toward halting the ugly, horrible, and needless highway slaughter of thousands of Americans.

Sufficient evidence is available today to demand thorough research of driver causation of accidents.

In 1959, Dr. W. David Dunavent, of Memphis, undertook a study of 16,903 accidents. The results disclosed that more than 85 percent were attributable to "driver failure."

Complementing Dr. Dunavent's findings is the statement by Mr. Howard Pyle, president of the National Safety Council, that "vehicle failure and mechanical faults and design imperfections account for fewer than 10 percent of the Nation's accidents."

Without the driver there can be no accident.

This we know. What we do not know is to what extent the driver contributes to the accident and to what extent this contribution can be reduced and/or eliminated.

It would be the task of the Commission which I propose, to make these determinations.

The cost of this undertaking in time, talent, and money would pale in comparison to the returns in protection of life and limb for thousands of American children and adults today and in the future.

I conclude with one final observation. We are daily reminded anew of the carnage on our highways.

We are daily reminded anew of the growing toll in lives being taken on our highways.

We are daily reminded anew so often that this data and these statistics lose impact and fail to register the tragic needlessness of this murder by motor.

But it takes just one careless moment by just one careless or incompetent vehicle operator to translate these cold statistics into living horror—the realization that you or I, our loved ones, our wives and children have been struck down and that tomorrow they will be, themselves, items for the data processors tabulating the ever-mounting number of persons who have been murdered or mutilated needlessly in an automobile accident.

OUR PRESIDENT'S PLEA FOR INDIA

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may

extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President sent to the Congress a message which represents the finest qualities in the American people. It was a magnificent speech, eloquent not just in words but, most importantly, eloquent in its appeal to the noblest instincts of the people he leads. I have little doubt that those people, and the men and women who represent them in this National Legislature, will respond with equal magnanimity. In marshaling our unprecedented agricultural resources to rescue a great nation—India—from an almost unimaginable catastrophe, we have an opportunity to employ a national asset which has for too long been treated as a liability. No other nation in the world can rival the United States as an agricultural power, and this is a power more potent and majestic in a hungry world than all the nuclear bombs ever manufactured.

This morning's Washington Post carried an editorial whose sentiments I share. Among other things the editorial stated that the President "has had the courage to recommend this vast program of aid, not because the Indian people some day may be our allies, not because they may help us in Asia, not because they will subsequently reward us with friendship or assistance but simply because the people of India are hungry." Another editorial, in the New York Times, stated:

His message to Congress—and to the world—calling for aid for India, and pledging a truly generous measure of American assistance, is in the best tradition of John-sonian philosophy.

With this I also thoroughly agree, and I include at this point in the RECORD the full texts of both editorials:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 31, 1966]

AID FOR INDIA

President Johnson's congressional message on aid to India is a great and gratifying document. It is a great document because it asks Congress forcefully and directly to underwrite the rescue of the Indian people from the threat of starvation—at any cost. It projects the direct appropriation of 3½ million tons of wheat—in addition to 6.5 million tons already scheduled for 1966 shipment. And it calls for shipment of 200,000 tons of corn and up to 150 million pounds of vegetable oils and up to 125 million pounds of milk powder. It proposes besides the shipment of quantities of cotton and tobacco that may permit the diversion of more Indian cropland to food products. But more than this, it bluntly states that if others do not meet the remaining requirements, the United States will.

The President has dared to present the problem to Congress, it is gratifying to note, as a challenge to this country's humanity. He did not claim that the United States will derive any promised or unpromised quid pro quo. He did not assert that feeding the Indians will help contain or isolate Communist China. He did not allege that it will help balance or frustrate the Soviet Union. He has not asked the Congress to support the program for any of these reasons or for any

other national or selfish reason. He has rightly assumed that the Congress of the United States and the people of this country will support action on this magnificent scale on a purely humanitarian basis.

He has had the courage to recommend this vast program of aid, not because the Indian people someday may be our allies, not because they may help us in Asia, not because they will subsequently reward us with friendship or assistance, but simply because the people of India are hungry. And that is the only attribute, the only necessity, the only condition we ought to require as a qualification for aid from the granaries and storehouses of America.

This program is being undertaken in the spirit of the great efforts of this country to feed the hungry of many nations after World War I and World War II. It is in a great American tradition. The President will not urge in vain "the strong and warmhearted and generous support of this program by the American people." He will not be disappointed in the response to an appeal to the hearts of the citizens of this country.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 31, 1966]
AID FOR INDIA

Lyndon Johnson is at his best when challenged by some staggering task of human needs. His message to Congress—and to the world—calling for aid for India, and pledging a truly generous measure of American assistance, is in the best tradition of John-sonian philosophy. It is in no sense a deduction from his gesture to add that it is good, sound American policy to help India.

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, now in New York after her visit to Washington, obviously played a vital role in the timing and scope of the American response to India's need. The meeting in Washington was a moment of international drama. This was not just because Mrs. Gandhi is a charming woman bearing the legendary name of Jawaharlal Nehru, her father, or because Mr. Johnson was at his most ingratiating best. It was because of what each of the main figures represented. India, with 500 million people, is the second most populous nation in the world and a bulwark of democracy in threatened Asia. The United States is the most prosperous and most powerful nation on earth and is engaged in a bitter war on that same Asian mainland.

But India, as Mr. Johnson said in his message, "may stand at this moment on the threshold of a great tragedy." Two years of drought imposed on a badly conceived and managed agricultural program, with the population increasing at the rate of 11 or 12 million persons a year, add up to potential disaster on a colossal scale.

President Johnson's message tells the whole tragic story, and it should be pondered as carefully in India as in the United States. Much of India's land is fertile. With better agricultural techniques India could eventually feed herself.

Droughts are unavoidable, but the human factor is more to blame—ancient, rigid ways; caste restrictions; overly small or overly large land holdings; the selfishness of well-fed states refusing to help starving neighbors; hoarders; speculators, usurers.

The great virtues of the Indian people somehow become constricted by customs, traditions, and history in times like this. Those virtues must and can be released—and India has already done a great deal in the years of independence. Much more may now be done, thanks to the imaginative, intelligent, and generous program President Johnson announced for an Indo-American Foundation which will use \$300 million in tied-up rupees for education and scientific research in India. In the long range, such a program can do wonders; but in the meantime Indians must be fed.

An undernourished nation has no future. Neither has an unskilled one in this technological age. President Johnson is wisely moving to provide the foodstuffs and the training. Indians must do the rest.

Mr. Speaker, not many days ago this Congress approved a supplemental military appropriation bill for more than \$13 billion. For less than one-tenth that amount we have an opportunity now to fight a war with weapons, as Senator McGovern has said, that are "corn instead of cannons, with farmers instead of marines, with tractors instead of tanks, with nitrogen used in fertilizers instead of explosives, with technology instead of battle plans, with food instead of fear and with development instead of destruction." It is a war which will cost no lives, but only save them; one which will destroy no villages, but rather preserve them; a battle of love rather than hate, and a battle in which the foe is not one's fellow man, but instead his common enemy which is human misery. Many of us have questioned the wisdom and morality of another war now being fought, but this is one whose justification is beyond doubt. Now all who have protested that other war have an opportunity to prove they can be as generous on behalf of policy representing the best in our national ideal, as they can be vigorous in opposing policy they believe transgresses that ideal. For my own part I pledge to our President and my colleagues and my constituents my total support.

In a previous decade, Mr. Speaker, the American Government and its people responded to the plight of a beleaguered city and for a total cost of \$266 million we furnished Berlin over a long year's period of time with approximately 1½ million short tons of coal, food, and other supplies. Yet this relatively inexpensive venture represents one of the most brilliant and proudest chapters in the history of American foreign policy. Now in this decade we behold the blight of a whole nation, whose existence is also menaced by lack of food. If our task is on a grander scale, so much greater will shine its grandeur.

Yet in the final analysis our actions must not be prompted by dreams of glory or gain, though these are surely to be had. Our actions must spring, rather, from that reservoir of goodness which is in man and which will not allow one nation to avert its sight from the brutal suffering of another, such as India, nor permit it to turn, as the President has said, "in indifference from her bitter need."

An American philosopher, Irwin Edman, has written:

Not what the citizens of a commonwealth do when they are obliged to do something by necessity, but what they do when they can do anything by choice is the criterion of a people's life.

In India we have an opportunity to demonstrate that one measure of our people's life is the will to do right.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I missed a quorum call on the floor. I would like to state that at the time of the quorum call I was signing up for the new medicare program. As you know, the present deadline date to sign up for this program is at midnight tonight.

As you know, I originally sponsored this type of legislation some 20 years ago to provide for a national health insurance program, and this also played a large part in my defeat for reelection to the U.S. Senate in 1950.

More than 80 percent of the Nation's senior citizens are reported to have signed for the new medicare benefits. I have introduced legislation to extend the filing deadline to June 30, 1966, to enable the remaining 20 percent to learn about the benefits and file the necessary application.

Medicare is the cheapest possible insurance for any person 65 or over, and we cannot find a better program anywhere in the world.

THE NEED FOR TIRE SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that would require the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe regulations establishing minimum safety and performance standards and a system of grading and labeling for motor vehicle tires, with the objective of providing safe tires for the motoring public.

With the steady progress in the completion of the Interstate Highway System and State construction of other highways permitting sustained high speed, the conditions under which the modern tire is used are making it daily a far more critical component of a vehicle than it formerly was. Developments in vehicles also have contributed to the increased performance demands on tires. The technology of the tire industry has made strides toward meeting these demands. An undetermined portion, however, of tires available to the public may not only fail to meet these rigorous demands but may also pose a positive danger under far less stringent conditions than high-speed travel on the highways.

The National Safety Council estimated in 1964 that 4 percent of all accidents on turnpikes have been due to tire failure, or that tire conditions have been a contributing factor in the cause of accidents. Reviewing some other sta-

tistics, the New York Thruway ranks tire failure as a major cause of auto accidents. Officials of the Indiana and Pennsylvania Turnpikes say that tire failure ranks second to driver fatigue as an accident cause. Ohio claims that 10 percent of its turnpike accidents are due to defective tires and New Jersey attributes 9 percent to this cause.

