sponsored by his friends of the American Legion, Washington, D.C., on Saturday, May 21, 1966.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR RALPH W. YARBOROUGH AT APPRECIATION DINNER FOR COL. WALDRON LEONARD, SPONSORED BY FRIENDS OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, WASHINGTON, D.C., SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1966

It gives me great pleasure to be able to join with all of you here to show our appreciation to Col. Waldron E. Leonard. Seldom do we have the opportunity of paying tribute to such an outstanding man, and such an outstanding defender and supporter of veterans. Recognition of Colonel Leonard is shown in the editorial from Stars and Stripes which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 10, 1966, to show what a wonderful job he has done.

The editorial said, in tribute to his many virtues: "To believe that he will not be sincerely missed in his accustomed haunts, that his retirement will go unremarked or will not take some of the individuality, color, interest and human warmth which his longtime sympathetic and humane qualities brought to every veteran's problem which touched their lives, their interests, and the welfare of their loved ones, would be unrealistic and untrue."

Stars and Stripes called Colonel Leonard the Capital's "most outstanding veteran", an appellation all of us will agree is most fitting.

For more than twenty years before his retirement, Colonel Leonard served as the Director of the Department of Veterans Affairs of the District of Columbia. In addition, he has been department service officer for the District of Columbia department of the American Legion and president of the Metropolitan Area Council of Veterans Organizations, representing 22 major veterans groups in the District, Maryland, and Virginia. Waldron Leonard is not one to work in behalf of veterans only during official working hours; his support of veterans, his assistance to them, is an avocation as well as a vocation, and he has devoted his total life to it, and will continue to do so even when officially "retired."

The colonel's efforts in and around this area involve far more than what I have already said. He is an active member in civic, patriotic, and religious organizations in this area; a member of the advisory committee for the USO, both national and local; he has served as the representative of the District of Columbia Commissioners on many matters pertaining to veterans and patriotic affairs; he has worked diligently on veterans' participation in four presidential inaugurals, and has been recognized for this work by both Democratic and Republican national chairmen of the inaugural committees. The distinguished service awards and special citations the colonel has received number well over a hundred and give further testimony to the quality of the work he has done and the wide range of the people who have been helped by him and who recognize his ability.

Before he came to Washington, Colonel Leonard lived in Texas. Unfortunately, I cannot claim him as a native, as he was born in the State of West Virginia. Fortunately for Texas, he went there and left a great mark on the State before he left to come here to the District of Columbia. He had already begun to develop his experience working in behalf of veterans in West Virginia, before he went to Texas.

His involvement in veterans affairs in Texas, something he did in addition to running a business, led to his being named to President Hoover's Central Relief Committee to help eliminate unemployment.

He would put in many hours of his time trying to obtain justice—and getting it—for ex-servicemen who were not getting the service or benefits or treatment they were entitled to. He looked into suspicious situations and battled past stodgy administrators to get to the heart of problems—showing he had a heart and was not just an administrator or well-meaning do-gooder. The same sympathy for the individual serviceman is one of the fine characteristics for which we honor him tonight—and it is a trait he kept throughout the period when he himself became an administrator.

Colonel Leonard started his fine administrative career working with veterans in Texas, where he was State director of the department of veterans affairs for 2 years. It is his continuing work in this area here in the District of Columbia which we are here to honor tonight.

And while he was director of veterans affairs here in the District he worked with me for seven long years to effectively aid in passing the cold war GI bill under which three million discharged veterans will be eligible to go to school next Wednesday, June 1 and two million more by 1970. I am proud to be here tonight to help honor the veterans' veteran.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 27, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Louis H. Zbinden, Jr., minister, Augusta Stone Presbyterian Church, Fort Defiance, Va., offered the following prayer:

Live life, then with a due sense of responsibility, not as men who do not know the meaning and purpose of life but as those who do. Make the best use of your time, despite the difficulties of these days.—Ephesians 5: 15 (Phillips).

Thou, Lord, who openest Thy hand to repentance, to receive transgressors, forget us not this day. Recall in us as we pause that we are Thine and give us grace to live each day with courage and infectious hope.

Though we may differ, Lord, in our strategy and methodology, let our common desire to serve, our fervor for truth, our pursuit of justice, and our concern for the unproductive unify us.

Inspire Thou, this day, those who write what others read, who speak where others listen, who act where others observe. May Thy inspiration guard us against flippancy, sham, and hypocrisy.

Ever keep us conscious, Lord, that in the hollow of Thy open hand are we kept all the day long.

Through Christ Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 23, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 13431. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; and

H.R. 13822. An act to provide for an additional Assistant Postmaster General to further the research and development and construction engineering programs of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2035. An act to provide for cost-of-living adjustments in star route contract prices; and

H.R. 8989. An act to promote health and safety in metal and nonmetallic mineral industries, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 13881) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MONRONEY, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. SCOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 13935) entitled "An act to give the consent of Congress to the State of Massachusetts to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the act of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157)," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. HRUSKA to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill S. 2999 entitled "An act to repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (act of October 22, 1965 (79 Stat, 1068))," with amendments in which concurrence of the House is requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3005. An act to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce accidents involving motor vehicles and to reduce the deaths and injuries occurring in such accidents;

S. 3484. An act to amend the act of June 3, 1966 (Public Law 89-441, 80 Stat. 192), relating to the Great Salt Lake relicted lands; and

S. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol."

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

ROBERT GERALD PERRY, FRIEND TO ALL MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago, a young man, whom I consider to be a good friend of us all, entered the Bethesda Naval Hospital. I was deeply saddened to learn that he is suffering from cancer.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of Robert Gerald Perry, who was born in Beckley, W. Va., on March 17, 1923, and who has, in his capacity as assistant to the attending physician of the Capitol since 1951, served many of us and many Members of Congress before us in a very courteous and efficient manner.

On January 31, 1941, Bob enlisted in the U.S. Navy and served continuously and honorably until his retirement and transfer to the Fleet Reserve on January 30, 1961. During his long naval career, Bob was authorized several decorations and awards, and rose to the rank of chief hospital corpsman.

To Bob, I extend my sincere appreciation for the many kindnesses and courtesies he has extended to us. To his family and loved ones, I extend my sympathy and my hope in this time of his illness.

I know my colleagues here in the House join me in the fervent hope and prayer that Almighty God will heal our stricken comrade.

AMBULANCE SERVICE FOR PUBLIC BEING KILLED BY FEDERAL REGULATION

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, I find that throughout my district, ambulance service, which historically has been provided by funeral homes, will terminate on June 20. New Federal regulations have been issued which make the cost of providing such service prohibitive. Apparently this is true throughout much of the Nation. The problem stems from regulations issued by the Department of Labor imposing the provisions of the minimum wage and hours requirements on ambulance service and from staffing requirements by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

These arbitrary rulings, which apparently were taken without regard for essential service to the public, can result in a very serious problem. Nationwide traffic accidents and the necessity for ambulance services go on, regardless of the rulings of Federal agencies. I am asking that the effective date of these rulings be postponed until further studies can be made at appropriate levels. Otherwise, an emergency situation is certain to result on the eve of the July Fourth holiday weekend when tremendous numbers of Americans take to the highways.

The problem is complicated by the fact that local counties in my State have no authority under law to appropriate funds to provide ambulance service, and it is highly questionable that hospital trustees have any such authority. There simply is no one to assume responsibility for this important service.

Even should Federal or State or county ambulance service be provided, it is deplorable if we find ourselves arbitrarily forcing another segment of the business community into governmental operation and control.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. 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. 153]

Abernethy	Gubser	Murray
Addabbo	Gurney	Nelsen
Andrews, Glenn	Hagan, Ga.	O'Konski
	Halpern	Pelly
Ashbrook	Hansen, Iowa	Pepper
Ashmore	Harsha	Powell
Baring	Harvey, Ind.	Pucinski
Blatnik	Henderson	Purcell
Boland	Hicks	Quillen
Callaway	Hull	Reid, N.Y.
Cederberg	Jarman	Reifel
Celler	Johnson, Okla.	Resnick
Clausen, Don H.	Johnson, Pa.	Rhodes, Ariz.
	Jones, N.C.	Rodino
Clawson, Del	Karth	Rogers, Tex.
Colmer	Keith	Roncalio
Conte	Kelly	Rooney, N.Y.
Conyers	King, N.Y.	St Germain
Corbett	Kluczynski	Scheuer
Cramer	Kupferman	Shipley
Curtis	Langen	Smith, N.Y.
Dulski	Long, La.	Stephens
Evans, Colo.	Long, Md.	Stratton
Farbstein	McCarthy	Sullivan
Farnsley	McDowell	Tenzer
Flynt	Mackay	Toll
Fogarty	Mackie	Utt
Frelinghuysen	Martin, Mass.	Waggonner
Fulton, Pa.	Miller	Weltner
Gallagher	Morris	Whitten
Gilbert	Morse	Williams
Goodell	Multer	Willis
Gray	Murphy, N.Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 335 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

REVISING POSTAL RATES ON CERTAIN FOURTH-CLASS MAIL

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to provisions of clause 22 of rule XI and by direction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I call up House Resolution 875 providing for the consideration of H.R. 14904, which has been pending before the Committee on Rules for more than 21 calendar days without being reported by the said committee.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 875

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14904) to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 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. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 875 provides for an open rule, with 3 hours of debate, on H.R. 14904, the bill to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, and for other purposes.

I sponsored H.R. 14904 on the basis of an official recommendation of the Postmaster General. It is concerned primarily with parcel post.

The Postal Rates Subcommittee of the Committee on Postal Office and Civil Service held extensive hearings last year, and 19 days of hearings this year, on legislation to solve the critical situation of our parcel post system. No bill ever had this much consideration by our subcommittee or full committee. Even these exhaustive hearings are not the full measure of attention accorded the deteriorating parcel post service in recent years. This present problem is not anything new. Every Postmaster General who has served in the last 18 years has sought corrective measures. Three years ago the Post Office and Civil Service Committee took up an emergency recommendation of former Postmaster General J. Edward Day but, reaching no agreement on his proposal, adopted a temporary expedient which expires 3 days from now, on June 30.

Public Law 199, 83d Congress, effective January 1, 1952, has proved to be an unjustifiable burden on the public and the Nation's economy. That law sharply cut back size and weight limits on packages that may be sent by parcel post. This caused terrific hardship on millions of Americans. Even worse, it is highly discriminatory and has caused wide confusion and chaos for the mailing public because of the hodgepodge of rules it laid down as to who could mail and how much where.

I would like to cite two or three examples to illustrate just how confusing this situation now is.

A man and wife living in my hometown of Hammond, La., wish to mail identical 25-pound Christmas packages to their two sets of parents. All post offices involved are first-class post offices. The husband's parents live in Baton Rouge, less than 150 miles from Hammond, so the 25-pound package can be mailed, as the weight limitation for post offices less than 150 miles is 40 pounds. The wife's parents live in Shreveport, more than 150 miles away. The package cannot be mailed since it is more than the 20-pound limit which applies to first-class post offices more than 150 miles apart.

Lest anyone think that this strange business is confined to my home State only, I would like to give you an example of how the present system works in the case of a business firm in Buffalo, the second largest city in New York, which receives an order from Jersey City, the second largest city in New Jersey. The item ordered weighs 21 pounds. Since the two cities have first-class post offices and are more than 150 miles apart, the item, being over 20 pounds, cannot be mailed.

However, another patron who lives in Wainwright, Alaska, a town of 253 people, above the Arctic Circle and 4,200 miles away, places an order for three of the items that were too heavy for mailing from Buffalo to Jersey City. The combined weight of the three articles being less than the 70 pounds applicable to parcel post mailed to Alaska, permits the articles to be placed in a single carton and mailed to Alaska by parcel post. However, not even one of the articles could be mailed to the neighboring State of New Jersey.

Another example can be used on the basis of a manufacturer who is a constituent of Congressman MORRIS K. UDALL in Tucson, Ariz., who wishes to send an item weighing 70 pounds and measuring 100 inches to a constituent of Congressman OLSEN in Helena, Mont., which has a population of over 20,000. The article may not be mailed because the post offices are first-class post offices where the maximum weight is 20 pounds and the maximum size is 72 inches. However, the same article could be mailed to a more fortunate constituent of Congressman OLSEN, who lives in Silverbow, Mont., a fourth-class post office, where the maximum weight of 70 pounds and the maximum size of 100 inches are applicable.

The examples I have given are by no means unrepresentative for they happen literally millions of times a year in this country and they add immeasurably both to the demands on the time of our postal clerks who have to try to explain the existing provisions of law, and to the demands of our patrons who seem to feel that this is a prime example of how the Government operates when left to its own devices.

An amendment to the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, prohibits withdrawal from the Treasury of appropriated funds for any postal activity, if the variance between parcel post revenues and expenses is greater than 4 percent, unless the Postmaster General initiates action to adjust rates or conditions of mailability—other than sizes and weights—on parcel post, or both, to bring the variance to 4 percent or less. When agreement could not be reached in 1963 on a permanent solution to the parcel post problem, the Congress in Public Law 88–51 granted the 3-year moratorium on the 4-percent requirement. The moratorium will terminate 3 days from now, on June 30, 1966, so that the 4-percent limitation will once more apply.

The Subcommittee on Postal Rates and the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service voted H.R. 14904 out by overwhelming margins, and the bill was reported to the House on May 18 of this year. The next day, May 19, the chairman of our committee wrote the chairman of the Rules Committee asking a prompt hearing by that committee at which a rule could be requested to bring the bill before the House. The Committee on Rules has taken no action on that request. I introduced House Resolution 875 on June 1 of this year in order to afford the House timely opportunity to consider this urgently needed legislation. On June 22 the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service specifically directed me to seek recognition to call up House Resolution 875 for consideration by the House pursuant to clause 23 of rule XI of the House.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14904 will place the parcel post system on a near break-even basis, with a variance between revenues and expenses, if any, of 4 percent or less The bill does this by providing fair and moderate rate increases on parcel post and appropriate revisions in the maximum limitations on the size and weight of parcels. According to the Postmaster General's testimony, these changes will produce approximately $102 million additional net revenue yearly as an offset to the existing deficit of $107 million—in parcel post.

The bill continues the parcel post rate-fixing authority of the Postmaster General, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It also continues the present restriction on the use of appropriated funds for postal purposes, should the variance between parcel post revenues and expenses exceed 4 percent, until the Postmaster General initiates action to adjust rates or conditions of mailability—other than size and weight limits—or both, in a manner which will bring the variance to 4 percent or less.

The major difficulties concerning parcel post stem from the two statutes noted earlier. The 4-percent variance limitation imposes an absolute revenue-expense relationship that is impossible of attainment except through frequent and exorbitant rate increases. Such rate increases are pricing the parcel post system out of the market because the system is prohibited by Public Law 199 from accepting profitable large-package business to equalize the unprofitable small-package business it must accept. The size and weight limitations imposed by Public Law 199 have resulted in a sharp and permanent contraction of parcel post volume, most of which has occurred in the more profitable large parcels.

These two statutes preclude the achievement of the break-even goal, or anything approaching it, and have precipitated a crisis in the parcel post service. Parcel post cannot possibly be maintained anywhere near a break-even basis with the present size and weight limits. Thus, we are faced with a choice of only two alternatives—we must either sensibly revise the size and weight limits, as will be done by H.R. 14904, or provide for a highly subsidized parcel post system—at a tremendous cost to the taxpayers.