The tire market today is characterized by confusion and deception, created by excessive variation in manufacturing which produces a lack of tire uniformity. Approximately 950 different tire names currently marketed represent the products of approximately 120 private label marketers and 14 tire manufacturers. Virtually every tire manufacturer produces and markets many lines of tires, each with differing construction standards and performance characteristics. The typical manufacturer's firstline tire conforms to the specifications of automobile manufacturers for tires supplied to them as original equipment on new automobiles. The typical tire manufacturer also sells his designated firstline tire in the replacement market, but in addition, produces a number of other lines for the replacement market. He markets one or more lines of premium tires whose standards and performance characteristics exceed those of his firstline tire. He also manufactures a second line, third line, fourth line and even a fifth line of tires whose construction standards and performance characteristics are less than for his firstline subject. In other words, the situation that the consumer is confronted with is one where tires may be designated as to quality regardless of the tire's inherent quality or safety; where the price of the tire has no discernible relation to its quality or safety level; and where many of the descriptive terms employed, such as ply rating, 100 level and other grade designations, have no real meaning or definitive value in the absence of uniform standards.

I would like to state here that Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, has performed a great public service by exposing the deception used by the tire industry and is to be commended for his unceasing efforts to obtain strong tire-safety legislation.

The problems of tire selection by the average motorist has become more complex as vehicle operating speeds have increased. The intervals of time between tire purchases has decreased due to an accelerated use of vehicles during recent years. The average motorist is in a quandary when tire purchase time is at hand. Confronted by a large baffling selection from which to choose and the deceptive price advertising and other abuses in the marketing of automobile tires, the buyer usually accepts what is offered by the salesman. The tire manufacturers as a group, however, issue little or no information with respect to construction standards or performance characteristics of tires to the independent retail dealers, a pattern, I might add parenthetically, which contrasts sharply with the practice of European tire manufacturers, where disclosure of the performance characteristics and proper use

of each line of tire is the rule rather than the exception.

Thus, the tire market is one identified by confusion due to a lack of basic standards that can be easily understood and relied upon by the average car owner. Despite the uncooperative attitude displayed by the tire manufacturers, there are, however, certain questions the consumer is entitled to have answered with regard to just what he is getting when he buys a tire for his car. He needs to know—

The strength of the body of the tire.
The number of miles of service the tire tread will deliver in line with a predetermined standard.

The antiskid qualities of the tire in line with a predetermined standard.

The limitations, if any, on the maximum speed the tire will sustain.

The maximum load the tire will carry at a particular inflation pressure.

If the consumer can be given figures, he will certainly be in a much better position to decide for himself just what kind of a tire he needs. I cannot overemphasize the point that, at present, the motorist cannot make a judgment for the simple reason that he is given practically no figures on which to make a decision.

It is time for the tire manufacturers to abandon their the-public-be-damned attitude. The need for tire standards is becoming critical in view of the industry's practices in advertising, pricing, tire dimension differences, grading and the multitude of designs and claims offered to the motoring public. For this reason, tire manufacturers should be required to clearly and specifically label all tires as to grade and quality, and the terminology used should be the same and mean the same for all tires so as to afford the purchaser a guide in making a selection and to assure him of the quality of the tire.

POSTAL PAY INCREASE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, as several of my colleagues on the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service have also done, I have today introduced a postal pay bill which will automatically raise all postal employees in the first four levels of pay to the level immediately above that which they now occupy.

In my opinion this is the only way to cut the Gordian knot of ersatz comparability which binds these hard working and greatly deserving people to an inadequate wage scale.

When Congress passed the Pay Reform Act of 1962 its intentions were honorable and praiseworthy. This body was confident that it had hit upon the means of providing postal and Federal em-

ployees true and living comparability with the wages of their opposite numbers in private industry.

As we all know now, we underestimated the power of the executive branch to pervert and transform a generous proposal into a program of suppression.

In putting the principle of comparability to work, the executive branch first refused to take into consideration the years of inequity which had existed before passage of the Pay Reform Act. During the 1950's there were 8 lean years in which the postal and Federal employees received no pay raise at all and, as a result, their wages fell far behind those in private industry. The recommendations which the executive branch made for the activation of the pay reform bill paid no heed whatsoever to this situation. And we in Congress have been able to do nothing to correct this oversight.

Furthermore, the principle of comparability was established on a completely false basis. The wrong comparisons were made. For example, an artificial and arbitrary connecting point—or linkage—was made between level 4 of the postal field schedule—in which all letter carriers and postal clerks are bunched—and GS-5 in the other Federal agencies. GS-5 is a grade occupied mostly by relatively junior typists and office clerks—surely there is no comparison between these positions and the positions of letter carriers and postal clerks. Furthermore, most people who are in GS-5 are merely tarrying there on their way to better things. Because of the limited opportunities for promotion in the postal service, 95 percent of all letter carriers and clerks must remain in level 4 for the rest of their active careers. This is the level of pay at which they must feed and clothe and house their families, educate their children, care for their sick, bury their dead.

To make matters worse, the Bureau of the Budget has used the principle of comparability purely for its own purposes, changing the rules of application as it sees fit. Whenever they have come to the conclusion that any semblance of comparability would cost more money than they wanted to spend, they threw the principle away. They have also changed the ground rules whenever they felt that fair and equitable treatment of postal employees would be more expensive than they desire. Just this year, for instance, they threw into their computations a leavening of nonmetropolitan area wage levels in order to dilute the samplings and keep the so-called comparability factors low.

Comparability, unfortunately, has been considered somewhat as a sacred cow in the Congress. We passed the law in 1962 and we thought it would work. We have been inclined to avoid looking at the principle critically because it would be so much more convenient all around if it did work. But, under the present ground rules, it will not work. Postal employees will never get simple justice from their Government as long as the executive branch uses comparability as a blunt instrument to bludgeon them into economic disadvantage.

By raising all the employees in the first four levels of the postal field schedule one level we shall make a fresh start at granting justice to postal employees. We shall eliminate the mean little and the disastrous big inequities that have been written into the comparability code as it is practiced. We shall improve the postal service demonstrably by improving the morale of those who work in it—by attracting more able recruits and by enabling the Department to retain its more able employees.

This is a matter of justice, Mr. Speaker, and I think we should take action on it as swiftly as possible.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Task Force on International Educational of the House Committee on Education and Labor heard four distinguished witnesses testify today in support of H.R. 12452, the International Education Act of 1966.

Today's witnesses were the Honorable David E. Bell, Administrator, Agency for International Development; the Honorable Charles Frankel, Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State; the Honorable Leonard H. Marks, Director of the U.S. Information Agency; and the Honorable Warren W. Wiggins, Acting Director of the Peace Corps.

Under permission granted, I will insert the prepared statements of these witnesses following my remarks.

I should also like to note, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow, April 1, 1966, our task force will hear testimony on this legislation from some of the best known experts in the United States on matters affecting international education. The witnesses scheduled for tomorrow's hearings are as follows:

ROBERT MCCLORY, Member of Congress, Republican, of Illinois.

Stephen K. Bailey, dean, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.

Willard W. Cochrane, dean of international programs, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Kenneth Holland, president, Institute of International Education, New York, N.Y.

Howard P. Jones, chancellor, East-West Center, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii.

The prepared statements of today's witnesses follow:

STATEMENT BY DAVID E. BELL, ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, ON THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to

appear before you in support of H.R. 12451 and H.R. 12452, the proposed International Education Act of 1966.

This bill will authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants, first, to establish graduate centers for advanced international training and research; second, to strengthen undergraduate instruction in international studies; and third, to expand language and area studies.

We in AID strongly endorse these proposals as vital steps to support the participation of our Nation in the modern world. Every element of our national life—business, transport, agriculture, education, health, communications—is becoming increasingly international in character. If we are to act intelligently and constructively in international affairs, from the smallest transactions of business or travel to the gravest matters of world peace, we must understand better the people of the world outside our borders and the ways to solve our common problems.

This bill is necessary, therefore, in our own deepest national interest, to increase the competence with which we in the United States can participate in international life.

There is another reason why we in AID support this legislation. American educational institutions are making major contributions to the foreign assistance program. We look upon them as a major resource, capable of supplying professional personnel both by direct hire and contract to man overseas programs and projects, as a source for the conduct of research, as advisers on policy, and as a training ground for foreign participants and visitors.

The authority to be granted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish centers for advanced international studies should serve to strengthen U.S. capacity to provide training for foreign students and scholars at the same time that it serves the primary purpose of making an important additional contribution to American education. The grants to be made to educational institutions should add to their capacities to conduct necessary research in the foreign field and should improve their abilities to provide useful and significant training for U.S. citizens in the field of foreign affairs.

The Department of State, USIA, AID, and other departments and agencies of the Government engaged in overseas activities will be able to draw upon the U.S. university resources. Outside of Government, voluntary relief and social service agencies depend heavily for success in their missions on an understanding of foreign cultural, economic, and political behavior.

In the future, therefore, AID, and other agencies, public and private, that conduct overseas activities, would indirectly benefit from the expanded international competence this bill will encourage in American universities. We will, however, expect to continue to finance directly with AID funds the services we will use in the foreign aid program. Thus when we seek university support for an overseas technical assistance project, we will continue to finance it through an AID contract—as, to take one illustration only, we are doing through a contract with the University of Illinois Medical School to help improve the Medical School at Chengmai, Thailand. Moreover, we expect to finance with AID funds research activities intended to yield knowledge that will speed up the development process in the low income countries. Finally, we are asking in the new foreign assistance legislation, now before the Foreign Affairs Committee, for clearer authority to finance enlarged training activities in American universities where the persons trained are expected to be needed in future foreign assistance work.

Thus we are attempting to maintain a clear and sensible distinction between activities in the foreign aid field, authorized and

financed under the Foreign Assistance Act, and activities designed to enlarge and strengthen U.S. training and research facilities in international fields—not for foreign aid purposes, but to permit our country to fulfill better its normal and continuing role as a member of the world community of nations.

In view of the rapidly increasing complexity and urgency of U.S. involvement in international affairs, I regard passage of the proposed International Education Act as a matter of the greatest importance, and I strongly recommend it to this committee.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CHARLES FRANKEL, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BEFORE THE TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 31, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for the privilege of appearing before you in behalf of the proposed International Education Act of 1966. I believe that this proposed legislation can open an important new chapter in the history of American education, and in the history of our country's relations with other nations. Not only as a member of this administration, but as one who has spent most of his life in education, and simply as a citizen, I feel particularly honored to appear before this group in connection with your consideration of this significant proposal.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has already appeared before you to discuss the International Education Act of 1966, which places special responsibilities on his Department. In my remarks I propose to focus upon the significance of this bill as it affects the Department of State and the international relations of this country. From this point of view, this proposed legislation is important for at least three reasons.

First, it offers a better chance to American citizens to acquire the education they need to cope with the facts of international life.

Second, it strengthens the American capacity for foreign affairs.