The adjustments in parcel post rates and size and weight limits provided for in H.R. 14904 are supplemented, in the bill, by certain procedural changes. These procedural changes, with the continued rate-fixing authority of the Postmaster General, will require and permit the parcel post system to give the public necessary parcel service at reasonable rates and on a near break-even basis.

H.R. 14904 is a good bill and one that has been very carefully thought out. It takes into consideration the public convenience and necessity, the needs of people living in both rural and urban areas, the requirements of business and commerce, and the effect on the American taxpayer. It gives full recognition to the principle that parcel post is not a monopoly, and that it does operate, in the public interest, as a supplement to services afforded by private carriers.

The procedures and standards prescribed in this legislation, under which rate adjustments are required to maintain a proper revenue-expense relationship, will preclude the parcel post system from unduly competing with any private carrier of parcels.

Much concern has been expressed over the effect this legislation will have on employees of certain private carriers. Our committee has given this important question extremely careful consideration. We concluded that there should be no major adverse effect.

When H.R. 14904 is read for amendments, I shall offer an amendment which, by law, will require the Postmaster General to employ any person who, on the date of enactment, is employed by a private carrier of parcels and who loses such employment for reasons directly or indirectly attributable to the enactment of this legislation. The appointments will be to positions in the competitive civil service, and the appointees will receive competitive status.

Moreover, the salary of the Federal position in the postal service must be

greater than the salary for the position that was lost. In other words, the person will be given the salary step rate for the grade or level of his new position which is next higher than the salary he was receiving with his former employer, the REA Express Co.

To assure all possible protection, my amendment will also give the person credit for all service rendered to the carrier, before his separation from employment by the carrier, for purposes of annual and sick leave, civil service retirement, veterans' preference, group life and health insurance, severance pay, tenure, training, promotion, and civil service status. For purposes of all of these excellent Federal employee benefits, therefore, he will be treated just as though all of his earlier service for the carrier had, in fact, been rendered to the Government. No REA employee laid off will lose anything.

My amendment further stipulates that none of the provisions of the amendment which grant these Government benefits shall be held or considered to reduce any retirement or pension benefit to which the person, is entitled under any other law. For example, if an employee is separated by a carrier such as the REA and is appointed to a Federal postal position, as provided by the amendment, after having completed 10 years of service subject to the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended, he will continue to be eligible for a pension under that act, upon reaching the appropriate age, computed in accordance with section 2 of that act. Should he have completed less than 10 years of service subject to the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended, such service will continue to be treated, as it is now, as "employment" under title II of the Social Security Act, in accordance with section 5(k) of the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended.

My amendment defines a person who is entitled to the protection and the benefits of the amendment as meaning an "employee" as defined in section 1 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, or as defined in section 2 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947. This will cover all employees and minor officials.

Finally, in order to insure against any loss of regular career positions by postal employees, the amendment stipulates that no regular employee in the postal field service shall be reduced to substitute status by reason of the operation of the appointive requirements of the amendment as they relate to persons separated from employment with private carriers of parcels.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the adoption of my amendment will remove all fears on the part of employees of private carriers that enactment of H.R. 14904 will deprive them of gainful employment. Although our committee has believed any such fears to be groundless—the result of a propaganda campaign instituted by others with the direct intent to create fear and panic among employees—we do not question the entire sincerity of the employees themselves when they express concern about whether or not they will have jobs. It is in their interest—to lay to rest, once and for all, any concern on their part—that I am offering my amendment. I believe the amendment will have the overwhelming endorsement of this House.

Our committee is convinced that the laws which now bind parcel post to a never-ending spiral of rising rates will soon leave the average individual with no reasonably priced parcel service. We sincerely believe that the only possible alternative is to provide, as this legislation does, for certain changes in the present discriminatory size and weight limits and for reasonable rate adjustments. I also have another amendment with the effective date from 90 days after enactment to January 15, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis the issue boils down to this: In voting on House Resolution 875 and on the bill the Members will be making a choice between the preeminent interests of the public—their right to a useful, economical, and sensible parcel post service—on the one hand, and the special interests of individual private carriers for hire on the other hand. In my judgment, there can be but one choice—a vote for the resolution and a vote for the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on this proposed parcel post system reform bill, I wish to say I hope the House will vote to take it up, will consider and debate it and vote favorably on it this afternoon.

Our Postal Rates Subcommittee held 19 days of hearings on the proposal over a period of 2 months.

We were in session and listening to witnesses for 40 hours. We heard 62 separate witnesses before our subcommittee on this bill. Of those 62 who actually testified, 25 submitted supplemental statements in addition to their testimony either in response to requests from the subcommittee or on their own motion. In addition to that, 94 individuals submitted statements which were included in the record and which have been considered by the subcommittee. Beyond that the full committee met and debated this proposal for a number of hours. As a result, the full committee, your own House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported this bill out favorably with an overwhelming majority.

I approached the consideration of this measure not from the standpoint of any private companies and what effect it was going to have on them, although I was concerned with that, and not from the standpoint of the Post Office hierarchy and bureaucracy downtown but from the standpoint, since I am from Kansas, of rural people and smalltown people and the effect of the present system on them and the effect on them of the proposed reforms in the pending bill. From that point of view I can tell you that I became convinced over the course of the hearings that this reform bill was needed and would serve the best interests of the rural people and smalltown people I represent in Kansas. I commend it to you on that basis among others.

Let me give an example. Back in 1950 a 5-pound carton shipped by a farmer via parcel post to a customer 100 miles away cost 21 cents postage. Today the rate is 57 cents. If the proposed reform of the parcel post law fails, then the rate will be raised to 71 cents immediately. This action will further reduce the volume of parcel post business that is done by the Post Office Department and result in even more rate increases, because you know we in Congress require that the parcel post system operate on a break-even basis or nearly so. Parcel post service to rural America is its only real means of package delivery. It is threatened with extinction unless the parcel post laws are reformed, because rural America has no effective parcel delivery system to replace the parcel post system. Under the present parcel post law, which has been in effect since 1952, there has been a large-scale drop in parcel post volume. The great bulk of large parcels shipped between cities of first-class post office areas has shifted away from parcel post and over to other means of transportation, or else it has disappeared from the market entirely because of restrictions in sizes, weights, and distances contained in the law. As a result of this shrinking volume and because of the fact that we require that the parcel post system operate on a nearly break-even basis, the Post Office Department has had continuously and repeatedly to increase rates. That in turn results in further reductions in volume and further rate increases. Unless we change the present law, we will simply continue this spiral of shrinking volume and increasing rates until ultimately the cost of parcel post delivery to rural and smalltown America will become so exorbitant that the service will have to be discontinued, as indeed it has been sharply reduced over the last few years.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the bill we have before us this afternoon—and I hope that the House votes to take it up and consider it and vote on it favorably this afternoon—H.R. 14904, will increase volume for the parcel post system, will raise an additional $40 million revenue, and will stop the spiral of mounting rates.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of items in recent years have been removed by mail order houses from the market, because of the increase in costs to rural areas and to small town areas which I have already described.

Mr. Speaker, let me give one example of the manner in which the present confusing system limits the volume of shipments and limits commerce in smalltown areas and in the rural areas of America.

Under the present law a parcel post package mailed between first-class post offices 150 miles away is limited to 40 pounds in weight and a combined total length and girth of 72 inches. Today, a firm in Lawrence, Kans. can mail a 40-

pound parcel to Bartlesville, Okla., or Fairbury, Nebr., but cannot mail the same identical package to Dodge City, Kans. H.R. 14904 would raise the maximum limits to 40 pounds and 100 inches.

Mr. Speaker, the reform proposals contained in H.R. 14904 would standardize and simplify the entire parcel post system. This would benefit the business world, it would benefit consumers, and would benefit my constituents in Kansas, as it would preserve the parcel post system for rural areas and for smalltown areas.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will adopt the pending resolution and will favorably vote on H.R. 14904 later this afternoon.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I might say that there are 3 groups that are for this proposition: One, the large mail order houses, and one in particular, the Post Office Department, and a few misguided souls and individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], who says he is going to offer an amendment, and I understand that there might be others, which indicates how poorly this legislation is drawn.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] says, in effect, that the Post Office Department is going to employ and protect the seniority rights, and so forth, of these displaced persons. Well, this is absolutely ridiculous. It cannot be done. They can employ them, but these various workers who are going to be displaced—5,000 union members in REA and 40,000 union members of the railroad brotherhoods—have built up seniority, pension rights, and various other benefits. There is no way in the world by which they can be hired by the Post Office Department and their seniority rights protected. They could pay them a salary but they will lose all of these other benefits. But if even that were possible and if they were taken into the Post Office Department consider a letter carrier or a clerk with 15 years of seniority.

Under Mr. MORRISON'S proposal, here comes a member of the railroad brotherhoods or another union member, from the REA, who has seniority. They would bump the dedicated post office workers and believe you me, if that ever would occur, you would really run into a hornet's nest because you know how very sensitive our dedicated postal workers are when it comes to their seniority rights.

I and another Member sent to every Member of this body a list of all of the organizations that are opposed to this. There are 22 railroad brotherhoods and other union members who are violently opposed to this bill. In the hearings when the spokesman for the brotherhoods testified he was no little mouse in his statement; he was raving mad at this legislation.

These union people are so incensed at this proposition that just Thursday or Friday they even picketed the Ben Franklin station down here in protest against this bill. As I said, 22 labor organizations mostly affiliated with the AFL–CIO are violently opposed to this because it means the loss of their jobs.

In addition to those organizations, here I have in my hand one, two, three, nearly four pages, listing the names of other groups and organizations that are violently opposed.

In the last couple of days, and maybe within the last few hours, you may have received some wires. We never heard from these people before. I received about a dozen this morning and they are all identical in their language. I do not know who put the burr under their tail and got them to send these messages, but they really do not know what this is all about. They were told to send a wire or a letter and they had done so. I hope you will not pay too much attention to these various pressure group communications.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, 40,000 employees on the railroads will be displaced. Five thousand REA people will be displaced. In fact, it will put the REA out of business. And as I want to repeat and strongly emphasize, these people are not going to be able to be taken in by the Post Office Department and the seniority rights and other benefits retained. It amazes me that under our great late President Kennedy and our President today, both of them sent messages to the Speaker and to the House and to the Senate urging that we have a revision of all of the transportation facilities because they are not in the best shape—and they made particular reference to the railroads. I know this because I am also a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The railroads are in a very bad way. So we have the last two Presidents wanting to help railroad employees and another arm of the Government, the Post Office Department destroying this great industry.

There are many Members on both sides of the aisle who are opposed to this. I do not know that I should presume to have the privilege of mentioning two members of the Committee on Rules on the majority side who are opposed to it. No rule was granted because there was so much controversy about this.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this is a very politically sensitive issue. I think all of you received material from the railroad brotherhoods, the REA, the railroad clerks and motor bus operators representing the union employees who are going to lose their jobs and I hope you have had time to pursue your correspondence to find out exactly what serious consequences may result politically for anybody who votes for this legislation. There is a way out of this problem and we think it is a good way out. We are going to propose it. That we shall go into later. This is not an emergency. I have been in Congress for 10 years. I have never received one single complaint because you could not send bigger parcels.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, none of us who will speak against this rule can match the great eloquence of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] and when that eloquent gentleman took to the floor of the House in his supersensational debating fashion, he obscured anything that any of us might say in following.

However, despite eloquence of that great, distinguished, world-renowned orator [Mr. MORRISON] I take this time to present facts to you rather than oratory.

The gentleman from Louisiana used 20 minutes supposedly to debate the resolution under consideration. Except for an opening comment and closing comment asking for a vote for the resolution, the rest of his commentary was directed entirely to the bill. I think there is such little merit in the bill, I do not see how the gentleman could have used 19 minutes discussing it. But he did.

I would like to point out, some very intriguing developments here this afternoon. For example, I note as I check the record of the debate when the 21-day rule was adopted in January 1965, that the 224 Members who voted in the majority basically cast their votes on this liberalizing development on the argument that the social legislation of the Great Society needed relief from the Rules Committee, and that the 21-day rule would be specially used tc promote only administration social legislation.

The bill before us hardly falls into the category of great social legislation. It is actually against the public interest. It is against unions. It is against free enterprise. It is against investors. It is against almost anybody you could think of, including the general public. The 21-day rule is going to be desecrated to bring this bill before the House.

For example, if you want to compare the other bills that were advanced under the 21-day rule, we had the right-to-work repeal; we had the Federal Employees Salary Act, and the Equal Employment Opportunities Act. They were all brought to the floor under the 21-day rule, all administration promoted legislation. How could this bill before us in any way compare to those I have referred to?

This entire procedure, is a farce. The entire procedure is unnecessary. I would suggest to the Members one or two other intriguing points. The distinguished, eloquent, and most convincing gentleman from Louisiana also pointed out that this legislation was immediately needed. On June 30 the Postmaster General is going to be faced with technical requirements of the present law.

However, I would like to remind the Members that the Senate has yet to act on this measure. They have not even held 1 day of hearings. I presume they will have to give a little time to studying this complex subject. But I do not see why there is this drastic emergency on the House side when the other body is involved in more crucial subjects, such as

Vietnam and foreign aid, and has not had time to consider this issue.

I also point out there are alternatives. Many Members are disturbed at being caught in a position of being against the railroad brotherhoods, of being against free enterprise, against the Nation's railroads, and the fear of public irritation when this bill passes.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and I have an alternative proposal which would give the Post Office Department needed flexibility, would not penalize the railroad brotherhoods and the railroads, and would be an effective scholarly, progressive answer to this problem.

The most logical course of action would be to vote down the resolution. Then we would be very pleased to work out a practical alternative with the gentleman from Louisiana and others to see that the Post Office Department gets the additional flexibility but in such a way as not to punish the employees of the REA and other railroad employees, and in such a way as not to punish the investors of a free enterprise operation. In other words, we could create a perfect solution, rather than the very troublesome proposal before us this afternoon.

To be scholarly and statesmanlike, we should vote down this resolution and still solve all the problems inherent in this controversy. If we fail, however, in voting down the resolution, we will offer a number of constructive, practical amendments to try to salvage something in this bill.

This bill as it is written must be described as a legislative monstrosity. We are going to try to make it reasonably palatable to the conscience of the House of Representatives. We think we have amendments to do so. The key, Mr. Speaker, is really the attitude of the Members toward the employees of the railroads and the investors in the REA, the railway companies, and the attitude of the House toward the great concept we have of free enterprise.

I do not believe any Member wants to put himself into the position of deliberately penalizing free enterprise in order to expand the operations of the Post Office Department, which is the least efficient of any Federal depa tment or agency.

For those who are interested in the effectiveness of the Post Office Department in handling of parcel post, may I remind the Members that just two Christmases ago there were parcel post packages stacked up in Chicago, destined for points all across the country, which did not move out of the Chicago Post Office until the second week in January—3 weeks after the intended Christmas delivery date.

When, by passage of this legislation, we bankrupt the Railway Express Agency and give the Post Office added volume of parcel post to mishandle the Members will regret their action. I do not believe it is necessary.

If the House will defeat the resolution and then join us at a very expeditious moment, in cooperation with other gentlemen on the committee, in providing practical solutions to this problem—solutions we will have in the form of a substitute bill or any amendment that could be worked out—we believe the House would take a great progressive step.