Third, it takes steps that are essential if this country, in conjunction with other countries, is to move ahead purposefully in a great effort to bring the people of the world closer together in mutual tolerance and understanding.

With your permission, I should like to say something about each of these purposes. Let me begin by addressing myself to the contribution of this proposed program to the education of Americans.

It is now a truism to which I believe everyone gives assent that the United States lives in an international environment, and that the future of our own country is intimately linked to the destinies of other nations thousands of miles away. But the full significance of this truism is often hidden, perhaps precisely because we find it so easy to agree with it.

The fact is that the international environment of the United States does not begin at the oceans edge. This international environment penetrates almost every corner of our society. It is revealed in the news we hear, the coffee we drink, the movies we see, the political decisions we debate. Indeed, we hear so much about the rest of the world that it is very easy to imagine that we know what we need to know. But this, of course, is not true. We do not know what we need to know until we can go behind the noises we hear and the signals of other peoples' existence that we receive, and get some comprehension of what really causes those noises and what those signals really mean. An education, to be valid, must give the individual the information he needs to cope with important facts in his environment.

Today, for the ordinary American including the American who never goes overseas, education must provide a capacity to deal with the facts of the international environment. An education without an international dimension is an inadequate education for Americans in this century. One of the significant points about the legislation you are considering, I venture to suggest, is that it takes account of this consideration. It adds a new dimension to the Federal Government's interest in education.

This brings me to the second reason why I hope that you will give this proposed legislation favorable consideration. In strengthening the education of Americans at home, it also strengthens the American capacity for foreign affairs. To work effectively in ventures beyond our borders, we need more people with specialized skills. But in addition to their competence as doctors, teachers, agronomists or economists, such people must also have special knowledge of the societies in which they are going to apply their skills.

They need to have a special sensitivity and sympathy—a special eye and a special ear—for the differences in outlook and feeling that mark the people with whom they must work. Such special knowledge and sensitivity are not easy to come by. A difficult educational effort is required to produce them. A nation like our own, which wishes to work collaboratively and in a spirit of equality with other nations, must take deliberate steps to insure that such an educational effort is strong and continuing. That is one of the purposes, as I understand it, of the International Educational Act of 1966.

Moreover, as I have partly suggested already, we need not only more specialists who combine technical skills and international sophistication, but we also need a citizenry that has received, as part of its general education, an exposure to the complex facts of the international scene. In the long run, as the President has observed, a nation's foreign policy can progress no faster than the curriculums of its classrooms. American schools and colleges have done much in recent years to improve the study and teaching of international affairs. But much more still needs to be done if we wish to insure, for the decades ahead, that the citizens of this country have the awareness and the resilience to generate and support enlightened policies, and to pursue long-range policies with the understanding, patience and resolution such policies require.

I come now to the third reason for suggesting that the legislation you are considering is of importance to the United States in its foreign relations. It is that education has moved front and center in this Nation's affairs and in every nation's, and that close cooperation between the educational systems of different countries is one major instrument for building the structure of peace in diversity which has been the goal of this administration and those before it.

Today, for the first time since the invention of writing 5,000 years ago, more than half of mankind is literate. Nevertheless, in an era in which the ability to read and write is increasingly necessary to an individual's or a society's well-being, 4 out of 10 of the world's population are illiterate.

Today, the desire for education has become almost universal, and in all countries a larger number of people than ever before have a chance to realize this desire. Nevertheless, equality of educational opportunity remains, in most parts of the world, only a distant ideal.

Today, ideas, techniques, information, and works of art travel between the men of different countries with unprecedented speed. This process has created new possibilities for cooperation and mutual understanding among the nations. But it has also created

new sources of tension and misunderstanding. Over the long run, the educational systems of the nations have as much power as any other human agency to promote understanding any sympathy at their roots.

The legislation that is before you today proposes that we in this country set about to prepare ourselves to do our part with regard to this situation. It proposes that we make ourselves ready to join with others in finding, in the words of William James which the President quoted in his message, "a moral equivalent of war." The hope behind it is that if the teachers and students of different countries can be brought together, working purposefully on common projects, they can educate each other. Given time, they can reduce the influence, it may be hoped, of such ancient human emotions as hostility toward the stranger. That is what our schools have done at home. To be sure, they have not wholly succeeded. Provincialism and fear of the outsider are perhaps inevitable facts of human nature. But the skeptic who doubts what education can do to reduce the influence of such attitudes should study the record of what American schools have done to promote habits of mutual respect and forbearance between different kinds and groups of people. The vision that lies behind the legislation you are considering is that this is possible on the international scene.

Yet while this is the vision behind the program, the proposals before you are, I believe, measured and modest. There are certain things which these proposals do not contemplate. They do not suggest that it is America's duty to educate the world. They do not commit the American taxpayer to underwriting the goal of universal education everywhere in the world. They do not propose to accomplish miracles in a year—or ever. They are addressed, in all humility, to meeting certain specific needs in our country so that we will be better able to work with others to advance education, and particularly the process of mutual international education. They look ahead to a shared adventure with other nations in which, together, we work to produce school systems that will release children from the awful handicap of ignorance, and bring them up to look on people in other nations with understanding and respect. And this hope is joined to a sober recognition that education needs time to achieve its goals.

In sum, from the standpoint of foreign policy, I endorse this proposed legislation because it lays the foundation for an international effort that gives proper attention to the crucial role that education can play in realizing the promise of our time and offsetting its perils. The legislation you are considering gives expression to the proposition that education is a major and enduring activity of this Nation, and that educational cooperation with other nations constitutes an abiding national interest. It projects to the forefront of our national policy the conviction that the advancement of education, at home and abroad, is properly a national objective of the United States, and it offers a program that is not a crash program for an emergency but a deliberate effort to seek such long-range goals.

Not least, it recognizes the crucial truth that American educational activity at home and American educational activity abroad comprise a single interrelated whole. They are not separate. Each grows more effective as it is reinforced by the other. This program is offered not as a one-sided American venture but as a sign of our desire to work cooperatively with others. Its object is to strengthen American education so that we can assist other countries in strengthening theirs, and so that, in this process, our education will be strengthened too. In the words of the President, "The knowledge of our citizens is a treasure which grows only when it is shared." A truly international

educational endeavor cannot be the work of one country. The passage of the International Education Act of 1966 would indicate that this country is prepared to make a contribution to an international enterprise in which other nations are invited to join.

Finally, it may be of interest to you if I say just a few words about the relationship of the International Education Act of 1966 to the programs in Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange which are conducted by the Department of State. The programs envisaged in the act before you do not in any way duplicate the activities of the Department of State, but rather support and complement them. The search for people of high quality to take part in our programs takes much of our time and effort. I would hope and expect that the initiation of programs such as those contemplated in the International Education Act would make it easier to find the people we need. Moreover, the programs in the Department of State have been aimed, in the main, at individuals apart from their institutional affiliations, and have been conceived as part of our effort in other countries. The International Education Act of 1966 will focus on institutions, and on the needs of American education at home. Accordingly, from the point of view of the Department of State, the passage of the International Education Act will not obstruct or overlap our efforts. On the contrary, it will greatly aid these efforts.

I should be happy to answer any questions you may have.

STATEMENT OF LEONARD H. MARKS, DIRECTOR OF THE U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY, BEFORE TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, MARCH 31, 1966

I am glad to testify on behalf of H.R. 12451 and H.R. 12452, the bill for the International Education Act of 1966.

Although as this task force knows, the U.S. Information Agency is concerned with programs overseas, not within the United States, this bill has significant implications for us. In our task of projecting the United States abroad—its policies, society, culture, and institutions—our most valuable resource is human talent. The men and women who represent USIA abroad must combine professional expertise in communications with a sound knowledge of both the United States and the countries in which they serve. Language skills and area knowledge are essential tools for them.

Thus from the point of view of strengthening our overseas * * * this bill can make a significant contribution. As American institutions of higher education improve their curriculums in international affairs and foreign languages, the young men and women who join the Agency's foreign service as junior officers will come to us better prepared in these fields. Equally important, the graduate centers of international studies envisaged in the bill will be excellent grounds for advanced training for our cultural officers and public affairs officers during their careers. My aim is that the Agency shall develop more than has been possible so far, strong corps of experts in all areas of the world; to do so, the Agency must rely heavily upon the resources of American education.

I recognize that these hearings are limited to the proposed International Education Act of 1966. Since the committee is also concerned with the broader aspects of the President's message on international education, however, I should like to state briefly my support for these new initiatives and my agency's readiness to contribute to their execution. We are working closely with Assistant Secretary of State Charles Frankel in making necessary plans, and have supported the appointment of education officers in key embassies abroad to give new impetus to the U.S. effort in international education.

These education officers will not supplant the work of USIA personnel abroad, and indeed I foresee heavier responsibilities for my agencies as a result of the President's initiative. I refer not only to programs that USIA now administers and will continue to direct—such as book publication, English teaching, and support to the local educational and cultural institutions known as Binational Centers—but also to the programs of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State for which USIS posts are responsible overseas.

The expanded training that I mentioned above will help us equip agency officers to carry out these responsibilities at a higher level of excellence, and thus contribute significantly to the President's program.

STATEMENT OF WARREN W. WIGGINS, ACTING DIRECTOR OF THE PEACE CORPS, BEFORE THE TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 31, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the task force, it is a pleasure to testify on behalf of the bill incorporating part of the President's new program for international education.

The Peace Corps itself is a venture in international education. About half of the 11,000 volunteers now serving overseas are engaged in classroom teaching. The other half are teaching too—by example and by action in their communities overseas. Just as they are all learning about other peoples, other countries, other continents, other cultures, millions of people around the world are learning from them about Americans and about America. And as volunteers return to this country, millions of Americans are learning more about the world.

From the beginning, Congress has placed great emphasis on this educational aspect of the Peace Corps. Two of the three purposes stated in the Peace Corps Act have to do with mutual education and international understanding.

And from the beginning, the Peace Corps has seen the importance of preparing the volunteers for this venture in education, not only in training before they begin their actual service but throughout their overseas service.

For this training and educational support, both in this country and overseas, we have turned primarily to American institutions of higher education. They have responded generously, often on short notice and under great difficulties. We are remedying the short notice because most of our programs are now continuing ones. But many of the difficulties remain. They arise primarily from the fact that few of our colleges or universities have sufficient experience or strength in the areas for which our volunteers need training. Particularly at the beginning, many of the languages the volunteers needed to learn had not been taught in this country before; there were no texts, no tapes, no teachers. There were no experts for many of the areas to which they were going, and for many of the fields of work they were to undertake.