We need not be too concerned over the pros and cons in the telegrams we have received. Most of these, as the gentleman from Nebraska pointed out, were organized rather than spontaneous or based on understanding of the bill.

We have in the House of Representatives a chance to rise above the unnecessary debate on this bill and develop practical and progressive alternatives, which are available.

I also point out to the membership the emphasis by the spokesman of the committee on the perfecting amendments to protect employees of Railway Express Agency and other railway units, which are very fascinating since, by the very fact that they are of such great concern, prove that this bill will adversely affect employment on the Nation's railroads.

The amendment, which I believe any way it is written will be unmanageable, is clearly an admission of the detrimental effects of this bill.

I also point out to the Members that fundamentally the Post Office operation of parcel post is not intended to be a competitive vehicle to private enterprise. This is exactly what it will become if this bill is passed in its present form. I suggest, therefore, that the Members display their usual interest in the public, and join the gentleman from Nebraska and myself in developing the alternatives which are possible.

I would suggest that the proper answer to the problem is not the bill before us. The proper answer is the alternatives we do have, which we can develop if the resolution is voted down.

We could, therefore, protect the integrity of the 21-day rule and we could solve all of the problems this controversy has developed.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was considered very, very carefully by the subcommittee, and it was approved by an overwhelming vote of the subcommittee. In the full committee it was approved by a vote of 17 for the bill with only 3 against.

The gentleman from Nebraska mentioned the various unions which are against the bill. There are many unions. Particularly the gentleman mentioned some who would be affected because jobs would be "bumped." I can assure the Members of this body that no postal employee's job will be "bumped."

The major postal unions, which represent more than 500,000 postal employees, are supporting this bill. In addition to that, aside from postal unions I can mention the Teamsters Union, which has more than 1.8 million members. They are supporting this bill.

It has been alleged, likewise, that there are people who might be laid off, by REA Express, who might not be able to get jobs in the Post Office Department. I explained that any employee of REA or any other parcel carrier who might lose his job because of this bill absolutely can have a postal job. They would not only get the same pay they were getting, but perhaps a little more pay, and they would get all of the fringe benefits. They would get retirement and they would get hospitalization insurance and they would get credit for the time they worked for the carrier.

So far as the railroads are concerned, a lot of the new parcel post business which will accrue to the Post Office Department will be transported on the various railroads. It is not beyond expectation that the railroads might have to take on more employees to handle the mail volume that will be put on the trains—the volume that the Post Office Department will get in additional parcel post.

It has been brought out that June 30 is the deadline.

It is, but I have a letter here from the Postmaster General. I will not read the entire letter, but it says in part:

> We now have determined we can operate normally for as much as 30 days in Fiscal Year 1967 without drawing on the general fund.

I believe if the bill is passed today and goes to the Senate it will become law before the 30-day period expires.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that there have been some wires which have come in recently from postal groups. However, I have talked to several of those who are in my district. They are always sincere, but I do not believe they are overly concerned about this. I have always been on their side, ever since I have been in the Congress.

They have had some differences with Mr. O'Brien, and perhaps this is a little ploy they can put forth to show they are not always at odds with him; I do not know.

Again I will say that there are 22 unions which are vitally opposed to this.

I will say further that the Post Office Department—and every Member of this House should know that—the Post Office Department cannot even handle the parcel post it has today, in the present sizes and weights, without having half of it busted up.

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

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule under consideration. This rule brings in order H.R. 14904, which would repeal many confusing and discriminatory provisions which have been caused by Public Law 199 enacted by the 82d Congress 15 years ago.

The legislation was enacted in an attempt to bolster the finances and the employment of the REA, otherwise known as the Railway Express Agency. Let me point out, however, that 2 years after the passage of Public Law 199, REA's volume of business shrunk to a new low. By 1958 REA was losing $35 million a year liquidation plans were formulated. A major reorganization took place and REA began to operate in the black. Thus, it is safe to assume that whatever financial stability REA en-

joys must stem from factors other than parcel post size-weight restrictions.

In terms of employment, following passage of this legislation, the number of REA employees shrunk from 46,000 to 32,000. This, Mr. Speaker, is a net loss of 14,000 jobs. It is very obvious that Public Law 199 was no boon to the employees of REA.

Equally alarming is the effect that this legislation has had upon the parcel post system. Since 1952, the parcel post system lost 40 percent of its volume measured in pounds.

Mr. Speaker, after a decade and a half has passed, we find a most unhappy situation. On the one hand, the postal service is precluded by restrictive size-weight limits from fully serving the public's needs; and, on the other hand, REA seems unwilling to provide the desired service.

It is evident to me, Mr. Speaker, that the main thrust of REA promotional efforts are directed toward quantity shipment. I might point out that REA's classed rate business has dropped from 85 percent of total volume to 23 percent.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14904 is not a piece of hastily conceived legislation. As all Members know, extended hearings were held on this measure and its overwhelming support by the Postal Rates Subcommittee and the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service are eloquent testimony as to the reasons why this rule should be granted and why this bill should receive the approval of this House.

I might say last year our subcommittee held 10 days of hearings which were supplemented this year by 19 days of hearings and that almost 200 persons have testified or filed statements for the record. Those who even opposed this bill in committee have come forward and addressed the chairman—and I have heard it with my own ears—and complimented the chairman for his fairness and understanding in giving everybody who desired to testify the opportunity to do so. I think the chairman's fairness in handling this work and his understanding of the problems which will be confronted by the workingman, the REA, the railroads, and everyone else involved is further typified and symbolized by his own expression of interest this morning in support of this rule when he said that he would propose an amendment to take care of anyone who might be displaced in his employment by reason of the enactment of this legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me go on to say and point out to you some of the quirks in the present law. For example, a parcel mailed by one of my constituents in Jersey City may be 73 inches in dimension if mailed to Mantua, N.J., but the same parcel cannot be mailed to Warren, Pa. A parcel may be mailed from Jersey City to New York City if it weighs 21 pounds. But, the same parcel cannot be sent to Boonville, N.Y.

Mr. Speaker, this situation cries out for correction.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the rule now under consideration.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. 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 222, nays 148, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

YEAS—222

Adams	Gonzalez	Olson, Minn.
Albert	Grabowski	Ottinger
Anderson, Tenn.	Gray	Patman
Annunzio	Green, Oreg.	Pepper
Ashbrook	Green, Pa.	Perkins
Ashley	Greigg	Philbin
Aspinall	Grider	Pickle
Bandstra	Griffiths	Pike
Barrett	Gross	Pool
Bates	Hagen, Calif.	Powell
Bell	Hamilton	Price
Bingham	Hanley	Pucinski
Boggs	Hanna	Race
Bolling	Hansen, Wash.	Redlin
Brademas	Harvey, Mich.	Rees
Brooks	Hathaway	Reid, N.Y.
Broomfield	Hawkins	Resnick
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Reuss
Burke	Hechler	Rhodes, Pa.
Burleson	Helstoski	Rivers, Alaska
Burton, Calif.	Henderson	Roberts
Byrne, Pa.	Herlong	Rodino
Cabell	Holifield	Rogers, Colo.
Cahill	Holland	Rogers, Fla.
Callan	Horton	Ronan
Cameron	Howard	Rooney, Pa.
Carey	Hungate	Rosenthal
Casey	Ichord	Rostenkowski
Celler	Irwin	Roush
Chamberlain	Jacobs	Roybal
Chelf	Joelson	Ryan
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	St Germain
Clevenger	Jonas	St. Onge
Cohelan	Jones, Ala.	Schisler
Conable	Karsten	Schmidhauser
Conte	Karth	Secrest
Cooley	Kastenmeier	Sickles
Corman	Kee	Slack
Craley	Keogh	Smith, Iowa
Culver	King, Calif.	Stafford
Daddario	King, Utah	Staggers
Daniels	Kirwan	Stalbaum
Dawson	Krebs	Steed
de la Garza	Kunkel	Stephens
Dent	Leggett	Stubblefield
Denton	Love	Sweeney
Diggs	McFall	Teague, Tex.
Dingell	McGrath	Tenzer
Donohue	McVicker	Thomas
Dow	Macdonald	Thompson, N.J.
Duncan, Oreg.	Machen	Thompson, Tex.
Dyal	Madden	Todd
Edmondson	Mahon	Trimble
Edwards, Calif.	Mathias	Tunney
Edwards, La.	Matsunaga	Tupper
Ellsworth	Meeds	Udall
Evins, Tenn.	Miller	Ullman
Fallon	Mills	Van Deerlin
Farnsley	Minish	Vanik
Farnum	Mink	Vigorito
Fascell	Moeller	Vivian
Feighan	Monagan	Waldie
Fisher	Moorhead	Walker, N. Mex.
Flood	Morgan	Watts
Foley	Morrison	White, Idaho
Ford, William D.	Mosher	White, Tex.
Fraser	Moss	Wilson, Bob
Friedel	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson, Charles H.
Fulton, Tenn.	Natcher	Wolff
Garmatz	Nedzi	Wright
Giaimo	Nix	Wyatt
Gibbons	O'Brien	Yates
Gilligan	O'Hara, Ill.	Young
	O'Hara, Mich.	Zablocki
	Olsen, Mont.	

NAYS—148

Abbitt	Fino	O'Neill, Mass.
Adair	Ford, Gerald R.	Passman
Anderson, Ill.	Fountain	Patten
Andrews, George W.	Frelinghuysen	Pelly
	Fuqua	Pirnie
Andrews, Glenn	Gathings	Poage
	Gettys	Poff
Andrews, N. Dak.	Goodell	Quie
	Grover	Quillen
Arends	Gubser	Randall
Ayres	Gurney	Reid, Ill.
Battin	Haley	Reifel
Beckworth	Hall	Reinecke
Belcher	Halleck	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bennett	Hansen, Idaho	Rivers, S.C.
Berry	Hardy	Robison
Betts	Hébert	Roudebush
Bolton	Hosmer	Rumsfeld
Bow	Huot	Satterfield
Bray	Hutchinson	Saylor
Brock	Jarman	Schneebeli
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Jennings	Schweiker
	Johnson, Calif.	Scott
Broyhill, N.C.	Jones, Mo.	Selden
Broyhill, Va.	Keith	Senner
Buchanan	King, N.Y.	Shriver
Burton, Utah	Kornegay	Sikes
Byrnes, Wis.	Laird	Sisk
Carter	Latta	Skubitz
Clancy	Lennon	Smith, Calif.
Cleveland	Lipscomb	Smith, N.Y.
Collier	McClory	Smith, Va.
Cunningham	McCulloch	Springer
Curtin	McDade	Stanton
Dague	McEwen	Talcott
Davis, Ga.	McMillan	Taylor
Davis, Wis.	MacGregor	Teague, Calif.
Delaney	Mailliard	Thomson, Wis.
Derwinski	Marsh	Tuck
Devine	Martin, Ala.	Tuten
Dickinson	Martin, Nebr.	Waggonner
Dole	Matthews	Walker, Miss.
Dorn	May	Watkins
Dowdy	Michel	Watson
Downing	Minshall	Weltner
Duncan, Tenn.	Mize	Whalley
Dwyer	Moore	Whitener
Edwards, Ala.	Morse	Widnall
Erlenborn	Morton	Wydler
Everett	Murphy, N.Y.	Younger
Findley	O'Neal, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—62

Abernethy	Fulton, Pa.	Mackay
Addabbo	Gallagher	Mackie
Ashmore	Gilbert	Martin, Mass.
Baring	Hagan, Ga.	Morris
Blatnik	Halpern	Multer
Boland	Hansen, Iowa	Murray
Callaway	Harsha	Nelsen
Cederberg	Harvey, Ind.	O'Konski
Clausen, Don H.	Hicks	Purcell
	Hull	Rogers, Tex.
Clawson, Del	Johnson, Pa.	Roncalio
Colmer	Jones, N.C.	Rooney, N.Y.
Conyers	Kelly	Scheuer
Corbett	Kluczynski	Shipley
Cramer	Kupferman	Stratton
Curtis	Landrum	Sullivan
Dulski	Langen	Toll
Evans, Colo.	Long, La.	Utt
Farbstein	Long, Md.	Whitten
Flynt	McCarthy	Williams
Fogarty	McDowell	Willis

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Boland with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Langen.

Mr. Conyers with Mr. Kupferman.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Shipley.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Ashmore.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Rogers of Texas.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Murray.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Mackie.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Mackay.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Long of Maryland.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.

Messrs. KORNEGAY and TUTEN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). This is District is Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUTHORIZE 14TH STREET HIGHWAY BRIDGE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill H.R. 12119 and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12119

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to reconstruct the existing substructure of the Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, including the removal, repair and modification of existing piers, and the complete reconstruction of the bridge superstructure.

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to construct bridge approaches and roads connecting such bridge and approaches with streets and park roads in the District of Columbia and with roads and park roads on the Virginia side of the Potomac River: *Provided,* That the authorization contained in this section shall not apply to any bridge approaches and connecting roads extending beyond the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, as defined in section 101 of Public Law 208, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved October 31, 1945.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such District of Columbia funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 through 8 inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to remove the existing Fourteenth Street Bridge structure, also known as the Highway Bridge, across the Potomac River, and to construct on the general alignment of such structure a highway bridge of at least six lanes."

Page 2, strike out lines 14 and 15.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I have promised some of the Members of the House that I would take just a moment to attempt to explain this legislation.

Three years ago, during the 1st session of the 88th Congress the former Director of the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic asked me to introduce a bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to reconstruct the substructure and replace the superstructure of the existing highway bridge at 14th Street, across the Potomac River. This gentleman presented this to me as a matter of considerable importance, in view of the plans to widen the four-lane Shirley Highway into an eight-lane artery and for the construction of the Southwest Freeway, with a consequent anticipation of a heavy increase of traffic on the Rochambeau Memorial and George Mason Memorial Bridges now serving the Potomac River crossing at this point.

I complied with this request, and introduced H.R. 6744 on June 3, 1963, to authorize this project and the appropriation of the necessary funds. However, our committee received no report on this bill from the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, and no further action was taken at that time.

Early this year, it was announced that the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic had received some $300,000 in their appropriation for planning and design of a replacement structure on the general alinement of the old highway bridge.

Upon this evidence of renewed interest in this project, I was pleased to introduce H.R. 12119, identical to my former bill, to provide the necessary authorization.

At a public hearing on this bill, the District of Columbia Engineer Commissioner and officials of the District of Columbia Highway Department informed us that while it had been thought several years ago that reconditioning and reuse of the present bridge piers would be practical, a more thorough inspection of the condition of these piers, including boring and testing, has made it obvious that this is not the case. They cited examples of deterioration in these present piers sufficient to convince us that their complete replacement will be the only practical procedure. For this reason, even though the original language of my bill would probably have permitted this replacement, we amended the bill in accordance with the District of Columbia Commissioners' request, so as to leave no possible question on this point.

The present planning for this bridge has been on the basis of a four-lane span. However, I and my colleagues on the committee took the view that this would almost certainly prove to be inadequate in the not-too-distant future. When it is considered that approximately 130,000 vehicles per day now cross the 2 present bridges at 14th Street, and that this is an increase of nearly 150 percent in the past 9 years, it seems reasonable to doubt that 4 new lanes of crossing will long be adequate for future traffic demands.