Faced with the need to train 20,000 Peace Corps volunteers and to assist in their support overseas, and faced with other important needs for overseas expertise, American higher education has been extending itself and gaining in overseas experience and understanding. But much more must be done. And the President's program will enable it to be done.

Through this bill, colleges and universities will be able to expand their international studies and research on both the undergraduate and graduate levels. They will be able to strengthen their faculties, both with American teachers who have acquired first-hand experience and with teachers from other countries. They will be able to

give their students first-rate courses and first-hand experience overseas. They will develop true centers of strength and excellence in international studies—centers with which the Peace Corps can work to improve further the training and overseas educational support of volunteers.

The strengthening of undergraduate programs in international studies should greatly increase the number of applicants for Peace Corps service who have demonstrated interest and ability in international education and who already have special skills. And the centers for advanced international studies can provide returned volunteers with an avenue through which their interests, ability and experience in international education can be effectively used.

In the first report to President Kennedy on the Peace Corps, 5 years ago, Sargent Shriver wrote: "It is time for American universities to become truly world universities. They need to expand their horizon—their research and curriculum—to the whole world. The Peace Corps will help with this transformation."

The Peace Corps has helped. College and universities, faculties and student bodies, are helping themselves. And this bill will make possible even greater progress in this transformation.

That is what the Peace Corps needs. That is what the Nation needs.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, to publish continuously for 20 years is a remarkable feat in and of itself. The Ukrainian Quarterly, which for many years has enjoyed the reputation of being an authoritative journal of east European and Asian affairs, has this further accomplishment to its credit.

For the past two decades, it has provided American and foreign readers analyses of developments and events in eastern Europe and Asia which are in many ways unique and novel. Its articles on U.S. foreign policy issues have developed dimensions of thought and perspective that are not readily found in any other American publication.

With good reason, many of the subscribers to this journal are official agencies and groups in the Red Empire. For years they have followed carefully the periodical's studies of the captive nations problem, and Moscow especially has attacked the journal persistently for disclosing facts and developing interpretations which it regards as harmful to its impericocolonialist domination over numerous captive non-Russian nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union.

It can be truthfully maintained that no periodical in this country contains as much information and critical analysis about the captive nations in general, and the captive nations in the U.S.S.R. in particular, as does the Ukrainian Quarterly. Adding to its uniqueness, the journal consistently deals with U.S. foreign policy issues from viewpoints

that have scarcely been developed or even understood by other American literary media. For example, its viewpoints concerning a sound liberation policy, the totalistic captive nations concept, Red economic strategy, Sino-Soviet impericocolonialism, the historical Russian problem, a free world poltrade policy, American myths about the U.S.S.R. and Russia, and numerous other subjects, are virtually pioneering in contemporary American thought.

I know I speak for many of my colleagues, who have profited over the years from reading this journal, when I congratulate the Ukrainian Quarterly upon its 20th anniversary, and offer my felicitations and wishes for many more decades of productive public service and enlightenment. A perceptive insight into the highly constructive character of the journal can be gained by reading the anniversary article on "In the Mainstream of Basic Issues," written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, and published in the index of the journal's spring issue. I insert this illuminating article as part of my remarks in the RECORD.

IN THE MAINSTREAM OF BASIC ISSUES

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Within the span of a short article it isn't easy to recount all the rich and varied experiences connected with a publication in existence over 20 years. Those who are at all familiar with the tasks, burdens, and costs of regularly publishing a periodical cannot but regard this very duration of the Ukrainian Quarterly with considerable esteem and perhaps some amazement. On the American literary stage periodicals of scholarly and yet popularly written content come and go, each well attesting to the difficulties surrounding the nature of the enterprise itself. Many a college or university cannot even afford a publication of this type. It is therefore no mean feat to have been able to maintain the quarterly for over two decades, and the prospects of its expanded circulation, particularly in areas of influential thought and action, are far brighter now than they were after the first decade of its existence.

My association with this journal of East European and Asian affairs commenced back in 1946, when I was serving on the faculty of New York University. The cumulative experience of these years leads me to ascribe the following reasons to this real, successful achievement of the journal. First, the dedication to the journal as shown by its originator and first editor, Dr. Nicholas D. Chubaty, and by its subsequent editor, Dr. Walter Dushnyck, has been basic to the sterling performance and high standards of the publication. Editorial direction of this spirited and dedicated kind is the very soul of any publication, infusing it with activist purpose, balanced accomplishment, and perpetual momentum.

The second dominant reason for this genuine achievement has been the steady growth of subscribers and readers, both here and abroad. The sustained interest of the readers has been a veritable source of inspiration and encouragement for successive improvements in the journal itself. From the very beginning a determination was made to produce a scholarly and objective journal with an intellectually activist orientation. Too many scholarly publications tend to accumulate dust because of their lack of this orientation. In so many instances over the years our readers have let it be known that they disagreed with the data and ideas of the article and editorial but were nevertheless moved by the spirit of translating

the overriding theme into concrete, constructive action. This, in short, is what is meant by intellectual activism.

Another impressive reason for the progress made is the editorial advisory board. This body consists of distinguished scholars who occupy professorial positions at universities and colleges on almost every continent of the world. They have substantially contributed with their articles and advice to the stable growth of the publication. Their association with the journal has been of inestimable value.

A VALUABLE MEDIUM IN THE STRUGGLE

In addition, the Quarterly has become during this period a valuable medium of knowledge, interpretation, and understanding in the truly titanic, contemporary struggle. The reader would be surprised to know the official and private subscribers to the periodical, both in the free world and the Red empire. And yet a moment of reflection would erase any cause for surprise. Without exaggeration, there is no publication in the United States that provides material on the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union as does this one. Criticisms from Moscow, Kiev, and other Red totalitarian capitals have been consistently abundant and severe, but they have also measured the effectiveness of the journal's regular output. The record is an imposing one.

Furthermore, the Quarterly is also unique in furnishing information and ideas regarding all the captive nations in the Red Empire. Doubtless, there are other publications that dwell on one or a few captive nations, but none can be compared with this periodical in terms of scope, breadth, and outlook. One of the publication's policies is drawn along the lines of Public Law 86-90, the Captive Nations Week Resolution, and in effect privately implements this Congressional resolution by offering articles, editorials, and commentaries dealing with each captive nation, be it Cuba, mainland China, Georgia or Hungary. In this respect the issues of the Quarterly have served as a vital reservoir for research and study, especially in the past 6 years.

Highly important, too, for the prominence of the periodical are the prime perspectives that almost every issue maintains and cultivates. The central idea that impericocolonialist Moscow and no other capital or area in the Red Empire is the crucial enemy of the free world is one essential perspective. Another is the genetic development of the Soviet Russian Empire, from Moscow in 1917 to Cuba in 1960. A third is on the basic and determining distinction between Russia, the power center of the empire, and the U.S.S.R., the legalistic facade concealing from free world view the basic captivity of a dozen large captive non-Russian nations. After all, the largest captive non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe is Ukraine; in Asia, it is mainland China. Happily, this fundamental perspective has gained wide acceptance in the United States. For example, speaking of the breakup of empires in this century, one outstanding American historian states, "If the Ukraine had been detached from the Soviet state immediately after the Russian Revolution, the Soviet empire today would not be such a disturber of the peace."¹

A further, most important perspective, particularly for U.S. leadership, concentrates on the key to cold war victory and the prevention of aggression and a hot global war, namely the freedom and independence of all the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Our inability to see this and its unlimited ramifications and opportunities is one of Moscow's most formidable defenses of its empire. Protracted American ignorance

¹Anthony Harrigan, "Our War With Red China," National Review, New York, Mar. 8, 1966, p. 206.

about the multinational composition of the U.S.S.R. empire-state really devolves into forming Moscow's chief weapon against the free world, negative though it be. Without question, the Quarterly has been in the forefront of such constructive thought, and undoubtedly one of its chief contributions to U.S. policy and action will be this perspective over the long run.

LIVE ISSUES, LIVE WRITING

Perhaps the best aspect of the journal is its constant idealational location in the mainstream of basic issues. Addressing itself continually to live issues, the Quarterly has attained to the remarkable reputation of being an organ of live writing. Not the superficial weekly or monthly type, aggregating facts and offering shifting opinions, but rather the analytic quarterly type, sifting and dissecting facts against a stable, interpretative background of history and ideas. Pick up any issue of this journal and you will find this omnipresent truth staring at you. Indeed, there are current, basic issues and subjects which you are unaware of simply because other media either fail to recognize them or, if they do, are not competent to handle and treat them with analytic adequacy and insight. Most are even unaware of the running literary battles waged across the seas and within the United States on these fundamental subjects.

Being in the mainstream of basic issues, the Quarterly regularly covers a wide spectrum of essential material. Developments in Eastern Europe, Asia, and elsewhere, thoughts on U.S. foreign policy, cold war analyses, and a wide range of disciplines—historical, economic, political, anthropologic, etc.—consistently appear in the pages of this journal. But perhaps the best indication of the live nature and character of the periodical is its use in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which is an integral part of the Nation's recorded history. The prudent publication of Quarterly material in the RECORD has not only made much valuable analysis more readily accessible to the general public but has also contributed to legislation, congressional hearings, and studies, and informed opinion concerning the U.S.S.R. in particular.

Just to cite two examples, Public Law 86-90, the Captive Nations Week resolution, and Public Law 86-749, authorizing the Taras Shevchenko statue, are the products of thought found in the journal.

The creative public service performed by the Quarterly all these years cannot be appreciated unless one has followed this whole development closely and attentively. The evidence is a massive one, but the scope and depth of it can be gleaned from a concise review of some highlights that have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The items are a selected few, enough to indicate the variety of subject matter, the nature of the analyses, and the acute currency of the issues. Many of the issues discussed openly and in this form 10 years ago still apply today. This is why the journal has become increasingly important for research purposes as well as new discussion.

THE BREADTH AND WIDTH

As highlighted examples, then, several articles appeared in the last decade on the intriguing subject of U.S. diplomatic relations with the Ukrainian S.S.R.² The analyses formed a basis for congressional hearings that gained nationwide attention. The death of the resolution's sponsor and several intervening events caused a long delay on the subject, but the matter is still before the 89th Congress for consideration. It is one of those basic issues that fleeting time

cannot erase. It will have to be resolved sooner or later.