Hence, realizing that more lanes in the original construction of this new bridge will be much less costly than adding new lanes in years to come, we amended this bill also to specify that this structure be at least six lanes in width.

In view of the ever-increasing traffic problems in the Washington metropolitan area, particularly with respect to the arteries bearing traffic between the District and the suburbs, I cannot emphasize too strongly the urgent need for approval of this new crossing for the Potomac River.

Mr. Speaker, there was a great deal of question as to whether or not the District of Columbia Commissioners have the authority to construct such a facility, without additional congressional authorization.

The bill was originally opposed by the District Commissioners because they felt that it would establish a precedent wherein in the future any time new river crossings over the Potomac River were constructed, they would have to obtain congressional authorization. And, that was just the reason why the committee felt that this legislation should be approved, in that it would require the District Commissioners to come before the Congress for authority for any new construction of a river crossing.

Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General supported the committee's view that legislation should be required. The Commissioners ultimately agreed with the committee on this point, and stated that they would await authorizing legislation, but at the same time they wanted the committee to indicate that they felt the Commissioners had the authority to go ahead with freeway and highway construction in the District, without further congressional authorization. It was proposed that the committee indicate its agreement with that theory in the report on this bill.

Language to accomplish this was recommended as follows:

PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR INCLUSION IN COMMITTEE REPORT ON 14TH STREET BRIDGE BILL

The committee, in the course of its consideration of the bill, inquired into the authority of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia under existing law to undertake highway construction projects, both those essentially of a local nature and those involving the extension of the Interstate Highway System into and through the District of Columbia. As a result of its inquiry, the committee is persuaded that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia presently have authority under existing law to undertake highway projects in that area of the District of Columbia east of the Potomac River. However, the committee is of the view that this authority of the Commissioners is not so broad as to extend to

the construction of interstate bridges across the Potomac River, between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia. Accordingly, the committee considers it necessary that the Congress enact legislation specifically authorizing the construction by the District of Columbia of any interstate bridge which crosses the Potomac River.

Some members of the committee felt that this legislation was not pertinent to highways and freeways, and that it would be improper to put such a statement in their report on this particular legislation.

However, Mr. Speaker, there was no argument whatsoever made but what the Commissioners do have the authority to go ahead with whatever freeway or highway construction in the District of Columbia they felt was feasible, without having to come to Congress for specific congressional authorization.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we do feel that they should have legislative authority before they construct any new crossings over the Potomac River, particularly an interstate facility.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McMILLAN. I believe the gentleman will recall that we did not make any agreement that would bind any future Congresses concerning the highways in the District of Columbia in connections with authorizing new highways and we did not give them any new authority or bind any new Congress on this subject.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The gentleman is correct. We are not attempting to bind any future Congress. We had agreed, let me state, that we did not believe that they needed congressional authorization to proceed with highway construction. Whatever a future committee or Congress might do, I would not know.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Virginia if he can tell us approximately what this is going to cost.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. $12.4 million.

Mr. SPRINGER. By whom is that to be paid?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Ninety percent will come out of the interstate highway trust fund because it is a part of the Interstate Highway System. The other 10 percent will come out of the District of Columbia appropriations because it is entirely within the boundaries of the District of Columbia. Incidentally, I might point out to the gentleman that this legislation is not only affirming the necessity for the construction of a new bridge but also establishing the fact that legislative authorization for this construction and similar facilities in the future will be required.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the distinguished gentleman this question? This is not a substitute for the Three Sisters proposed bridge; is it?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. It is not. The Three Sisters proposed bridge will be part of another Interstate Highway System, Route No. 66. Before such a bridge can be built legislation authorizing the construction would have to be approved by the Congress. That is the point I was trying to make in the statement I just made.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia says that the proposed $12,400,000 expenditure for another bridge across the Potomac is to be financed 90 percent by the Federal Government. How much money does the District of Columbia get for interstate highway purposes, if that is where the bridge money is coming from?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. All of the highways constructed in the District of Columbia which are a part of the Interstate Highway System, will receive 90 percent of the cost from the interstate highway fund just as any other State would receive.

Mr. GROSS. My question is directed to the proposition that we seem to be getting shortchanged on interstate highway funds in the State of Iowa. How does it come about that they can with the greatest of ease spend another $12½ million on a bridge over the Potomac River connecting the District of Columbia and the State of Virginia. How much is the State of Virginia going to put into this bridge?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. They will put in their share of all of the approaches to the 14th Street Bridge—that portion of Route No. 95, which is 10 percent, up to Route No. 7, which is 5 percent, and from Route No. 7, on to the 14th Street Bridge. This was provided for by special congressional legislation. They will put in 50 percent of the cost of their secondary roads and approaches that bring the traffic up to the 14th Street Bridge.

Let me point out to the gentleman, actually if this bridge and similar bridges which are part of the interstate highway program are not built we could have Interstate Route 95 coming up to the Potomac River into a bottleneck or becoming a dead end. This, of course, would be ridiculous.

Mr. GROSS. I understand. I travel that road every day. It is true, is it not, that only a comparatively few feet of the expense will be borne by the State of Virginia?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I do not believe that any of the cost of the bridge itself will be borne by the State of Virginia. Only the approaches on the Virginia side will be paid for by Virginia.

Mr. GROSS. And only a few feet of the approaches will be paid for by the State of Virginia?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. All of the approaches on Virginia soil will be paid for by the State of Virginia except that portion that is paid for out of the interstate highway funds, which is a national program.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any idea of the amount of money committed to the District of Columbia for interstate road building purposes?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I believe there is approximately $300 million allocated as of this date.

Mr. GROSS. My point is that I hope the cost of this bridge is not being taken out of our hides in the State of Iowa because we are now being shortchanged. I hope it is not going to go to the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

Who made the determination, with respect to the present bridge which was carrying traffic up to the time it was abandoned? Who made the determination that it was not capable of continuing to carry traffic—can the gentleman tell me?

Mr. McMILLAN. I should like to state, Mr. Speaker, that the District Commissioners are supposed to make that determination, including the District of Columbia Engineering Commissioner.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that the existing bridge that stands there today was carrying 100,000 vehicles a day up to the moment use of it was discontinued?

Mr. McMILLAN. I understand the bridge was carrying 100,000 vehicles each day, and all of a sudden they stopped using it when they opened the new bridge; causing the same bottleneck we have had before the new bridge was opened for traffic use.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot understand why the bridge is not usable today.

Mr. McMILLAN. We made an effort to get that information, and we have learned that some consulting engineers decided that the understructure of the bridge was not safe. I of course, have my own opinion and certainly believe the reason for not continuing to use this bridge is because the Commissioner and Fine Arts Commission want a new, modern bridge to replace the old overloaded steel structure.

Mr. GROSS. I wanted to be sure that the proposed new bridge is not being built simply because of the superstructure of the old bridge. I hope there is justification for the building of a new bridge other than simply because the present structure does not add to the scenic beauty of the polluted Potomac River where 14th Street now crosses it.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I think the gentleman has made an excellent point. That was the original purpose or objective of this legislation, to explore why the old 14th Street Bridge could not be used. As was stated a moment ago, we were asked to sponsor legislation to permit the Commissioners to restore the old 14th Street Bridge, and the engineers determined that restoration was not economically feasible. The committee has been assured that a most thorough examination by recognized experts has been made and we accept their recommendation that the old bridge should be torn down.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 12119 is to authorize the replacement of the old Highway Bridge across the Potomac River at 14th Street

with a new bridge structure of at least six lanes. Also, the bill will authorize the construction of bridge approaches and roads connecting this bridge with streets, roads, and park roads in the District of Columbia and on the Virginia side of the river.

BACKGROUND

The present old bridge, a 2,234-foot pin constructed span truss structure, was built in 1904 as a replacement for the Old Long Bridge of Civil War time. In 1946, some 52,000 vehicles per day crossed this bridge.

In 1946, Congress authorized construction of two new bridges in the immediate vicinity of the Highway Bridge (Public Law 79-516, approved July 16, 1946, 60 Stat. 566). The first of these to be constructed, the Rochambeau Memorial Bridge, was opened in May 1950, to serve northbound traffic. The second span, the George Mason Memorial Bridge, was completed and opened in January 1962, to serve southbound traffic. Upon the opening of the George Mason Bridge, the old Highway Bridge was closed.

By December 1965, the traffic on these 14th Street bridges had risen to 129,500 vehicles per day, with rates up to approximately 140,000 vehicles per day having been experienced in July 1964 immediately prior to the opening of the outer circumferential highway—Interstate Route 495—and the Anacostia Freeway—Interstate Route 295—both of which have provided a bypass to the Highway Bridge crossing.

At present, Interstate Route 95—Shirley Highway—is being widened from four lanes into an eight-lane facility, to provide for three lanes in each direction plus two reversible lanes, and the opening of portions of the inner loop in the District of Columbia is also currently underway. With the completion of these projects, the anticipated evening peak traffic demands will exceed the capacity of the Rochambeau and George Mason Bridge. Further, when the Southwest Freeway connections now underway are completed, an estimated 9,000 additional vehicles per hour will be funneled into the 14th Street corridor.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

In June 1963, at the request of the District of Columbia Highway Department, a bill was introduced (H.R. 6744) to authorize the construction of this third 14th Street span, the future need for which was foreseeable then. At that time, the Highway Department expressed the opinion that the existing piers of the old bridge could be used, necessitating only a new superstructure, the cost of which was estimated at between $3 million and $5 million, at least 90 percent of which was to be provided through Federal funds for interstate highway aid. Your committee referred this bill to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and to other agencies for report. However, these reports were never received by the committee, and hence no further action was taken at that time.

In fiscal year 1965, the District of Columbia Highway Department received $300,000 in its appropriation for the preparation of plans and specifications for a proposed replacement bridge at 14th Street.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to replace the existing Fourteenth Street Bridge, also known as the Highway Bridge, across the Potomac River, and for other purposes."

SHRINE CONVENTION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1178) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 93d annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, District of Columbia, in July 1967, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1967, Inc., on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the ordinary resolution that is considered in connection with events of this kind?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct. Every time the Shrine, the American Legion, or any other organization of that type desires to hold their convention and a parade in Washington, D.C., a resolution such as this is proposed to give the organization permission and an opportunity to rent concessions, and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

PURPOSE OF THE JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this joint resolution is to authorize the District of Columbia Commissioners and certain Federal officers to provide for the comfort and protection of all persons within the District of Columbia during the 93d annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America which will convene in the District of Columbia on July 10, 1965, and conclude 3 days later on July 13, 1965.

The committee has been advised that the magnitude of the forthcoming Shrine convention will present special problems, as well as exert a heavy burden on the municipal services of the city. These problems relate to the handling of traffic and large crowds, and the erection of reviewing stands for the Shrine parade. In addition, there is a need for the services of the Police Department and the Department of Public Health to be adequately supplemented in order to protest the personal safety and health of the citizenry of the District and the many visitors who will be here.

The enactment of House Joint Resolution 1178 will in some large measure take care of these related problems and provide the District Commissioners and certain Federal officials with the authority needed to cooperate fully with Shrine officials in implementing a safe and successful Shrine convention in the District of Columbia.

PRECEDENTS

Legislation similar in scope to House Joint Resolution 1178 has been enacted in the past years when conventions and other public gatherings have brought large numbers of people into the District. The most recent enactment is the joint resolution approved May 22, 1965—Public Law 89-25, 79 Stat. 114—relating to the 1966 National Convention of the American Legion.

Similarly, another resolution—Public Law 88-386, 78 Stat. 337—was adopted and approved on July 28, 1964, in connection with the Shrine convention held in Washington in July 1965.

Further, the reported joint resolution is patterned substantially after the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act of 1965—70 Stat. 1049.

WHAT THE JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDES

The principal provisions of House Joint Resolution 1178 are as follows:

First. The Commissioners are authorized and directed to make regulations to preserve peace and order, specially regulate traffic, and issue special licenses to peddlers and vendors, such regulations to be effective during the period of the meeting, defined by the resolution as a 10-day period beginning July 7, 1967, and ending July 16, 1967, both dates inclusive.

Second. Appropriations are authorized to pay the cost of providing additional municipal services and to pay for other municipal expenses connected with the convention, estimated at $225,000.

Third. The Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioners are authorized to grant permits for the use of public space under their respective jurisdictions, subject to certain limitations imposed by the resolution.

Fourth. The Commissioners are authorized to permit the installation of temporary electrical facilities of all kinds, also subject to certain limitations imposed by the resolution.

Fifth. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to lend certain equipment belonging to the Department of Defense to be used in connection with providing for the well-being of the expected crowds, also subject to limitations imposed by the resolution.

Sixth. The temporary placing of wires along and across the line of any parade for use by electric lighting and communications concerns is authorized.

Seventh. The effective period of the regulations authorized to be adopted and a penalty for their violation are prescribed.

Eighth. The resolution requires the corporation—Imperial Shrine Convention, 1967, Inc.—to indemnify and save harmless the District of Columbia and Federal Government against loss, damage, or liability, and provides that such

requirement shall be satisfied by the corporation's submitting to the District of Columbia Commissioners and the Secretary of the Interior an insurance policy or a bond, or both, in such amounts and subject to such terms as these officials may deem adequate to protect the interests of the respective governments.

Ninth. Finally, the resolution specifically exempts from its provisions the U.S. Capitol Buildings and Grounds, and other property under the jurisdiction of the Congress.

Your committee was informed that the Imperial Shrine Convention is held annually in one of the major cities of the United States, Canada, or Mexico, and further, that when the forthcoming 93d annual session is scheduled to convene in the District of Columbia, it is estimated, as in 1965, that over 100,000 Shrine delegates will be in attendance. As is generally the custom, the Shrine during the course of its convention will present two parades, one at night, and the other during the day. It is anticipated that these colorful events will attract more than a million viewers into the downtown area of the city. The committee was also advised that the many Shrine delegates with their families, and the hundreds of thousands of spectators to the Shrine parades and activities may be expected to result in the spending of $15 to $20 million in the District of Columbia during the convening of the convention.

NECESSITY FOR THIS LEGISLATION

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia urge the enactment of the joint resolution for the following reasons:

The resolution authorizes the Commissioners and certain specified Federal officials to deal with the special problems which will arise on the occasion of the convention, and which are expected to exert a heavy burden on the municipal services of the District of Columbia, and, to a certain extent, on the Federal Government. These problems relate principally to the handling of traffic and large crowds, and the erection of reviewing stands for the parade to be held in connection with the convention.

In addition, there is need for increased services by the Metropolitan Police Department and the Department of Public Health to protect the personal safety and health of the citizens of the District and the many visitors who will be present in the District for the occasion.