Closely associated with the preceding subject is that of lands and nations in the U.S.S.R.³ A Quarterly article on this vital matter was reprinted in the RECORD and gained considerable popular appeal. Countless Americans under the illusions of the U.S.S.R. being "a nation," "a single country," "Russia," "a monolith" and many other baseless characterizations, found the data in the article "new" and "thought provoking." In process of education, what was said accurately 10 years ago has to be repeated for every new generation. The contents of that article apply today as they did nearly 10 years ago.

Much the same can be said for the Quarterly article on "Basic Misconceptions in U.S. Military Thought on the U.S.S.R."⁴ The misleading notion of assessing the enemy's military power solely in terms of arms technology is as current today as it was in 1959. The article exploded this notion and, with pertinent evidence and analysis, maintained that Moscow fears its armed forces far more than we do, but for other more determining reasons.

The subject has broad cold war implications, as do the two articles reprinted in the same year on the subjects of Russian machinations in the Middle East and traditional Russian cold war activity. "Guiding Impressions of the Middle East" still apply today as we witness Moscow's penetrations in Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Egypt, and elsewhere.⁵

Even without Khrushchev, the reprinted article on "The Russian Problem: From Ivan the Terrible to Nikita the Sanguine" applies to Brezhnev, Kosygin, and any other successor so long as the empire within an empire exists.⁶

With the U.S.S.R., indeed the entire Red Empire, in deep economic trouble today, we don't hear much about the "decisive economic race," "the economic competition" against the United States in particular and the free world in general. Yet, except for certain statistical data and dated empirical comments, the reprinted article on "Economic Vulnerabilities of the Soviet Union" enjoys an even greater application today because of both its structure and substantiation by subsequent development.⁷

Moreover, myths we have lived by are not only economic in character but of many other hues. This was clearly elucidated in a Quarterly article long before a concern about myths was shown by one of our Senators.⁸ Despite some improvement in our thinking about "Russia," the nine myths still linger on.

An area which continues to elude the understanding of most Americans is political warfare. This organic subject is the most important one since by proper definition it embraces everything within an operational context. An early article on "Polwar's Strategic Concept" covered the essentials of this field.⁹ A later reprinted analysis of "Dominant Russian and American Problems in the Cold War" showed the opportunities open to us for successful political warfare

operations.¹⁰ Here, too, with the slow progress of understanding in this critical field these articles will continue to enjoy current significance.

The reality of the captive nations in toto has been underscored repeatedly. This reality has served as the basis for numerous analyses. It has also justified the creation of a special congressional committee on the Captive Nations.¹¹ This journal has surpassed all others on this point, so that today the subject is being carefully considered and some workable arrangement will be consummated. Interlocked with all this is, of course, the Quarterly's persistent interest in all of the captive nations and attempts made to liberate them. An article titled "China's Battleline of Freedom" exemplifies this interest vividly.¹² The dominant ideas of this article remain fresh and pertinent for any discussion bearing on Free China or Red China.

As to the now traditional Captive Nations Week and general American understanding of its meaning and intent, numerous pieces appear annually in the Quarterly. An excellent but critical background article on "Nixon and the Captive Nations Resolution" usually serves as the base for measuring the strides made in this understanding.¹³ On this score, too, the Quarterly is unsurpassed. As a matter of fact, various other periodicals depend on this journal for analyses and commentaries dealing with the annual Captive Nations Week observance, reactions from the Red Empire, and projections for the future. Is it little wonder that the journal has been under constant attack by the Red totalitarians?

The Taras Shevchenko statue in our Nation's Capital is truly the second statue of liberty, dedicated to the liberation and freedom of all the captive nations. This living monument to world freedom was made possible through the analyses published originally in the Quarterly. One of the articles sets forth all the issues that were successfully controverted against a Washington daily.¹⁴

Not only this, the journal's articles and commentaries uniquely contained all the fire and battle sounds in 4 years of exchange with Moscow and its puppets, which constitute research data not to be found analyzed in any other American medium. An ardent advocate of the statue is revered by all freedom-conscious citizens in Washington, and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Shevchenko Memorial Committee have honored him with the Shevchenko Freedom Award. In one of its reviews the Quarterly paid fitting tribute to the beauty, inspiration, and truth of his official prayers.¹⁵

From all this it should be evident that this journal, enjoying the real and genuine achievement of 20 years in existence, is profoundly immersed in the critical issues of our times. Just to cite a few more examples from the angle defined earlier. East-West trade is an issue of considerable importance in the cold war. The Quarterly has examined every conceivable aspect of the issue in its articles and commentaries.¹⁶ Its conclusion

² CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 1, pp. 1129-1132.

³ "Why a Special Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 7, pp. 9617-9619.

⁴ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 13, pp. 17969-17972.

⁵ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 109, pt. 10, pp. 12788-12790.

⁶ "The Shevchenko Affair," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 4, pp. 5048-5051.

⁷ "Chaplain Harris' Inspiring Prayers Praised by Ukrainian Quarterly," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 13, pp. 17801-17802.

⁸ "Red Totalitarian Trade—Another Cold War Instrument," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 8, pp. 10469-10472.

⁹ "House Concurrent Resolution 58: Three of a Kind," daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 29, 1954, pp. A2384-A2386.

¹⁰ "Lands and Nations in the U.S.S.R.," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 11, pp. 14233-14237.

¹¹ Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 2, 1959, pp. A5760-A5762.

¹² Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 27, 1959, A3461-A3463.

¹³ Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1959, A4487-4489.

¹⁴ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 9, pp. 12282-12285.

¹⁵ "Nine Lingering Myths on 'Russia,'" CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 3, pp. 3521-3524.

¹⁶ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 9, pp. 11544-11546.

on the necessity of a poltrade policy is being widely discussed today. Another illustration is the effectiveness of its articles and commentaries on the U.S. Consular Convention with the USSR. This issue has been outstanding since the spring of 1964, and it can truthfully be said that the Quarterly's concentration on the problem has contributed heavily to the postponement of any quick and ill-advised ratification of this pact by the Senate.¹⁷

Finally, because of its activist literary output the Quarterly, the publication of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, is confronted by innumerable inquiries as to its policies and objectives. These are easily answered by "The Educational Policy of UCCA," an article that states clearly and distinctly the policy, aims, objectives, and convictions of all who manage the periodical.¹⁸

In short, derived from the general UCCA policy, that of the Ukrainian Quarterly is purely and candidly educational, but educational for action and survival. Its philosophy has been and its ideas and truths anchored in historical evidence and molding American thought and experience for excellence and success in the world crisis. Its contributions have found their mark in American scholarship and intellectual thought. And as it plunges into its third decade of existence, the Quarterly does so with a solid foundation of experience and achievement, a well justified and inspired hope of even greater successes, and a confidence in the longrun and ultimate efficacy of the power of its knowledge, ideas, and recorded convictions.

SBA BUSINESS LOAN PROGRAM SHOULD BE RESUMED

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill should be passed. There is need to resume the SBA business loan program.

The increase of \$125 million in lending authority as proposed in the pending bill will allow SBA to begin accepting loan applications again on a limited basis until additional financing is worked out for next fiscal year. It would be my preference that there be a more substantial increase in the revolving fund. In this connection, I introduced a bill—H.R. 12089—last January to provide an increase of \$359 million to \$2.2 billion in the fund.

However, I am pleased to support S. 2729 so that SBA can get on with its job of providing loan service for small businessmen of America who are in need of capital and credit.

The SBA is beginning to realize its great potential. Last October the loan program was suspended. We must pass

legislation to authorize and permit resuming of SBA's business loan services.

In fiscal year 1965 more than 13,000 loans were approved for \$418 million—which is twice the number of loans approved in 1964—and 1964 was a record year.

To assure adequate funds for the small business loan program, section 2 of S. 2729 establishes two separate loan funds—one for business loans and one for disaster loan programs.

I am sure we are all familiar with the fact that the mingling of the two funds has resulted on several occasions in business loans being exhausted because of the occurrence of natural disasters.

Certainly a fund for natural disasters at times is needed. Such funds should be earmarked and separated from the business loan program.

I urge the passage of this authorizing legislation.

SPEECH PRAISED

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune has taken due note of President Johnson's reminder to the French people as to what a withdrawal from NATO could mean.

It would mean, the paper pointed out, "returning to a bilateral system which brought the downfall of France in two world wars" and it would mean "taking France out of a collective system which has brought France greater peace and prosperity than it has known in this century."

Since the analysis made by the newspaper is very timely, I offer the editorial for printing in the Record.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 24, 1966]

L.B.J. ADDRESSES THE FRENCH

If President de Gaulle is to be diverted from his NATO collision course, it must now be clear that much more than diplomatic messages, however skillfully drafted, will be necessary. The exchanges now going on between the American and French Presidents were initiated by General de Gaulle to explore a solution for a France not inside, but outside, NATO.

The system of bilateral military pacts which De Gaulle would substitute for the collective NATO system already has been rejected by the United States and the 13 other NATO members; and if President Johnson goes to the trouble of spelling out the reasons, either in fresh letters to Paris or in a public speech, as he did yesterday, he may be doing so not because he thinks he might change President de Gaulle's mind, but because he would like to reach the minds of the French people. It may be too late for De Gaulle to change on his own volition; but it may not yet be too late for the French electorate to change his mind for him.

President de Gaulle, of course, presumes that the French will follow wherever he would lead. But the results of the last presidential election made it clear that he does not have the following he had before,

and that his losses were due in no small measure to his anti-NATO position.

President Johnson has developed the implications of this position for the benefit of the French public as well as the U.S. Foreign Service officers whom he addressed yesterday. They would mean returning to a bilateral system which brought the downfall of France in two world wars; and they would mean taking France out of a collective system which has brought France greater peace and prosperity than it has known in this century.

That is a good deal to be throwing away in exchange for something, the nature of which is still not clearly known. The French may sympathize with De Gaulle in his romanticism, as may the rest of the world, but the road to romanticism could also lead to ruin if not tempered by reality.

It is to the French sense of realism that the champions of NATO must address themselves. And if this sense of realism should be expressed in the parliamentary elections to be held prior to expiration of the NATO treaty arrangements, these arrangements might yet conceivably be upheld. That would be a defeat for De Gaulle. But a victory for NATO may be more important for France, as for the rest of the Western World.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. STEPHENS) on account of official business.

To Mr. RUMSFELD (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through April 13, on account of official business as a member of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid and Government Information.

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. MULDER for 1 hour, on April 25.

Mr. ZABLOCKI, for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STRATTON, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois), for 1 hour, on April 5, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. LATTA.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. FINO in two instances.

Mr. MAILLIARD.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STRATTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska.

¹⁷ "Ten Reasons Against the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty," daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 7, 8, 9, 10, 1966, pp. A567-A568, A608-A609, A668-A669, A699.