The Commissioners have been informed that the minimum number of persons associated with the Shrine expected to be present in the District during the convention period has been estimated at approximately 100,000. This number of persons associated with the Shrine, together with the many other persons who may come into the District to witness convention activities, will generate a need for increased activity on the part of the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

The Commissioners, in the belief that the resolution will adequately provide for the safety and well-being of all persons in the District of Columbia during the period of the 93d annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, recommend its approval.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 1178

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the period of the ninety-third annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in the District of Columbia from July 10 to July 13, both dates inclusive, the Commissioners are authorized and directed to make all reasonable regulations necessary to secure the preservation of public order and protection of life, health, and property; to make special regulations respecting the standing, movement, and operation of vehicles of whatever character or kind during said period; and to grant under such conditions as they may impose, special licenses to peddlers and vendors for the privilege of selling goods, wares, and merchandise in such places in the District of Columbia, and to charge such fees for such privilege, as they may deem proper.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent or agents;

(b) The term "corporation" means the Imperial Shrine Convention, 1967, Incorporated, or its designated agent or agents;

(c) The term "meeting" means the ninety-first annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in the District of Columbia on July 10, 11, 12, and 13, 1967;

(d) The term "period" or "meeting period" means the ten-day period beginning July 6, 1667, and ending July 15, 1967, both dates inclusive;

(e) The term "Secretary of Defense" means the Secretary of Defense or his designated agent or agents; and

(f) The term "Secretary of the Interior" means the Secretary of the Interior or his designated agent or agents.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, payable in like manner as other appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia, to enable the Commissioners to provide additional municipal services in said District during the meeting period, including employment of personal services without regard to the civil service and classification laws; travel expenses of enforcement personnel, including sanitarians, from other jurisdictions; hire of means of transportation; meals for police, firemen, and other municipal employees; construction, rent, maintenance, and expenses incident to the operation of temporary public comfort stations, first-aid stations, and information booths; and other incidental expenses in the discretion of the Commissioners.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of such officer as may exercise jurisdiction over any of the Federal reservations or grounds in the District of Columbia, is authorized to grant to the corporation permits for the use of such reservations or grounds during the meeting period, including a reasonable time prior and subsequent thereto; and the Commissioners are authorized to grant like permits for the use of public space under their jurisdiction. Each such permit shall be subject to such restrictions, terms, and conditions as may be imposed, by the grantor of such permit. With respect to public space, no reviewing stand, or any stand or structure for the sale of goods, wares, merchandise, food, or drink shall be built on any sidewalk, street, park, reservation, or other public grounds in the District of Columbia, except with the approval of the corporation and with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior or the Commissioners, as the case may be, depending on the location of such stand or structure. The reservation, ground, or public space occupied by any such stand or structure shall, within ten days after the end of the meeting period, be restored to its previous condition. The corporation shall indemnify and save harmless the District of Columbia and the appropriate agency or agencies of the Federal Government against any loss or damage to such property and against any liability arising from the use of such property, either by the corporation or a licensee of the corporation.

SEC. 5. The Commissioners are authorized to permit the corporation to install suitable overhead conductors and install suitable lighting or other electrical facilities, with adequate supports, for illumination or other purposes. If it should be necessary to place wires for illuminating or other purposes over any park, reservation, or highway in the District of Columbia, such placing of wires and their removal shall be under the supervision of the official in charge of said park, reservation, or highway. Such conductors with their supports shall be removed within five days after the end of the meeting period. The Commissioners, or such other officials as may have jurisdiction in the premises, shall enforce the provisions of this joint resolution, take needful precautions for the protection of the public, and insure that the pavement of any street, sidewalk, avenue, or alley which is disturbed or damaged is restored to its previous condition. No expense or damage from the installation, operation, or removal of said temporary overhead conductors or said illumination or other electrical facilities shall be incurred by the United States or the District of Columbia, and the corporation shall indemnify and save harmless the District of Columbia and the appropriate agency or agencies of the Federal Government against any loss or damage and against any liability whatsoever arising from any act of the corporation or any agent licensee, servant, or employee of the corporation.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to lend to the corporation such hospital tents, smaller tents, camp appliances, hospital furniture, ensigns, flags, ambulances, drivers, stretchers, and Red Cross flags and poles (except battle flags) as may be spared without detriment to the public service, and under such conditions as he may prescribe. Such loan shall be returned within five days after the end of the meeting period, the corporation shall indemnify the Government for any loss or damage to any such property, and no expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, replacement, or operation of such equipment. The corporation shall give a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

SEC. 7. The Commissioners, the Secretary of the Interior, and the corporation are authorized to permit electric lighting, telegraph telephone, radio broadcasting, and television companies to extend overhead wires to such points along and across the line of any parade as shall be deemed convenient for use in connection with such parade and other meeting purposes. Such wires shall be removed within ten days after the conclusion of the meeting period.

SEC. 8. The regulations and licenses authorized by this Act shall be in full force and effect only during the meeting period, but the expiration of said period shall not prevent the arrest or trial of any person for any violation of such regulations committed during the time they were in force and effect. Such regulations shall be published in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia and no penalty prescribed for the violation of any such regulation shall be enforced until five days after such publication. Any person violating any regulation promulgated by the Commissioners under the authority of this Act shall be fined not more than $100 or imprisoned for not more than thirty days. Each and every day a violation of any such regulation exists shall constitute a separate offense, and the penalty prescribed shall be applicable to each such separate offense.

SEC. 9. Whenever any provision of this Act requires the corporation to indemnify and save harmless the District of Columbia and the Federal Government or any agency thereof against loss, damage, or liability arising out of the acts of the corporation or its licensee, or to give bond to any agency of the Federal Government guaranteeing the safe return of property belonging to such agency the requirements of any such provision shall be deemed satisfied upon the submission by the corporation to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the several agencies of the Federal Government, of an insurance policy or bond, or both an insurance policy and bond, in such amount or amounts and subject to such terms and conditions, as the said officials in their discretion approve as being necessary to protect the interests of the respective governments.

SEC. 10. Nothing contained in this Act shall be applicable to the United States Capitol Buildings or Grounds or other properties under the jurisdiction of the Congress or any committee, commission, or officer thereof.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike "July 13" and insert "July 13, 1967," in lieu thereof.

Page 2, line 20, strike "ninety-first" and insert "ninety-third" in lieu thereof.

Page 3, lines 1 and 2, strike the dates and in lieu thereof insert "July 7, 1967" and "July 16, 1967", respectively.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

INCREASING ANNUITIES PAYABLE FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' RETIREMENT AND ANNUITY FUND

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11439) with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "the first day of the third month which begins after the date of enactment of this amendment" and insert "December 1, 1965,".

Page 2, line 1, strike out "such effective date" and insert "December 30, 1965,".

Page 2, lines 6 and 7, strike out "latest published on the date of enactment of this amendment," and insert "of July 1965".

Page 5, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect December 1, 1965."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished chairman if he will explain this? I do not have it on my list.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I discussed this bill thoroughly with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] and he was agreeable to bringing it up at any time I thought convenient to bring it up.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the distinguished chairman explain the bill, please?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 11439 is to accomplish essentially a twofold objective in amending the District of Columbia Teachers' Retirement Act, as follows:

First. Afford teachers of the District of Columbia public schools the same increase in annuities based upon increases in cost of living which were provided for all civil service retirees in the last session of the Congress, approved September 27, 1965, 79 Stat. 840.

Second. Provide, in addition to the cost-of-living adjustment alluded to in the above paragraph, an additional increase of 6½ percent in the retirement annuity of those teacher retirees whose annuity commenced on or before October 1, 1956, and an additional increase of 1½ percent for those retirees whose annuities commenced after October 1, 1956.

The amended formula, as provided in this bill, will accelerate the cost-of-living adjustments and provide timely adjustments in annuities for teacher retirees similar to those already provided civil service employees. It is anticipated that it will result in all annuitants receiving an increase of 4.6 percent, effective as of December 1, 1965.

The further amendment providing for the annuity increases to be effective as of December 1, 1965, was necessary in order to assure the teacher retirees being accorded the same benefits as those extended civil service employees.

The bill passed the House without objection, and the House Committee on the District of Columbia concurs in the Senate amendments.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the distinguished gentleman if this bill was passed in the Senate, and we are just attempting to agree with the Senate amendments?

Mr. McMILLAN. It passed the House, and the Senate amended our bill. I am agreeing to their amendments.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on the District bills being considered today.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PRACTICAL NURSES' LICENSING ACT

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 8337) to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8337

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act (74 Stat. 803; sec. 2–421, D.C. Code) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The term 'Washington metropolitan area' means that area comprising the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Maryland, the counties of Arlington and Fairfax, Virginia, and the cities of Alexandria, Falls Church, and Fairfax, Virginia."

SEC. 2. Section 10 of the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act (sec. 2–429, D.C. Code) is amended—

(1) by inserting the subsection designation "(a)" immediately before the first word of such section;

(2) by amending clause (4) to read as follows:

"(4) has been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the District of Columbia for the year immediately preceding the effective date of this Act, or for the year immediately preceding the effective date of this Act has resided in the District of Columbia and been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the Washington metropolitan area;"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) Any application made by an applicant for a license pursuant to this section which, because of noncompliance with clause (4) of subsection (a) of this section, was not approved prior to the effective date of this section shall, at the written request of such applicant made within the ninety-day period immediately following such date, be reconsidered without additional charge to such applicant other than the repayment to the District of Columbia of any fee or portion thereof which may have been refunded to the applicant by reason of the denial of a license for which application was made, and such applicant may submit, without charge, such additional information in support of such application as she may desire.

"(c) Any person who failed to apply for a license under this section because the period

during which she was actively engaged in caring for the sick did not meet the requirement that such experience shall have taken place within the District of Columbia may, within the ninety-day period immediately following the effective date of this subsection, apply for a license under this section: *Provided*, That such experience took place within the Washington metropolitan area."

SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect thirty days after its approval.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 2 of the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act (74 Stat. 803; sec. 2–421, D.C. Code) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) The term "Washington metropolitan area" means that area comprising the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Maryland, the counties of Arlington and Fairfax, Virginia, and the cities of Alexandria, Falls Church, and Fairfax, Virginia.'

"SEC. 2. Section 10 of the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act (sec. 2–429, D.C. Code) is amended—

"(1) by inserting '(a)' immediately after 'Sec. 10.'; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) (1) Upon receipt of an application, accompanied by the required fee for an original license, the Commissioners shall issue a license to practice as a licensed practical nurse, without written examination, to any person who shall make application therefor prior to the expiration of the ninetieth day immediately following the effective date of this subsection if (A) the Commissioners find that such person (i) is at least twenty-one years of age; (ii) is of good moral character; (iii) is in good physical and mental health as certified by a physician licensed to practice in the District of Columbia; (iv) has resided in the District of Columbia and been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the Washington metropolitan area for the year immediately preceding the effective date of this Act; (v) has had three or more years of experience in the care of the sick prior to the effective date of this Act; and (vi) has submitted evidence satisfactory to the Commissioners that she is competent to practice as a licensed practical nurse, and (B) either the application is endorsed by two physicians licensed to practice in the District of Columbia who have personal knowledge of the applicant's nursing qualifications and by two persons who have employed the applicant in the capacity of practical nurse, or the applicant is listed on a nurses' registry licensed in the District of Columbia.

"'(2) Any person whose application under subsection (a) was not approved because such person did not meet the requirement of clause (4) of such subsection may have such application reconsidered in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (1) of this subsection if, no later than the ninetieth day following the effective date of this subsection, such person makes a written request to the Commissioners for such reconsideration such application shall be reconsidered without additional charge to such person other than the repayment to the District of Columbia of any fee or portion thereof, paid in connection with the submission of such application under subsection (a), which may have been refunded to such person and such person may submit, without charge, such additional information in support of such application as she may desire.'"

"SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the thirtieth day following the date of the enactment of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 8337 is to correct an inequity in the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act which has prevented many practical nurses from being licensed in the District without written examination.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Section 10 of the Practical Nurses' Licensing Act—74 Stat. 803; section 2–421, District of Columbia Code—approved September 6, 1960, and effective as of July 29, 1961, provided for the licensing of practical nurses in the District, without examination, who applied for such license within 1 year after the effective date of the act (that is prior to July 29, 1962), and who also possessed certain other qualifications, including the stipulation that they must have been "actively engaged in caring for the sick in the District of Columbia for the year immediately preceding the effective date of this act."

Even though the Licensing Board decided that they would accept 9 months of practice in the District during the prescribed year as satisfying this requirement for "grandfather clause" licensing, this language has caused a great deal of protest and hardship, because of the large number of practical nurses, many of them living in the District and belonging to the Association of Undergraduate and Practical Nurses of the District of Columbia, who had happened to be assigned to cases in the suburbs during a substantial portion of the year ending July 29, 1961. This situation has created a hardship particularly for those practical nurses who may have been out of school for some years and hence are not able to pass the written theoretical examination for a license, but whose professional competence and ability are unquestionably established by many years of successful experience. Appeals have been made by the above-named association and from many individual nurses as well, for an amendment to the licensing act which would alleviate this problem, and H.R. 8337 was requested by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

A bill—H.R. 5097—was introduced in the 88th Congress to accomplish this purpose, and a public hearing was held on June 6, 1963. Meanwhile, a similar bill—S. 933—was introduced in the Senate. This bill was approved by the Senate on August 28, 1963, but with an amendment which in the opinion of your committee seriously jeopardized its effectiveness. Consequently, the House amended S. 933 by substituting the language of H.R. 5097 with some modifications. However, no further action was taken by the Senate.

H.R. 8337, introduced on May 20, 1965, is identical in its provisions to the above-mentioned bills as originally introduced in the House and the Senate during the 88th Congress.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill seeks to correct this inequity, by the following provisions:

First. Defines "Washington metropolitan area" in the usual context for purposes of this act;

Second. Amends the controversial paragraph (4) of section 10 of the Practical Nurses' Licensing Act so as to provide that a practical nurse in the District of Columbia may now qualify for a license without written examination, if, together with possessing the requirements of section 10 of the D.C. Practical Nurses' Licensing Act with the exception of paragraph (4) thereof, she resided in the District and engaged in the care of the sick in the Washington metropolitan area for the year ending July 29, 1961. Further, such practical nurses will have a period of 90 days from the effective date of these amendments in which to apply for such license without written examination. In the case of a practical nurse who may have applied for a license under section 10 of the Licensing Act and whose application was rejected for noncompliance with paragraph (4), her application may be reconsidered without the payment of any new application fee, except such part of the fee which may have been refunded her.

The amendment to this bill is purely technical in nature, for the purpose of achieving greater clarity, and does not alter the substantive nature of the original bill in any way.

It is the opinion of your committee that these amendments to the D.C. Practical Nurses' Licensing Act are overdue, in fairness to the large number of experienced practical nurses in the District of Columbia who have been denied the advantages of licensure. Also, your committee feels strongly that in view of the inadequate supply of competent nurses, the provisions of this proposed legislation will be very much in the public interest.

Following is the letter from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, under date of May 20, 1956, requesting this legislation.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, May 20, 1965.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a draft bill "To amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes."

The purpose of the bill is to amend the Act to permit the licensing, without written examination, of an applicant otherwise qualified to be a licensed practical nurse who "has been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the District of Columbia for the year immediately preceding the effective date of this Act, or for the year immediately preceding the effective date of this Act has resided in the District of Columbia and been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the Washington Metropolitan Area." The bill defines "Washington Metropolitan Area" as comprising the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Maryland, the Counties of Arlington and Fairfax, Virginia, and the cities of Alexandria, Falls Church and Fairfax, Virginia. Applicants are given ninety days after enactment

of this legislation to make application, or reapplication, without additional charge.

The Practical Nurses' Licensing Act presently provides that an applicant for an original license otherwise qualified must "have been actively engaged in caring for the sick *in the District of Columbia* for the year immediately preceding the effective date of this Act." (Emphasis supplied)

The Commissioners recognize the inequity inherent in this provision of the Act which results in the denial of a license to an applicant who has lived in the District of Columbia for many years but has been nursing outside the District during the year immediately preceding the effective date of the Act.

The Commissioners, therefore, recommend that this amendatory legislation be enacted.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN B. DUNCAN,
Acting President,
Board of Commissioners, D.C.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Texas if the sole purpose of this bill is to allow the practical nurses who live now in the District of Columbia and practice in the suburbs to come under the grandfather clause, as far as licensing is concerned?

Mr. DOWDY. That is the only purpose of the bill. That is the entire purpose of the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. In other words, it is to make eligible for licensing in the District of Columbia those practical nurses who do nothing but nurse outside the District of Columbia?

Mr. DOWDY. No. They have to be in the District of Columbia or in the suburbs as practical nurses. The bill is merely providing that they must be residents in the District of Columbia, and the practice that makes them eligible may be done in the metropolitan area, rather than just in the District of Columbia. Is that clear?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes. I understand they practice in the District of Columbia and in the suburban area, which will qualify them for a license.

Mr. DOWDY. That is correct. It does not have to be in either place. Part of it can be done in the metropolitan area, and part of it in the suburbs.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in the 86th Congress, I introduced legislation to authorize licensing of practical nurses in the District of Columbia. This bill was enacted into law on September 6, 1960, as Public Law 86–708, and became effective as of July 29, 1961.

Section 10 of this act provided for the licensing of a practical nurse in the District, without written examination, who applied for such license within 1 year after the effective date of the act—that is, prior to July 29, 1962—and who also, together with certain other qualifications, "had been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the District of Columbia for the year immediately preceding the effective date of this act."

Even though the Practical Nurses Licensing Board decided that it would be reasonable to accept 9 months of practice in the District of Columbia during the prescribed year as satisfying this requirement for "grandfather clause" licensing, this provision caused a great deal of protest because of the large number of practical nurses, many of them residents of the District and members of the Association of Undergraduate and Practical Nurses of the District of Columbia, who had happened to accept cases in the suburbs during a substantial portion of the year ending July 29, 1961, and thus could not qualify for District of Columbia licensure without examination in view of this controversial restriction. Appeals were made by the above-named association and by many individual nurses as well, for an amendment to the act which would alleviate this problem.

In the 88th Congress, after consultation with the District of Columbia Practical Nurses Licensing Board and the counsel for the Association of the Undergraduate and Practical Nurses of the District of Columbia, I introduced legislation designed to correct this unfair situation. The language of this bill was approved by the House in the form of amendment to a Senate-passed bill, but failed of further action in the Senate.

Meanwhile, this problem continues to be a source of difficulty to those practical nurses in the District of Columbia who have been out of school for some years and hence are not able to pass the theoretical written examination for licensure, but whose professional competence through years of experience is beyond question, yet who are denied the benefits of licensed status through this inadvertent and unfair technicality. The District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, in recognition of this problem, requested the bill, H.R. 8337, which I was pleased to introduce on May 20, 1965, and on which I now urge favorable action.

Briefly, this bill seeks to correct this situation by amending paragraph (4) of section 10 of the Licensing Act, to provide that a practical nurse may be licensed without written examination, as far as residence is concerned, if she practiced her profession in the District of Columbia for the year ending July 29, 1961, or if she lived in the District and practiced in the Washington metropolitan area for that year. Further, a 90-day period after the effective date of this amendment is provided during which a practical nurse who was formerly ineligible for a license without written examination because of this narrow restriction may apply for such license. In the case of a nurse who may have applied and been rejected for this reason, reapplication will not require the payment of any fee which was formerly charged her, except that part of such fee which may later have been refunded.

Enactment of H.R. 8337 will serve to increase materially the number of licensed practical nurses in the District of Columbia. I urge the support of my colleagues for this measure, to correct an inequity which has existed in the ranks of practical nurses in the District of Columbia since 1960, and also as a worthwhile public service in these times when there is a woeful lack of experienced, capable nurses.

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

There was no objection.

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

CREDIT INSURANCE WITH RESPECT TO STUDENT LOANS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 10823) relating to credit life insurance and credit health and accident insurance with respect to student loans, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Comm¹ttee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10823

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 10(2)(d) of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act (D.C. Code, sec. 35–710(2)(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The amount of insurance on the life of any debtor shall at no time exceed the lessor of—

"(1) the amount owed by him which is repayable in installments to the creditor, or

"(2) $10,000 plus the amount of any insurance with respect to indebtedness incurred to defray educational costs of a student."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the Act for the Regulation of Credit Life Insurance and Credit Accident and Health Insurance (D.C. Code, sec. 35–1604) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding subsections (a) and **(b), the amount of any credit life insurance** or credit accident and health insurance with respect to indebtedness incurred to defray educational costs of a student may include the part of a commitment that has not been advanced by the creditor."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out line 6 and all that follows down through the period and quotation marks in line 2 on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) The amount of insurance on the life of any debtor shall at no time exceed the amount owed by him which is repayable in installments to the creditor or $25,000, whichever is less. Notwithstanding the immediately preceding provision, the amount of insurance with respect to a loan commitment incurred to defray educational costs of a student may be in an amount not exceeding the fixed amount committed to be loaned under the loan commitment less the amount of any repayments made on the loan."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

There was no objection.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this proposed legislation is to authorize, in the District of Columbia, an increase in the maximum amount of credit life, health, and accident insurance with respect to debtors who have secured loans for educational or other purposes, which loans are to be repaid in installments.

BACKGROUND

In recent years, the use of installment credit loans has become increasingly common throughout the Nation. Such loans furnish a convenient means for small businesses to finance operations and the purchase of equipment and supplies. Many persons use such loans for the purchase of automobiles, major household items, and to finance education costs.

Education loans are commonly made to parents or guardians to defray the costs of educational programs for their children, which at present may vary from nominal amounts to as much as $3,500 per year per child. These loans are not limited to financing higher education but are made to assist from elementary school through graduate courses.

Your committee is informed that about 18 percent of the full-time students at one of the large local universities, or their parents, finance their educational expenses through a tuition payment plan, either with a local bank or through one of the several national plans for such loans. In most such cases, each year's contract is for approximately $2,000, so that in the normal course of 4 years, this amounts to an $8,000 contract. Longer educational programs, such as law, medicine, or other graduate study, may involve costs which can easily reach $20,000.

In view of the constant increase in the costs of tuition, room, board, and miscellaneous expenses incident to higher education, which it is estimated will rise from 15 to 25 percent in the next 5 years, it is reasonable to anticipate that the numbers and amounts of such loans will increase materially.

As these loans for educational and other purposes may represent major financial obligations for the borrowers, the matter of protection for their families in the form of credit life, health, and accident insurance to cover the unpaid amounts, or commitments in the case of educational loans, is of great importance. The group creditor life insurance written by lenders upon the lives of borrowers is usually an option requested by the borrowers as a financial protection to their families who might have to pay part or all of the debt in the event of death.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Under existing law—64 Statutes at Large 330; District of Columbia Code, section 37–100—the maximum amount of group credit life insurance which can be issued on the life of a borrower is $5,000, regardless of whether the borrowed funds are for educational purposes or for other purposes. In view of present-day practices and requirements and the maximums applying in many other States, the maximum applying to such insurance in the District of Columbia is wholly inadequate to meet the reasonable needs of the community.

Only five States, in addition to the District of Columbia, have a statutory limit as low as $5,000 for group credit life insurance. One other State, Florida, applies this $5,000 limit only to loans which exceed 1 year's duration, allowing a $100,000 maximum of credit insurance for loans maturing within 1 year. Twenty-one States, including Maryland and Virginia, have a $10,000 statutory limit, and in six others the limit ranges from $15,000 to $25,000. The remaining 17 States either had no statutory ceiling in their group insurance statutes, or no statute at all relating to group life insurance. These limits imposed in the various States are shown in detail in the following exhibit:

STATUTORY MAXIMUM LIMITS FOR GROUP CREDIT LIFE INSURANCE

1. States (7) with $5,000 limit: Arizona, District of Columbia, Florida,[1] Kansas, Hawaii, North Carolina, Washington.

2. States (21) with $10,000 limit: California, Colorado, Connecticut,[2] Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan (if less than 100 entrants yearly $5,000), Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

3. States (2) with $15,000 limit. New York, Maine.

4. States (3) with $20,000 limit: New Mexico, Georgia, Louisiana.

5. States (2) with $25,000 limit: Arkansas, Vermont.

6. States (4) with no ceiling in Group statute: Kentucky, Indiana, Oregon, South Carolina.

7. States (1) with no provision for coverage in Group statute: Utah.

8. States (12) with no Group statute: Alaska, Alabama, Delaware, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, North Daktota, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Wyoming.

These statistics make it clear, therefore, that the amount of life insurance which has been demonstrated nationwide as necessary to meet the wishes of borrowers and of lenders, for proper debt protection, is substantially greater than the limit of $5,000 imposed by existing statute in the District of Columbia.

While these group credit insurance policies are issued to cover small business loans and major installment purchases of various types, as well as to defray costs of education, the figures cited earlier in this report indicating the cost of higher education are sufficient to establish the inadequacy of a $5,000 ceiling on such insurance relating to educational costs for students alone.

These facts point up a serious disadvantage to lending institutions in the District of Columbia, such as banks and credit unions, who wish to participate in the field of educational loans. With national finance companies and popular tuition programs offering credit life insurance with coverage up to $10,000, and with the neighboring States of Maryland and Virginia having a statutory limit of $10,000 on such credit insurance, residents of the District of Columbia wishing to finance the educational expenses for their dependents are obtaining these loans from sources outside the District, where adequate group insurance protection for these debts is available to them.

There is a further limitation in the D.C. Life Insurance Act (76 Stat. 581; D.C. Code, sec. 35–1604), wherein credit life insurance is restricted to coverage of moneys actually advanced at the time the insurance is written. The majority of the States permit a contract including coverage for the portion of a commitment for educational purposes which has not yet been advanced. This assures a student the completion of his education whether the parents leave an estate or not. In this important respect also, lending institutions in the District of Columbia are at a competitive disadvantage in the field of loans for educational costs.

These factors make for inconvenience to District residents, and also reduce the revenues to the District of Columbia.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

This bill seeks to remedy these two problems. Section 1 amends the group life insurance provision (D.C. Code sec. 35–710(2)(d)) by increasing the maximum limit for group credit life insurance on loans, for other than educational purposes, to $25,000. This insurance shall at no time exceed the amount owed by the debtor, to be repaid in installments.

However, with respect to loans for educational purposes the $25,000 maximum for group credit life insurance would not be applicable. Also, the amount of group credit life insurance, for educational purposes would be limited by the amount committed to be loaned rather than the amount actually owed by the debtor. Such insurance for educational loans may thus include both the full amount already advanced to the borrower and the balance of the commitment not yet advanced, less the amount of any repayments by the borrower.

To illustrate, assume that borrower A secures an installment loan in the amount of $5,000 for business purposes. Group credit life insurance may be issued in the full amount to be reduced by the amount of installment repayments made by A.

Before the repayment of the above loan, A secures an educational installment loan commitment in the amount of $16,000. One year later $4,000 has been advanced to the borrower and $2,000 has been repaid by the borrower. At that point the maximum amount of group credit life insurance allowed would be $14,000. One year later the borrower obtains an additional loan commitment for the purpose of covering the educational expenses of another child, in the amount of $15,000. The commitment to borrower A for educational purposes would thus become $29,000. The total amount of group credit life insurance then available to this borrower would be $29,000 for educational purposes—$14,000 plus $15,000—plus $5,000 less any repayments, on the business loan.

Section 2 similarly amends the credit life accident and health insurance provisions—District of Columbia Code, section 35–1604—to permit such insurance issued in the District of Columbia to provide coverage of indebtedness incurred

[1] Loans not exceeding one year's duration $10,000. Ch. 29856, L. 1955.

[2] In Connecticut $10,000 by department ruling.

for education purposes to include, in addition to any amounts actually advanced under a loan commitment, any part of a loan commitment which has not been advanced by the creditor, less any amounts repaid by the borrower.

HEARING

At a public hearing conducted by Subcommittee No. 4 on June 6, 1966, testimony in favor of this legislation was presented by spokesmen for the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Superintendent of Insurance, the District of Columbia Bankers' Association, the CUMA Mutual Insurance Society of Madison, Wis., the Riggs National Bank, the District of Columbia Credit Union League, and by the finance officer of Georgetown University. No opposition was expressed to the enactment of the bill.

Your committee amended the first section of the bill to attain better clarification of language, and also to increase the maximum for group credit insurance for noneducational loans to $25,000 rather than to $10,000 as provided in the original bill. This higher maximum limit was recommended by several witnesses at the hearing on the bill.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAIL AGENCY ACT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 15860) to establish the District of Columbia Bail Agency, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 15860

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 "District of Columbia Bail Agency Act".

SEC. 2. There is hereby created for the District of Columbia the District of Columbia Bail Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "agency") which shall secure pertinent data and provide for any judicial officer in the District of Columbia reports containing verified information concerning any individual with respect to whom a bail determination is to be made.

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "judicial officer" means, unless otherwise indicated, the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia (but only with respect to proceedings under Section 11–1556 of the D.C. Code) or any justice or judge of such courts or a United States Commissioner; and

(2) The term "bail determination" means any order by a judicial officer respecting the terms and conditions of release (including any order setting the amount of bail bond or any other kind of security given to assure appearance in court) of—

(A) any person arrested in the District of Columbia, or

(B) any material witness in any criminal proceeding in a court referred to in paragraph (1),

for trial or sentencing or pending appeal.

SEC. 4. (a) The agency shall, except when practicable, interview any person detained pursuant to law or charged with an offense in the District of Columbia who is to appear before a United States Commissioner or whose case arose in or is before any court named in section 3(a)(1) of this Act. Such interview when requested by a judicial officer shall also be undertaken with respect to any person charged with intoxication or traffic violation. The agency shall seek independent verification of information obtained during the interview, shall secure any such person's prior criminal record which shall be made available by the Metropolitan Police Department, and shall prepare a written report of such information for submission to the appropriate judicial officer. The agency shall present such report with or without a recommendation for release on personal recognizance, personal bond, or other nonfinancial conditions, but with no other recommendation, to the appropriate judicial officer and shall provide copies of such report to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia (if pertinent) and to counsel for the person concerning whom the report is made. The report shall include but not be limited to information concerning the person accused, his family, his community ties, residence, employment, prior criminal record if any, and may include such additional verified information as may become available to the agency.

(b) The agency when requested by any appellate court or a judge or justice thereof, or by any other judicial officer, shall furnish a report as provided in section 4(a) respecting any person whose case is pending before any such appellate court or judicial officer or in whose behalf an application for a bail determination shall have been submitted.

(c) Such information as may be contained in the agency's files or presented in its report or which shall be divulged during the course of any hearing shall be used only for the purpose of a bail determination and shall otherwise be confidential except for members of the agency staff, and such members shall not be subject to subpena concerning information in their possession and such information shall not be the subject of court process for use in any other proceeding.

(d) The preparation by the agency and the submission of its report as provided in section 4 shall be accomplished at the earliest practicable opportunity.