¹⁸ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 25, 1966, pp. 1060-1063.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4599. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel, Denver, Colo., and of certain chipped colored glass windows for Saint Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nev.;

H.R. 6568. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, and the oils crushed therefrom, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6845. An act to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; and

H.R. 9883. An act to amend subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 4, 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:

2254. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on implementation of section 511(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2255. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a recommendation for an amendment to the Social Security Act which would extend from March 31 to May 31, 1966, the deadline for enrollment in the medical insurance portion of the social security health insurance program for the aged (H. Doc. 418); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

2256. A letter from the Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Fees and expenses of witnesses" for the fiscal year 1966, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2257. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the 18th annual report on the national industrial reserve, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 80-883; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2258. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5 of the act of February 11, 1929, as amended, relating to the compromise of claims of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2259. A letter from the national president, Blue Star Mothers of America, transmitting minutes of the 23d Annual National Convention of the Blue Star Mothers of America, held in Miami Beach, Fla., October 24-29,

1965; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2260. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2261. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense, for the calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-804; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. BECKWORTH: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2573. An act to validate the action of the acting superintendent, Yosemite National Park, in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois: Committee on Foreign Affairs. A report entitled "The Costs of World Peacekeeping"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 14215. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 12617. A bill to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 14088. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.J. Res. 997. Joint resolution to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people; with amendments (Rept. No. 1408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SAYLOR:
H.R. 14176. A bill to enlarge the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:
H.R. 14177. A bill to enlarge the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 14178. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 14179. A bill to provide that individuals 65 years of age or older may be permitted to enroll, at any time during 1966, in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits established by part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 14180. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through September 30, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the supplementary medical insurance program in the case of individuals reaching age 65 before 1966; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.R. 14181. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to increase the rate of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, their widows and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 14182. A bill to provide for judgments for costs against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 14183. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through August 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 14184. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 14185. A bill to declare the Old Georgetown Market a historic landmark and to require its preservation and continued use as a public market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 14186. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for a Minority Economic Council; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 14187. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 14188. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 14189. A bill to prohibit insured banks from issuing negotiable interest-bearing or discounted notes, certificates of deposit, or other evidences of indebtedness; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 14190. A bill to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14191. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 14192. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 14193. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 14194. A bill to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 14195. A bill to authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 14196. A bill to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 14197. A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the control of alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14198. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend through August 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 14199. 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. McVICKER:

H.R. 14200. A bill to provide that a church and its minister may elect to have such minister treated, for social security coverage and tax purposes, as an employee of such church regardless of his coverage as a self-employed individual (or his lack of coverage) under the provisions of law otherwise governing his coverage status; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 14201. A bill to amend section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 14202. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the initial phase of the east side division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 14203. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 14204. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training of medical technologists and personnel in other allied health professions, to improve the educational quality of the schools training such allied health professions personnel, and to strengthen and improve the existing student loan programs for medical, osteopathic, dental, podiatry, pharmacy, optometric, and nursing students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 14205. A bill to declare the Old Georgetown Market a historic landmark and to require its preservation and continued use as a public market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 14206. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 14207. 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. PIKE:

H.R. 14208. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to suspend certain provisions of law relating to women in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14209. A bill to amend the act of August 21, 1957, Public Law 85-155, 71 Stat. 375, and title 10 of the United States Code, as heretofore amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 14210. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat sintering or burning as a mining process in the case of shale, clay, and slate used or sold for use, as lightweight concrete aggregates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 14211. A bill to enlarge the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 14212. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 14213. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to require that the daily ration of members of the Army and Air Force contain at least as much butter as the daily ration prescribed for members of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 14214. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 14215. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 14216. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 14217. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 14218. A bill to provide for the lease of certain public lands for ponding and related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 14219. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 14220. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 14221. A bill for the establishment of a Civilian Aviation Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 14222. A bill to establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 14223. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to extend the disability "freeze" to cases where an individual is compelled by his disability to give up his usual occupation and takes less remunerative work or limit the extent to which he performs such occupation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 14224. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 14225. A bill to establish a Commission on Revision of the Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14226. A bill to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14227. A bill to establish a consolidated Federal corrections system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.J. Res. 1002. Joint resolution on a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.J. Res. 1003. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 1004. Joint resolution on a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 1005. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.J. Res. 1006. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 8th day of September of each year as "International Literacy Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.J. Res. 1007. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.J. Res. 1008. Joint resolution to suspend temporarily the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve consolidations, unifications, or acquisitions of control of railroad properties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.J. Res. 1009. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 14 occurs as "National Flag Week," to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 1010. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.J. Res. 1011. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North At-

lantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.J. Res. 1012. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.J. Res. 1013. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.J. Res. 1014. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.J. Res. 1015. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.J. Res. 1016. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 14228. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Turriciano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 14229. A bill for the relief of Patrick Hugh McDonnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 14230. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 14231. A bill for the relief of Joao Oliveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 14232. A bill for the relief of Irene Calderone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 14233. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor Robledo Diaz Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14234. A bill for the relief of Juan deJ. Toledo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14235. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Camillo Farias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14236. A bill for the relief of Manuel M. Egea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 14237. A bill for the relief of Deb Kumar Das; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 14238. A bill for the relief of Shuhuru Ibrahimia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 14239. A bill for the relief of Nathaniel Eisenberg and Drora Eisenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Soybeans and the Fifth District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the 10 counties of my congressional district produce nearly one-third of the soybeans grown in my home State of Ohio.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's report on soybean production, dated August 1965, these 10 counties produced 13,059,000 bushels of soybeans on 554,800 acres during 1964. Total 1964 production for the State, according to the USDA report, was 41,850,000 bushels, grown on 1,860,000 acres.

Thus my district, Mr. Speaker, is a leading producer of a crop which has shown phenomenal growth in production in the United States—but of which still more is needed.

In the past decade, soybean acreage has almost doubled, while acreages for corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, peanuts, potatoes, oats, hay, and flax have decreased. Last year U.S. farmers harvested 34.5 million acres of soybeans with a farm value of \$2 billion. Ohio production, like the rest of the Nation's soybean output, increased—from 41 to 51 million bushels.

But there is currently a drive on by the National Soybean Crop Improvement Council to increase soybean acreage in 1966 by 3.5 million over the 1965 total. The Department of Agriculture is cooperating with this private industry group in accomplishing this goal. Secretary Freeman has announced that soybeans can be planted under provisions of the 1966 feed grain program.

The world demand for oil and protein is growing as populations of countries around the world explode. Soybeans

can help feed the world's 1.5 billion undernourished or malnourished persons. In planting more acres of soybeans and also increasing their yields, American farmers can help fill this worldwide need for oil and protein and, at the same time, reap the rewards of the crop which has come into its own as a money crop.

Future Homemakers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Future Homemakers of America Week.

The State of Tennessee is the second largest State in the organization's membership with a total of 36,686 members.

Over 30 schools in my district have FHA chapters, and the efforts these outstanding young women are making will long be felt by their communities and State.

While congratulating all the girls in my district and State, who are members of this fine organization, I would like to single out four young ladies from my district, who are candidates for State offices in the FHA—Becky Beets of Morristown, Dorris Milligan of Jefferson City, Cathy Norris of Dandridge, and Donna Whitson of Jonesboro.

This week the 11,000 chapters of the FHA, which have 600,000 members, have spotlighted activities and projects concerned with a 4-year national program of work.

The objectives of this program of work, as detailed by the National FHA, are:

To help each member recognize her abilities, strive for their full development, and participate actively in family, community and world improvement projects.

To further these objectives the elected youth officers of FHA developed nine projects which stress individual development; emphasize mental and physical health; encourage serious consideration in choosing and training for useful careers; develop codes of ethics, morals, and manners; further understanding of people of all heritages, customs, and beliefs; promote appreciation of all family members and their abilities and problems; teach selective spending; inculcate citizenship responsibilities; and encourage using leisure time for activities beneficial to the individual and society.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my gratitude for the ambitious and essential program, which the FHA chapters have undertaken.

I want to commend all the 600,000 students, who are members of the Future Homemakers of America, and urge them to continue to be concerned with and committed to the real values of life.

Future Homemakers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the week of March 17 through April 2 has been set aside to pay tribute to an organization that is doing an outstanding job in preparing some of our young folks for the future. I refer to the Future Homemakers of America—a national youth organization of more than 600,000 high school students enrolled in home economics courses with local chapters in every State, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

In these hectic days when so much publicity is given to the minority youth groups such as the juvenile delinquents, beatniks, and draft card burners, it is a pleasure to honor some of the good guys

who are seriously preparing themselves as good citizens of the future.

This national youth organization of home economics students in junior and senior high school provides opportunities for developing individual and group initiative in planning and carrying out activities related to today's complicated science of homemaking. As part of a large national organization of teenagers concerned with good home and family life each girl grows through new experiences, new views, and new friends. Its objectives are to help each member recognize her abilities, strive for their full development, and participate actively in family, community, and world improvement projects.

To further these objectives the elected youth officers of FHA developed nine projects which stress individual development; emphasize mental and physical health; encourage serious consideration in choosing and training for useful careers; develop codes of ethics, morals, and manners; further understanding of people of all heritages, customs, and beliefs; promote appreciation of all family members and their abilities and problems; teach selective spending; inculcate citizenship responsibilities; and encourage using leisure time for activities beneficial to the individual and society.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to add my voice to those who, this week, are paying tribute to this fine organization and its fine young members.

Fino Urges Minority Economic Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide for a Minority Economic Council to advise the Senate and House minorities on economic policy. I would also like to suggest another way in which minority and junior Congressmen might be given adequate technical staff assistance.

The Republican minority in the House of Representatives today suffer a very real handicap in the limited technical and professional staff assistance available to them in intricate fields like taxation, banking, foreign trade and investment, housing credit, and monetary policy, and so forth. The ratio of Democratic to Republican committee staff members becomes trebly unfair when it is remembered that many Democratic efforts are backed by the work and research of the many Federal departments and agencies.

The present administration has sent up a great array of complex legislation to the Hill. Often the farthest reaching parts of these bills are the most camouflaged. The lack of Republican staff assistance has been a major factor in Great Society legislative success because

often we in the minority cannot complete a careful analysis of the legislation in the short time we have to act. Nor do we have adequate staffs to prepare our own legislative programs.

Today I am introducing legislation to create a Minority Economic Council to give the minority assistance in one crucial field, but this is not enough. We must go further.