(e) A judicial officer in making a bail determination shall consider the agency's report and its accompanying recommendation, if any. The judicial officer may impose such terms and set such conditions upon release as shall appear warranted by the facts presented, except that such judicial officer may not establish any term or condition for release not otherwise authorized by law (including the Bail Reform Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–465)).

SEC. 5. (a) The agency shall function under authority of and be responsible to an executive committee of five members of which three shall constitute a quorum. The executive committee shall be composed of the respective chief judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, or if circumstances may require, the designee of any such chief judge; and a fifth member who shall be selected by such chief judges.

(b) Within thirty days of the date of enactment of this Act, the executive committee shall meet and shall appoint a Director of the agency who shall be a member of the bar of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. The Director of the agency shall be responsible for the supervision and execution of the duties of the agency. The Director shall receive such compensation as may be set by the executive committee but not in excess of that amount classified as GS–15 in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Director shall hold office at the pleasure of the executive committee.

SEC. 7. The Director, subject to the approval of the executive committee, shall employ a chief assistant and such assisting and clerical staff and may make assignments of such agency personnel as may be necessary properly to conduct the business of the agency. The staff of the agency, other than clerical, shall be drawn from law students, graduate students, or such other available sources as may be approved by the executive committee. The chief assistant to the Director shall receive compensation as may be set by the executive committee, but in an amount not in excess of that classified as GS–11 in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and shall hold office at the pleasure of the executive committee. All other employees of the agency shall receive compensation as set by the executive committee, but in amounts not in excess of that classified as GS–7 in said Classification Act; salaries of clerical personnel shall be set at levels comparable to those allowed in the offices of the Legal Aid Agency and the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia. From time to time, the Director, subject to the approval of the executive committee, may set merit and longevity salary increases.

SEC. 8. The Director shall on June 15 of each year submit to the executive committee a report as to the agency's administration of its responsibilities for the previous period of June 1 through May 31, a copy of which report will be transmitted by the executive committee to the Congress of the United States, and to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. The Director shall include in his report, to be prepared as directed by the Administrative Office, a statement of financial condition, revenues, and expenses for the past June 1 through May 31 period.

SEC. 9. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated to the judiciary such sums as may be necessary which shall be disbursed by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. The Administrative Office so far as is possible will follow its standard fiscal practices. Budget estimates for the agency shall be prepared by the Director and shall be subject to the approval of the executive committee.

SEC. 10. The Bail Reform Act of 1966 shall apply to any person detained pursuant to law or charged with an offense in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 11. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) hereof, this Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment.

(b) Sections 6, 7, and 8 shall take effect on the date of enactment of the first Act appropriating moneys to carry out the purposes of this Act which is enacted after the date of enactment of this Act, and section 4 shall take effect on the ninetieth day after the date of enactment of said first appropriation Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 7, line 11, after the date "1966" insert the following: "(Public Law 89–465)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Bow: On page 6, line 25, strike out "Administrative Office of the United States Courts.", and insert in lieu thereof "Commissioners of the District of Columbia".

On page 7, lines 2 and 3, strike out "Administrative Office" and insert in lieu thereof "Commissioners of the District of Columbia".

On page 7, strike out lines 7, 8, 9, and through the word "practices." in line 10, and insert in lieu thereof "District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary which shall be disbursed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia".

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

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

Mr. WHITENER. These are the amendments, I believe, which the gentleman discussed with us earlier today.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITENER. As I understand them, the purpose is to confine the financing and the direction of this agency to the District of Columbia Government, rather than to have an appropriation to the Judiciary of the United States.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITENER. And the expenditures are not to be under the direction of the Administrative Office.

Mr. BOW. I am fearful that if we leave it in this way the cost will be much greater, and it would be an appropriation to the Judiciary, to the Administrative Office, from funds of all of the taxpayers, rather than an appropriation by the District of Columbia to handle a District of Columbia matter.

This is a District bill, but the authorization of the appropriation part is in reference to the Treasury, to the Administrative Office. We have found the Administrative Office a rather expensive operation.

I believe that since the bill is a District bill it would be proper to fund it through the District of Columbia rather than through a general appropriation to the courts.

Mr. WHITENER. I say to the gentleman that I appreciate his having discussed this matter with us earlier today. I told the gentleman that at the time we acted upon the bill in the subcommittee after full hearings no discussion of this aspect of the bill was had. At our hearings we heard from the judges in the District of Columbia, the Bar Association, the Justice Department, the U.S. attorney's office, and others interested in the bail reform question.

For that reason, as I told the gentleman earlier, we are willing to agree to the amendment. We would want to do so, however, with the understanding by the gentleman and the other Members of the House that at the hearings in the other body it may be interested parties may have objection to this amendment. We would not want to be bound, if we must go to conference, to fight for the amendment which the gentleman offered even though we are willing to go along with it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I would hope the gentleman would fight for it, because it seems to me, this being a District bill, it should be financed through the District of Columbia appropriations. May I say to the gentleman, with respect to this judges bill which we passed here a few days ago, because of having these new judges, we had a supplemental request made to us now from the Administrative Office for another $100,000 to operate that office. If we pass this, there will be another supplemental request. In this particular setup they have a GS–15, a GS–11, and a number of GS–7's and I think that this money should be paid through the District of Columbia appropriations rather than the appropriations for the entire country for the judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's agreeing to the amendment, but I do hope that when he takes this to conference on this specific question the gentleman will see the advantage of its being done through the District of Columbia rather than through the appropriations for the entire United States.

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

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. An additional reason for the gentleman's amendment is that this should be administered by the District of Columbia and not by the Department of Justice.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman and thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to alleviate some of the injustices and inequities existing in the present financial bail system in the District of Columbia, by creating an independent fact-gathering-and-reporting Bail Agency to secure data and provide to any judicial officer in the District of Columbia—as defined in the bill—reports containing verified information concerning any individual with respect to whom a bail determination is to be made.

In addition, the fact-finding Bail Agency will also make its services available upon request to the judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and to any Justice of the Supreme Court, whenever bail pending appeal becomes an issue.

H.R. 15860 has as it basic purpose the establishment of a system whereby worthy defendants in criminal cases, as well as material witnesses in any criminal proceeding, may have an orderly procedure available to them and to the courts for the determination of the preliminary question of bailability, amount of bail, and other relevant factors which are daily passed upon by the judges in the District of Columbia.

It is important to emphasize the clear line which is drawn in the bill between the duty of the Bail Agency and the duty of the court. The Bail Agency, as a part of its prearraignment investigation, will interview defendants, verify facts, and submit reports with or without recommendations to the judicial officers. But, the bail decision remains the exclusive province of the judiciary, who may accept or reject the report and recommendations; only the judicial officer may determine the conditions of release to be imposed on the defendant.

As drafted and as reported by your committee, this proposed legislation is designed to implement the Bail Reform Act of 1966, which was passed by the House on June 7, 1966, and signed by the President on June 22, 1966—Public Law 89–465.

BACKGROUND

Many bail reforms have been proposed throughout the United States, seeking to foster the practice of the release on personal recognizance of an accused person where his ties to the community reasonably assure his presence for trial.

According to information furnished to your committee, more than 50 experimental bail projects are in operation. Among such States where such projects are performing are the following: California, Connecticut, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

In 1962, the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, appointed a committee on bail projects which made a study of the bail system in the District of Columbia. That committee, working in conjunction with the District of Columbia Bar Association, Junior Bar Section, reported that its study showed that, in 1962, between 30 and 40 percent of the District of Columbia jail population was composed of persons either awaiting trial or in the process of trial and sentencing, and that of those awaiting trial, 80 percent were eligible for release on bail.

Translating this burden into financial terms, the bar committee further reported that the cost, in 1962, of maintaining in the District of Columbia jail, defendants who were eligible for bond prior to or upon completion of trial, was almost $500,000.

In the District of Columbia during 1963, 1,640 persons, or 80 percent of all defendants charged with felonies, spent some time in detention between arrest and final disposition of their cases. The median time spent in jail was 75 days. This does not include any time such defendants may have spent undergoing observation at a hospital or mental institution. Many defendants who spent some time in detention were ultimately able to post bond.

Prolonged detention, it was found, was not necessarily due to crowded court calendars, but often resulted from delays attendant to the making and execution of defendant's motions for continuance, severance, and the like.

Among its many recommendations, the bar committee recommended that a pilot project, similar to the pretrial release program conducted by the Vera Foundation in New York City, be established in the District of Columbia.

RESULTS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAIL PROJECT

The following information was furnished your committee by the officers of the District of Columbia bail project now in operation, as to its operations to date:

Present project data indicate that as of June 3, 1966, the District of Columbia bail project has made a total of 2,456 recommendations for release on personal bond. The courts have followed approximately 85 percent of these recommendations with the result that 2,084 persons have been released on their word that they would return. Presently, over 97 percent of those released have appeared in court as they promised. It is interesting to note that 47 of the 59 defaulters have been returned to custody and 40 of these were rearrested in the Washington, D.C. area. A further matter of interest is the fact that 50 faced misdemeanor charges at the time of default.

While the criteria utilized by the project for determining whether the defendant would return to court if released were not primarily devised for any other purpose, experience has demonstrated that the criteria are meaningful as well when related to the safety of the community. To illustrate, of the 2,084 releases, 2.5 percent were charged with serious subsequent offenses arising during the period of their releases; 5 percent were charged with less serious subsequent offenses; and 1.6 percent were charged with subsequent municipal code offenses. It should be noted, in this connection, that while 17 percent of these subsequent charges remain pending, 31 percent were dismissed, nolled, ignored, or resulted in acquittals. The remaining 52 percent resulted in the following dispositions: 6 percent convicted and given probationary sentences: 43 percent convicted and incarcerated; 2 percent convicted and forfeited collateral.

The Acting Director of the Office of Criminal Justice, Department of Justice, testified in support of the proposed legislation, and particularly as to the experience of the pilot District of Columbia bail project stated as follows:

> The bail project has proven to be of great value to individuals, courts and the administration of justice generally in the District of Columbia. For the first time in this jurisdiction, it has enabled a large number of persons to be released on personal bond when, without a fact-finding project, they would either have remained in jail or been made to suffer financial hardship to raise a bondsman's fee. A recent report indicated that in its first two years, nearly 75 percent of the project's recommendations for release without money bail were honored by judges in felony cases, and 93 percent in misdemeanor cases. This means that almost 2,100 persons have been released because of information supplied by the project. We understand that the 3 percent default rate in Bail Project cases is less than that in bail bond cases. We also understand that charges of serious criminal conduct during periods of pretrial release have shown a similarly low rate: bail project reports indicate that less than 2.5 percent of persons released on its recommendation have been so charged, and that a majority of the charges disposed of to date have been dismissed.
>
> The project enables many persons to secure their liberty, retain their jobs, prepare their defense and maintain family relationships. Its cost savings to the community from eliminating unnecessary retention in the District of Columbia Jail run to many thousands of dollars. Our court system is able to make more meaningful decisions because they can be based on information not previously available. These results clearly demonstrate the desirability of establishing the project as a permanent independent agency in the District of Columbia.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAIL PROJECT

In May of 1963 the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit adopted this recommendation and, through its Committee on Bail Problems, proposed an experimental project designed to cover cases where the bail applicant appears to have a stable connection with the community even in the absence of the posting of security by a bondsman. In such cases, it was proposed, the relevant facts would be summarized, and such information, together with a recommendation of release on personal recognizance, would be made available to the presiding magistrate.

As a result, the Ford Foundation granted funds—$65,000 for each year for 3 years—to the Georgetown University Law Center, which made possible the institution and operation of a 3-year experimental program that is scheduled to terminate in September 1966.

Originally, this experiment covered only felony cases. However, in August 1965, the coverage was extended to misdemeanor cases. Also, in 1964, the experiment's operations were expanded to include fact investigation in cases involving bail pending appeal.

HOW THE BAIL PROJECT WORKS

Under this experiment, accused persons are being interviewed by staff members immediately after being brought before a committing magistrate. The arresting officers are also interviewed at this time. Thereafter, independent verification of the information is sought from the accused's relatives, friends, employers, unions, welfare officials, clergy, and the like. The accused's criminal record, if any, including juvenile court records, is obtained. Finally, a brief staff conference evaluates the case to determine whether a recommendation should be made that the accused be released on personal recognizance.

It should be stressed here that this decision is based on the community ties of the accused, and not on the alleged facts of the offense. The latter are usually not known by the staff unless they were brought out at initial presentment. Neither the accused nor any other contact is asked matters pertaining to the facts of the alleged offense.

The importance of this point is that the chief judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, in commenting upon the District of Columbia bail project, said that this experiment has produced some very good results, but voiced the reservation that it is necessary for the judges to reject the recommendations for release upon personal recognizance in some cases because the facts of the offense may make such rejection in the public interest, regardless of the personal data regarding the defendant. In other words, the chief judge is emphasizing what was said at the outset; namely, the judicial officer, in the final analysis, must alone exercise his discretion in determining conditions of release, or whether there shall be release of the accused.

Recommendations for release upon personal recognizance are submitted to the appropriate court or to the U.S. Commissioner. The entire procedure is concluded in periods of time ranging from the same day on which the accused appeared initially to a few days after his initial appearance, depending upon the difficulties encountered in obtaining necessary information from both private and official sources.

Upon release, each defendant is advised by a member of the staff of the penalties for failure to appear for trial. Also, certain followup procedures are used to assure the return of the accused for required court appearances. For example, felony defendants are asked to telephone the office weekly. This is not strictly enforced, however. This serves as a means of notifying defendants of required court appearance. Also, the released defendants and relatives and friends who have agreed to accept notification are notified in advance of required court appearances and reminded of the penalties for failure to appear.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Section 1 names the act.

Section 2 creates the District of Columbia Bail Agency.

Section 3 provides the following definitions: "Judicial officer" is defined as the Supreme Court of the United States, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia—but only with respect to proceedings under section 11–1566 of the District of Columbia Code—or any justice or judge of such courts or a U.S. Commissioner.

"Bail determination" means any order by a judicial officer respecting the terms and conditions of release—including any order setting the amount of bail bond or any other kind of security given to assure appearance in court—of (A) any person arrested in the District of Columbia, or (B) any material witness in any criminal proceeding in any of the courts referred to above, for trial or sentencing or pending appeal.

Section 4 provides that the Bail Agency established by the bill is required, "except when impracticable," to interview persons detained pursuant to law or charged with offenses in the District of Columbia, who are to appear before a U.S. Commissioner or whose cases arose in or are before any court specified in the bill. The Agency is to independently verify information obtained from such interview, secure the person's prior criminal record from the Metropolitan Police Department, and prepare a written report of such information for submission to the appropriate judicial officer. The Agency is authorized to present such report to the appropriate judicial officer, with or without a recommendation for release on personal recognizance, personal bond, or other nonfinancial condition, but without any

other recommendation. It must also provide copies of such reports to the U.S. Attorney, to the Corporation Counsel—if pertinent—and to counsel for the person who is the subject of the report. The report must at least include information concerning the person accused, his family, his community ties, residence, employment, and prior criminal record, if any.

The information contained in the agency's files, presented in its report, or divulged during the course of any hearing, is to be used only for the purpose of a bail determination and is to be otherwise confidential. It cannot be made subject to court process for use in any other proceeding.

Section 5 provides that the agency is to function under the authority and be responsible to a five-member executive committee consisting of the respective chief judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, and a fifth member to be selected by the four chief judges.