I would suggest that committees be budgeted an additional \$10,000 per annum per member, which money would be used to hire assistant counsel who would work not for the committee as a whole but for a particular member. This would give a newly elected Congressman immediate access to professional staff assistance in the realm of his committee's activity. I think that this would solve not only the minority staffing problem, but the staff-help problem of junior Members in general.

I would imagine that this proposal I am making would cost about \$10 million per year. The House would attract young professional people by the hundreds. Many young men and women would get their professional skills sharpened without absorbing the bureaucratic psychologies dispensed by the departments and agencies in the executive branch.

While this staffing would be a boon to the minority, because the minority are presently so badly understaffed, it would also be a boon to the Congress in general. Expertise in a given subject up before the Congress or one of its committees would not be confined to committee staffs under the thumb of a chairman presumably loyal to the administration. The type staff I am proposing would be a vigilant, alert staff which would restore much of the vanishing prerogatives of congressional supervision and control of Government. We would save any money we spent and tenfold more.

I commend this proposal to the House. It will be the vehicle of a restoration of vanishing congressional power.

The 145th Anniversary of the 1821 Revolt in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, since the House was not in session on March 25, I would like today to take note of the 145th anniversary of the 1821 revolt in Greece which culminated in her independence. Many American ideals and institutions can be traced to the Greek civilization and the Grecian achievements in art, philosophy, law, literature, and science. And I am sure that most of us are aware of the diverse and important contributions of Greek-Americans throughout our history. In my

district of Texas, we are blessed with a vibrant and vital community of Greek descendants who have contributed much to the culture and prosperity of San Antonio.

The recognized American concept of individual freedom owes its birth to the Greeks. Indeed, it was the basis of much of their civilization. Herodotus, the Greek historian, quotes a Greek conversing with a Persian:

You do not know what freedom is. If you did, you would fight for it with bare hands if you had no weapons.

The Grecian culture flourished under the city-states, but the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C. and the lack of national unity laid the groundwork for defeat by Rome near the end of the Macedonian wars in 146 B.C. Greece became a Roman province; but Athens remained a center of learning, and the Greek language and culture were widely influential. In A.D. 395 the Roman Empire crumbled, and Greece became the center of Byzantine Empire for more than one thousand years—another indication of Greek knowledge and influence.

The Ottoman Turks who conquered Constantinople in 1453 gave the Greeks a large measure of political autonomy. Greek merchants became engaged in worldwide trade, and the Greek Orthodox Church gained ascendancy in communal affairs. But the traditions of liberty and individual freedom were still smoldering in the hearts of the Greek people. It was ignited in the uprising of 1770, which was crushed by the Turks and led to severe curbs on Greek nationalism. But in 1821, under the leadership of Archbishop Patras, the Greeks on March 25 launched their war of independence against Turkish suzerainty. Greek independence was recognized by Britain, France, and Russia in the London Protocol of 1830.

The course of the Greek nation has not been smooth. She has been visited with domestic upheavals, bitter rivalries with Turkey, and, in 1944, a civil war. But Greece now participates in NATO, and is an associate member of the European Economic Community. She benefited from some American economic and military assistance beginning near the end of her civil war, and is now living up to all expectations of economic and political stability.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to salute Greek independence.

Voters in California's Sixth Congressional District Express Their Opinions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, every year, I send a questionnaire to every

registered voter household in my Sixth Congressional District. I am always gratified that so many take time to answer these questions on some of the critical issues of the day. This year,

over 20,000 families replied and the results are tabulated below.

Obviously, there was some confusion where "yes" and "no" answers were given to multiple-choice questions, but even

though the percentage figures on some questions do indicate duplication, the results leave little doubt as to the collective views of the respondents:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. VIETNAM			
The war in South Vietnam continues to be increasingly costly to the United States in terms of men and money. In your opinion should we—			
1. Continue the present policy of air attacks against North Vietnam and ground support for South Vietnam while pressing for negotiations?	69	25	6
2. Intensify the prosecution of the war in an all-out effort to end the fighting as quickly as possible despite the increased risks involved?	61	31	8
3. Withdraw U.S. forces on the theory that continued loss of lives cannot justify whatever may be gained from an eventual settlement?	36	58	6
B. MINIMUM WAGE			
The administration has proposed increasing the minimum wage in 3 steps, from \$1.25 to \$1.75 in 1968, and extending protection to 7,900,000 additional persons, including hotel, hospital, restaurant, and agricultural workers. Do you favor—			
1. Retaining the present minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour?	47	47	6
2. Increasing the minimum wage for those presently covered?	52	38	10
3. Increasing the minimum wage and broadening the coverage?	74	20	6
C. REAPPORTIONMENT			
In an effort to reverse the Supreme Court's decision that both houses of the State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population, a constitutional amendment has been proposed allowing other factors such as geography and political subdivisions to enter into the apportionment of one house, if such apportionment is approved by a majority vote of the people. Do you favor—			
1. The Supreme Court's decision?	43	48	9
2. Each State being able to determine the composition of one house on factors other than population?	76	16	8
D. TAFT-HARTLEY			
This session will see continued debate on the administration's bill to repeal sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, the so-called right-to-work section. Do you favor—			
1. Repealing sec. 14(b), thus eliminating the States' jurisdiction over right-to-work laws?	38	53	9
2. Retaining 14(b) and thus continuing the jurisdiction of the States over right-to-work laws?	80	13	7
E. ANTIPOVERTY			
During the last session, Congress appropriated a total of \$1,800,000,000 for the 2d year of antipoverty programs. San Francisco is to receive over \$3,000,000 for such programs as part-time jobs for college students, adult basic education, day care centers, and preschool training for children from lower income families. In your opinion, these programs—			
1. Are having a positive impact on the community?	30	41	29
2. Cause little impact on the community?	53	18	28
3. Cannot be evaluated due to their relatively short existence?	77	10	13

Extending the Enrollment Deadline for Supplemental Medical Insurance for Our Older Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, although I am well aware that the Social Security Administration is making and will continue to make every possible effort to encourage our older people to timely enroll, by today's end, under the new medical insurance plan it appears reasonably certain that, through no substantial fault of their own, a great many of our older citizens will not meet this deadline.

Some of these people are waiting to try to find out what changes may occur in their present medical insurance coverage or what plans their employer may have for providing medical insurance after the new medicare program takes effect. In quite a few cases it seems employers and insurers will not have time, previous to the deadline, to properly and fully advise our older citizens on these scores.

Beyond this, there are a surprising number of people, who have difficulty in obtaining all the identification documents, et cetera, necessary for enrollment and additional difficulty in decid-

ing whether or not they should enroll in the medical insurance plan after any changes in the private plans being offered have been announced.

As you know, the present law does have a provision permitting an individual to enroll after March 31 if he or she can show good cause for not having enrolled earlier. However, under this provision insurance protection cannot begin until 6 months after the enrollment. In other words, those who enrolled in April would not be given protection until October and if he or she enrolled in May they would not be protected until November.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this protection delay objectively appears too stern and severe a penalty to inflict upon any of our older citizens who may have been delayed from timely enrollment in this insurance program through no fault of their own.

In an effort, Mr. Speaker, to make absolutely certain that every one of our older citizens has a fair chance to make a deliberate and considered decision to become eligible under this obviously advantageous, voluntary medical insurance plan I introduced last Tuesday, March 29, a bill, H.R. 14043, to extend the enrollment deadline for supplemental medical insurance through May 31, 1966. I most earnestly hope that the esteemed Committee on Ways and Means and the House and the Senate will expedite action in the adoption of this measure, or any similar one, in the fullest consideration of the welfare and insurance protection of a great many of our elder citizens.

Fino Urges 5-Percent Tax on Betting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, in a letter to President Johnson, I recommend a 5-percent Federal tax on betting and a new Gambling Tax Unit of the Treasury Department, staffed by thousands, to enforce the tax.

In my letter, I said:

I am writing to you about a way in which the Federal Government may tap America's illegal gambling coffers without actually participating in gambling enterprises.

I urge the establishment of a 5-percent tax on betting. This would be a 5-percent tax on gambling turnover—on the Nation's overall gambling volume. It would not be the same as a tax on gambler's receipts or income.

No doubt you are aware that the British Government just announced a proposed 2½-percent tax on betting. I think they have a good idea. The problem, of course, is in the enforcement. I think it is a problem we can and should overcome. Gambling today is a \$50-billion-a-year business in the United States. That is a vast potential tax base.

To investigate gambling enterprises and provide the backbone of gambling tax enforcement, I propose a Gambling Tax Unit in the Treasury Department which would seek out gamblers and gambling the way the

Alcoholic Tax Unit does with illegal liquor dealings.

I urge that gambling enterprises be identified and their turnover estimated. A tax of 5 percent would then be imposed on that turnover. It would then be up to the gamblers to disprove the estimate or pay up. In a situation like this, tax procedure of this sort would be warranted.

With a \$50-billion-a-year taxable base to work to uncover, the potential of this tax would be great. It could reach \$2½ billion a year.

This tax would cripple illegal gambling if enforced in the way I have suggested by a powerful and well-staffed Gambling Tax Unit. It would also be a great revenue raiser. In addition, I think a tax like this would help to shift public wagering into State-run gambling enterprises.

I urge you to give real consideration to this measure. I think that such a tax, linked with the enforcement I propose, would be a social and financial boon to America. This is a better tax than the telephone tax boost. This is a better tax than the suggested 5- to 7-percent corporate and personal income tax hike.

Alaska's Gold Rush Contributes to Nationwide System of Trails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pleasant experiences of man is to strap a pack on his back or climb into a saddle and head off for adventure along a primitive trail. Not only does the experience touch the senses, but it is one of the best means I know of relieving the strain of modern living and promoting good health.

The value of hiking and riding trails is well known to the hundreds of thousands that yearly make the effort to meet nature on its own terms along trails. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, of which I was a member, pointed out in its 1962 report that trails are one of the best outdoor opportunities. President Johnson stressed the need for trails available to everyone last year in his eloquent natural beauty message.

For almost a year now, Secretary Udall has spearheaded a cooperative nationwide study of trails for the purpose of developing a comprehensive, far-sighted program that will assure adequate trail opportunities for present and future generations. This study has culminated in a proposal to establish a nationwide system of trails, which the President mentioned in his recent message on preserving our natural heritage. Today Secretary Udall submitted the proposal to the Speaker, and today I have introduced that bill and urge its early consideration and enactment.

The bill that I am introducing today would substantially contribute to meet the ever-increasing outdoor recreation needs of an expanding population by establishing a nationwide system of trails serving all sections of the country and

within easy reach of all segments of the population.

Several classes of the trails are recognized in the bill. National scenic trails would extend for hundreds of miles across whole regions of the country. Additional trails in scenic State and Federal forest and park areas would open new recreation opportunities for hikers and riders. Most important of all from the standpoint of the number of people to be served are trails that would be provided through green belts in and near our cities and metropolitan areas.

The bill includes provision for the imaginative development and expansion of each of these classes of trails. As the initial National Scenic Trail, the bill provides for the full establishment and perpetuation of the Appalachian Trail. This venerable trail, extending 2,000 miles from Maine to Georgia through 14 States has existed for many years. It was created by the efforts of thousands of volunteers who devoted their spare time and hard work to the task. It is now jeopardized by developments stemming from the increasing population pressures of the eastern seaboard, pressures that are greater than volunteer workers can hope to cope with.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with all of the public and private interests along the trail, including the Appalachian Trail Conference, to establish a firm route, to acquire the land, to upgrade the trail, and to regulate its use so that those who follow us will be able to enjoy the same quality experience which we now cherish.

The bill also earmarks 10 other potential national scenic trails for study by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, including an outstanding opportunity in Alaska which is associated with the gold rush era. Outstanding examples in Alaska are three gold rush trails, comprising the network of historic trails leading from southeast Alaska to the gold fields of the Yukon.

The tidewater terminus of the Dyea Trail and the White Pass Trail was the historic town of Skagway. The town of Haines was another historic gateway over the Dalton Trail. Trails in Federal and State park and forest areas would be given increased emphasis.

On Federal lands, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are directed to expand and upgrade the trail systems they administer. In State park and forest areas the States are encouraged with Federal assistance to do the same.

Trails in and near metropolitan areas are receiving increasing attention across the country. Much more needs to be done. Under existing authority, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development are directed to encourage the additional effort needed.

It has been customary down through the years to regard outdoor recreation as less of a necessity than other public responsibilities such as highways and water development projects. Through the efforts of President Johnson and of the

late President Kennedy, the Nation is becoming increasingly aware of the value of natural beauty and outdoor recreation to the welfare and well-being of the people. A deliberate effort is needed to protect our places of great beauty and inspiration and to make them available.

Trails to and through these great areas whether they are near at hand or far away, will help in an important way to provide the recreation opportunities that increasing millions need. The bill that I am submitting for your consideration today goes far in assuring these opportunities.

GOP Report and Proposal on Nonproliferation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following special report is being issued to the House GOP Conference by the chairman of its Nuclear Affairs Committee under date of April 1:

SPECIAL REPORT TO HOUSE GOP CONFERENCE

From: Representative CRAIG HOSMER, chairman, Committee on Nuclear Affairs.

Subject: Treaty barring nuclear weapons proliferation—Information concerning and GOP proposals.

Soon the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will be sending to the floor a resolution giving congressional blessings to the administration's efforts to negotiate a "non-proliferation" treaty (S. Res. 179 or H. Res. 673). NBC-TV on April 17, will do a well-advertised show about it. The administration is seeking to give prominence to the subject.

This special report contains background data you may need regarding it and contains GOP initiated proposals and viewpoints which I recommend to you.

TREATY BACKGROUND

Simply stated, the burden of the proposed treaty will be (1) a promise by the nuclear powers not to aid in the spread of nuclear weapons to nonnuclear powers and (2) a promise by the latter not to "go nuclear."

The 18-Nation Disarmament Committee at Geneva has negotiated on the subject intermittently for some time. Three nuclear powers are in attendance: United States, United Kingdom, and U.S.S.R. Two nuclear powers are not: France and Red China. The latter are not expected to "go along" in the near future with the treaty if it is negotiated.

U.S.-U.S.S.R. POLITICAL HANKY-PANKY

Both the United States and the U.S.S.R. have proposed their own versions of a treaty. So far the U.S.S.R. has used the negotiations mostly as a platform to shoot verbal-poisoned arrows at NATO. Most observers believe the U.S.S.R. finds nonproliferation to be in its own self-interest and expect it to commence serious negotiation when its venom is exhausted.

Some people, including myself, believe that the time will come at some appropriate point prior to the U.S. elections in November. The basis of this belief is a feeling that a certain amount of "left-handed" cooperation behind-the-scenes is going on between the current administrations of the two coun-

tries. With the Vietnam war likely to wage indefinitely, the Johnson administration will need something to go into the campaign with that can be touted as a "peace" accomplishment. Naturally, the Kosygin-Brezhnev administration will expect something in return.

NUCLEAR "HAVE-NOT" NATIONS' DEMANDS

Although the nuclear "have-not" nations presumably stand to gain as much from a pact as the nuclear "haves" in the form of a less turbulent world, they, too, are talking in terms of getting something from the "haves" for signing up. Rather than discouraging this kind of talk, the Johnson administration's position seems poised between tolerating it and encouraging it.

In return for giving up their right to go nuclear, a number of "have-nots"—some with such slight technical and industrial capabilities for atomic weapons production as to make their chatter ridiculous—are talking quid pro quo in terms of:

1. Making the "haves" get down to business on concrete disarmament steps;
2. Holding out for provisions outlawing the use of nuclear weapons, or at least prohibiting their use against nonnuclear states;
3. Demanding side agreements from nuclear powers (principally the United States) to protect them against nuclear aggression or, for that matter, against anything at all they themselves define as aggression—nuclear or otherwise.

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION BUNGLING

The nuclear "have-nots" first two conditions simply are not credible holdout positions. The third has some grains of legitimacy, but administration spokesmen and the President himself have evidenced so much equivocation and ambiguity in dealing with it there is a possibility the treaty will create more trouble for the United States than it is calculated to eliminate. The administration could be making so many loose

and general defense commitments to so many nonnuclear states to rush to their rescue that we could be triggered automatically into East-West confrontations seriously involving dangers of world war III. This will be discussed in detail in a separate special report to be issued soon.

"HAVE-NOTS" REALLY NEED "FLOWSHARE"

Actually, what the "have-nots" really need—and which neither they nor the Johnson administration yet have perceived—is in the plowshare area of peaceful atomic explosives.

The AEC is on the brink of producing practical and economic devices and techniques to put the atom's explosive power to work for mankind. They are sorely needed for such massive excavation jobs as creating a new canal supplemental to the congested Panama Canal. Other large-scale nuclear excavation needs soon will be felt to implement such bold proposals as the Amazon Basin project to turn into productive use vast South American swamps and jungles and NAWAPA (North American Water and Power Alliance) to regulate and divert this continent's rivers to meet burgeoning United States, Canadian, and Mexican requirements for water and hydropower. Much of southeast Asia and other portions of the globe also must depend on nuclear explosives for geographical face-lifting operations to reclaim land and provide an economic base for peaceful societies.

Underground there also are splendid economic potentials dependent on peaceful nuclear explosives. It is estimated the world's supply of natural gas can be doubled by nuclear fracturing of impervious gas formations deep beneath the surface.

These are but a few examples of the great future for peaceful nuclear explosives. The nuclear "have-nots" real loss from giving up nuclear development lies in the Plowshare area, not in weaponry.

UNITED STATES SHOULD SHARE FLOWSHARE

The United States not only should point this out, but should take the creative initiative of offering our Plowshare technology and devices on a fair-charge basis to any friendly country needing and wanting them. They also could perform tremendous service in our AID programs for global elimination of hunger and poverty.

In bilateral arrangements by which AEC officials retain physical custody and control of the nuclear devices until exploded, the strict provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 prohibiting turning them over to others can be met. By using a dual firing key arrangement whereby a U.S. custodian would first activate the firing circuit and the foreign official finally close it to initiate the actual firing, the limited test ban treaty's general prohibition against U.S. releases of radioactive material on foreign soil would be technically observed.

AMEND LIMITED TEST BAN TREATY TO UNCHAIN FLOWSHARE

However, as pointed out in my February 8 memorandum to you, the unrealistic provisions of the limited test ban treaty precluding release of any quantity of radioactivity—no matter how small or harmless—beyond any national boundary now paralyzes Plowshare use.

This restriction bears no reasonable relation to the purposes of the treaty. It even bars releases over empty ocean water beyond the 3-mile limit and thus we cannot proceed nuclearly with the second Isthmian Canal because of it. Until the bar is removed benefits to mankind from most Plowshare possibilities will be denied unreasonably.

Here, again, is a fruitful area for creative initiative being neglected by the administration and which only GOP sources presently are initiating proposals.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Father Lawrence E. Comey, S.J., Gonzaga College High School, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Let us all pray that God, in His infinite wisdom and profound peace, may inspire these self-sacrificing and dedicated men of the Senate who must determine that course of action which will be for the greatest common good and the future prosperity for all people—that God may inspire them to make sound judgments and wise decisions on so many weighty and pressing problems which will result in a deeply significant tranquillity within our own land and a lasting and universal accord throughout the entire world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 29, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were commu-

nicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

ECONOMIC AID TO INDIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 417)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, by unanimous consent, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

In recent months I have been watching with deep concern the emerging problem of world food supply. And I have been especially concerned with the prospect for India. During this past week I have discussed the Indian food problem with the Prime Minister of India, who has been our welcome and distinguished guest here in Washington. I am persuaded that we may stand, at this moment, on the threshold of a great tragedy. The facts are simple; their implications are grave. India faces an unprecedented drought. Unless the world responds, India faces famine.

Strong efforts by the Indian Government, and our help, have so far averted famine. But in the absence of cooperative and energetic action by the United States, by other nations, and by India herself, some millions of people will suffer needlessly before the next crop is har-

vested. This, in our day and age, must not happen. Can we let it be said that man, who can travel into space and explore the stars, cannot feed his own?

Because widespread famine must not and cannot be allowed to happen, I am today placing the facts fully before the Congress. I am asking the endorsement of the Congress for a program that is small neither in magnitude nor concept. I am asking the Congress, and the American people, to join with me in an appeal to the conscience of all nations that can render help.

I invite any information that the Congress can supply. Our people will welcome any judgments the Congress can provide. The executive branch, this Nation, and the world will take appropriate note and give proper attention to any contributions in counsel and advice that congressional debate may produce.

If we all rally to this task, the suffering can be limited. A sister democracy will not suffer the terrible strains which famine imposes on free government.

Nor is this all. The Indians are a proud and self-respecting people. So are their leaders. The natural disaster which they now face is not of their making. They have not asked our help needlessly; they deeply prefer to help themselves. The Indian Government has sound plans for strengthening its agricultural economy and its economic system. These steps will help India help herself. They will prevent a recurrence