Sections 6 and 7 provide for the appointment of a director of the agency selected by the executive committee—whose compensation may not exceed that of a GS–15 employee—and for the employment of agency personnel.

Section 8 of the bill requires the submission to the Congress and to the administrative office of the U.S. courts of a report on the agency's activities.

Section 9 authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be required for the operation of the agency, to be disbursed by the administrative office of the U.S. courts. Budget estimates for the agency are to be prepared by the director of the agency, and are subject to the approval of the executive committee of the agency.

Section 10 states that the Bail Reform Act of 1966—Public Law 89–465—shall apply to any person detained pursuant to law or charged with an offense in the District of Columbia. Your committee wishes to make clear it is the intent of the Congress that the provisions of the Federal Bail Reform Act, approved June 22, 1966, are fully applicable to any person detained pursuant to law or charged with an offense in the District of Columbia.

Upon the recommendation and request of the chief judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, your committee included that court within the terms of H.R. 15860—section 3—but only with respect to criminal nonsupport cases under District of Columbia Code 11–556.

ESTIMATED COSTS OF LEGISLATION

According to testimony before your committee, the estimated annual costs of the operation of the District of Columbia bail agency, based upon the experience to date in the experimental project, will be between $95,000 and $120,000, depending upon the size of the staff ultimately required and the office space and equipment which may be needed.

ESTIMATED SAVINGS FROM THE LEGISLATION

A more obvious benefit of the enactment of this legislation will be to remedy in part one of the many staggering problems confronting the community under the present financial bail system, viz, the tremendous burden placed on the District of Columbia Jail by the pretrial incarceration of defendants and the resulting cost of maintaining the large number of people who must languish in jail prior to trial because they lack the funds for a bond premium. In addition, there are other costs, such as welfare expenses and loss of wages, which may be involved with pretrial incarceration of large numbers who cannot afford bond premiums.

According to testimony before your committee, a comparative study of persons released on bond in 1963 before the project began operations, with persons released on bond in 1965 when the project was at maximum operating capacity, has revealed that as a result of the bail project's operations in 1965 over $60,000 has been saved in jail costs of the District of Columbia jail and in welfare costs. These jail cost savings pertain to the projected number of people who, if not released on personal bond, would have been required to stay in jail for an overall average of 47,157 man-days. The welfare costs pertain to the expenditures that the Welfare Department would have expended in cases where the supporting head of the household would have been incarcerated. In addition, the cost study reveals that the Department of Corrections would have expended over $12,000 in transporting from the jail to the courts and back the persons who were released as a result of bail project operations in 1965 and who, but for this personal bond release, would have been incarcerated.

The preliminary result of the cost of detention study conducted by the District of Columbia bail project reveals that over $72,000 in jail and other related costs were saved by the District of Columbia as a result of the bail project's experimental operation during the year 1965. Projecting the jail costs alone it is estimated that with operation capacity identical to that in 1965, the bail project would save in 1967 a total of over $61,000. The increase, of course, is attributed to the current trend of rising jail costs.

Another aspect of this cost of detention study has been to project on the basis of the present operation of the project the savings which would inure to the District of Columbia Government should this bill, like the Bail Reform Act of 1966—Public Law 89–465—be enacted into law. Assuming that these two statutes would increase the number of personal bond and other nonfinancial conditional releases by at least one-fourth of those still incarcerated who cannot presently qualify under the project's experimental criteria or afford the price of a bond premium, it is estimated that the District of Columbia will save almost $110,000 per year in jail costs alone.

ENDORSEMENT OF LEGISLATION

The President of the United States, in his special message of March 9, 1966, to Congress against crime, in his first-stage recommendations to enhance justice in our courts—calling for immediate action—proposed as follows:

> We must reform our bail system.
>
> The administration of criminal justice must be fair as well as effective.
>
> Whether a person, released after arrest, is likely to flee before trial or endanger society is not determined by the wealth he commands. Yet all too often we imprison men for weeks, months, and even years—before we give them their day in court—solely because they cannot afford bail.
>
> Effective law enforcement does not require such imprisonment.
>
> To correct this injustice, I urge the Congress to complete action on the pending Federal Bail Reform Act and to give favorable consideration to the District of Columbia Bail Agency bill.
>
> These measures will insure fairness. They will provide an enlightened model for those States and communities which have not already undertaken bail reform.

HEARING

A full hearing was held by Subcommittee No. 5 of your committee on H.R. 15065—the original bill—on June 8, 1966, at which time its enactment was urged by all witnesses present. Judge John A. Danaher of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, who chaired the Committee on Bail Problems of the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit, presented the support of the Judicial Conference which unanimously approved the proposed legislation at its recent annual meeting attended by all the judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals, and of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Favorable recommendations were also presented on behalf of the Chief Judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, and of the Juvenile Court, as well as the U.S. Department of Justice, and the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia.

Representatives of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia; the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia; officers of the District of Columbia bail project; and the Assistant Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia, all supported the legislation and presented helpful amendments which the committee adopted before introducing the present bill.

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

PROVIDING AN ALTERNATE METHOD FOR ACQUISITION OF A SITE FOR SHAW JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill H.R. 15858, to amend section 6 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, to authorize early land acquisition for the purpose of acquiring a site for the replacement of Shaw Junior High School, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 15858

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (District of Columbia Code, sec. 5–705) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Prior to the adoption of an urban renewal plan by the Planning Commission and approval by the District Commissioners, the Agency may exercise the powers granted to it by this Act, for the acquisition and disposition of real property, the demolition and removal of buildings or structures, the relocation of site occupants, and the construction of site improvements for the purpose of providing a site for a new facility to replace Shaw Junior High School within the boundaries which may be established for any urban renewal project area: *Provided*, That (1) the District Commissioners, after a public hearing, and the Planning Commission approve the acquisition and disposition of all such property or properties; and (2) the District Commissioners agree to assume the responsibility to bear any loss that may arise as a result of the exercise of authority under this subsection in the event that the property is not used for urban renewal purposes because the urban renewal plan is not approved by all appropriate authorities or because such urban renewal plan, as approved by all appropriate authorities does not include such property or properties or is amended to omit any of the acquired property, or is abandoned for any reason. The District Commissioners and the appropriate agencies operating within the District of Columbia are authorized to do any and all things necessary to secure financial assistance under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to acquire and prepare a site for a new facility to replace Shaw Junior High School. The District Commissioners are authorized to assume the responsibilities described in this subsection and, to carry out the purposes of this subsection, the District Commissioners and the Agency are authorized to borrow money pursuant to the early land acquisition provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and to issue obligations evidencing such loans and to make such pledges as may be required to secure such loans."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, may I say in explanation of this bill that the Shaw Junior High School is in one of the worst neighborhoods of the city of Washington. If any of you have visited it, you have some idea of how bad the conditions are in that neighborhood.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this bill would allow them to proceed with urban renewal on the site of the Shaw School only. It is probable in future years a great deal of the neighborhood surrounding it will be under urban renewal of some kind or character, but it is important that something be done on this immediately. This legislation makes provision for allowing the Shaw site to be cleared and a new building built thereon.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the responsible members of the Committee on the District of Columbia as to just what is contemplated here with respect to this land that is referred to as the site of the Shaw Junior High School.

I believe all Members of the House are aware that there was a site for the Shaw Junior High School for which the taxpayers had provided money at a previous time. And, that this site was taken away from the Board of Education of the District of Columbia for other purposes, under what was to have been a temporary arrangement. However, when the time came to construct a Shaw Junior High School those who had taken the land away refused to return it to the Board of Education to be used for what purpose.

Are we now to understand that this legislation now seeks to provide for the acquisition, at the cost to the taxpayers, of an alternative site for Shaw Junior High School?

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, the purpose of this legislation is to expedite the selection of a new site for a new Shaw Junior High School, within the confines of an area which is already mapped as a proposed Shaw urban renewal area.

Mr. Speaker, it is contemplated that once this site is selected and the new school building is erected upon that site, that they will use the present building, pending the completion of the new school building, and then there can be an exchange of realty between the Urban Renewal Agency—the RLA—and the Board of Education.

Mr. Speaker, it would be hoped that the cost to the taxpayers would be minimal.

I am familiar with the situation to which the gentleman refers, but the old site or the formerly purchased site for the new Shaw Junior High School was not, as the gentleman suggested, taken away from the Board of Education. They made the mistake of giving it away, and it was a mistake and it should not have been done.

But, you have a problem here of one of the most unsatisfactory school facilities to be found in the Nation, so we thought, and it seemed to us that something should be done in order to give the children who must attend that substandard facility an opportunity to have a decent place to go to school, notwithstanding the improvidence of the Board of Education in the past.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Is this the site regarding which there was some discussion before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, where the land—the ownership of the land, I believe—was in the Department of the Interior then or the National Park Service, and that this land could have been available for transfer to the District of Columbia as an alternate site, or is it contemplated that we are going to have to spend new money in order to get this site for the Shaw Junior High School?

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am not familiar with the proceedings that occurred before the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from Wisconsin who is a member of that committee and particularly a member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Appropriations I am sure would know better than I about that. But insofar as I know, there is no land in that area owned by the National Park Service or by the Department of the Interior that is available for use as a school site.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, what happened to the site, if I may ask the gentleman from Wisconsin? Who got it, and what use is made of it, and how is it proposed to get the site back and through what process?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. As I recall it, I would say to the gentleman from Iowa, this site which had been acquired as the site of a new Shaw Junior High School, was transferred, with the consent of the Board of Education, for what was to have been a temporary purpose, and that purpose was the so-called Kennedy Playground. When the time came that the Board of Education was ready to proceed, as I understand it, the Parks and Recreation Department of the District of Columbia was unwilling to return that land to the Board of Education for the purpose for which it had been acquired.

Mr. GROSS. And, so, it did not serve for the purpose for which it was intended; is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is quite obviously correct.

Mr. GROSS. It evidently proved to be something in the nature of a flop.

How is it proposed to be gotten back and put to a proper use, that apparently being a new school building?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not think anyone in a responsible position in the executive department has any intention of ever restoring that site to its intended use. There has been some discussion before our subcommittee of some land now owned by the National Park Service, I believe it was—or at least it was the Department of Interior—that could have been transferred back to the District and which would have made the taxpayers of the District of Columbia whole substantially with respect to this matter. Apparently, this legislation is an alternate proposal, which makes contemplated site No. 3, about which apparently there has been no discussion before our subcommittee—but this is the first notice we have had that it was contemplated that this third site was now to be made available for that purpose and apparently to be made available only if new money is provided for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. And by right of condemnation?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I have not had a chance to read this report so as to know by what means it is to be acquired.

Mr. WHITENER. I will be glad to answer the gentleman if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, that I would assume that if there is an urban renewal law in his state, it would be like the urban laws in most States which specifically provide for early acquisition proceedings.

The District of Columbia is a rarity in that the local urban renewal law does not permit early acquisition. May I say this. The gentleman from Wisconsin has mentioned something about making the taxpayers of the District of Columbia whole.

The former site which was turned over to another agency was not turned over to the Federal Government or to the Department of the Interior, as I understand it. It was turned over to the recreation department of the District of Columbia. So, that land has not gone out of the possession of the District of Columbia nor has the District of Columbia lost title to the land. So there is no question of making somebody whole in any way.

May I say to the gentleman from Iowa further that this bill does not require anything. It merely sets up a procedure through which there can be early acquisition of a site within defined boundaries. This may be done under the urban renewal law after full hearings, just as are now required for urban renewal action. But it could not be done for any purpose if this bill becomes law except to provide a site for this school building.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] if he cares to respond to that statement.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Obviously, this matter will have to be throughly reviewed by our subcommittee at some later date. Because of that opportunity and necessity, I shall not now further take up the time of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I think all of us are aware of the deplorable condition of so many of the schools of the District of Columbia. This school is particularly in need of replacement.

On March 14 I informed the House of a remarkable event which took place on Tuesday, March 8, at Shaw Junior High School. It was Project Push, Pupils United for Superior High Schools. Young people, without the help of teachers or advisers, led a guided tour through Shaw Junior High School—a dilapidated, ill-ventilated, ill-equipped, gloomy, old school building.

So bad were the conditions that the young students took it upon themselves to organize in protest and in request of aid. On that occasion they spoke of "The Shame of Shaw" and said they would come to Congress for help. Today we are called upon to give that help.

I am sure that no one who has heard about the dangerously cracked floors which flood during each rain, the classrooms without desks, and the improvised classes in a draughty gymnasium would think of denying these students what they need.

Mr. Speaker, the children of the Nation's Capital have long been condemned to an inferior education. Today we have the opportunity to take a very small step in correcting this situation. H.R. 15858 authorizes early land acquisition procedures for the purpose of acquiring a site for the replacement of Shaw Junior High School. This means that a site may be acquired without waiting for the completion of an urban renewal plan.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason for delay. Children in the Capital of the richest nation on earth deserve our support of this legislation. As long as Congress is unwilling to provide home rule for the District, as long as Congress insists on being the local city council, then it has an obligation to act responsibly.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 15858 is to provide the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with an alternate method for acquiring a site for the new Shaw Junior High School, by authorizing the Commissioners and the Redevelopment Land Agency to use urban renewal early land acquisition procedures.

Under the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, local urban renewal agencies, when authorized to use such procedures, may acquire and clear land for redevelopment after project area boundaries have been established but without waiting for the completion of an urban renewal project plan for such area. Under the terms of this legislation, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Redevelopment Land Agency will be empowered to use early land acquisition procedures to acquire a site for the new Shaw Junior High School building and grounds.

The Board of Education of the District of Columbia has owned for several years, and still owns, a suitable site for the Shaw Junior High School, but this land has been diverted from their use and control to other purposes. As a result, a serious deadlock has developed in connection with the selection of and financing of another site suitable for the construction of the new Shaw Junior High School. With the enactment of this legislation, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia will be able to proceed either under existing authority for the acquisition of a site or, if the public need is better served, they may use the authority provided in this bill.

Prior to the approval of any urban renewal plan for an urban renewal area, which includes a site for the new Shaw Junior High School, land may be acquired for such site, buildings demolished and removed, occupants of the land relocated, and site improvements constructed for the purpose of providing a suitable site. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, after a public hearing, and the National Capital Planning Commission must approved the acquisition and disposition of all property which is acquired. Further, in the event the land so acquired is not used for urban renewal purposes, because the urban renewal plan is not approved by all appropriate authorities or because it is not included within an urban renewal plan, or is abandoned, the Board of Commissioners must assume the responsibility for any losses which may arise as a result of the use of the advance land acquisition procedures.

The bill authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and other appropriate agencies to do all things necessary to secure financial assistance under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 for the purposes of acquisition and preparation of a site for the new Shaw Junior High School. Further, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Redevelopment Land Agency, for the purposes of acquisition of a suitable site for the new Shaw Junior High School, are authorized to use the early land acquisition provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, to borrow money, and to issue evidences of indebtedness as may be required to secure such loans.

At public hearings on June 8, 1966, your committee received testimony from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Redevelopment Land Agency, and District of Columbia public school officials in support of the purpose of this bill.

Under urban renewal procedures, a major portion of the cost of acquisition of the real property selected for the school site can be financed with Federal urban renewal funds. The cost of the site to the school board can be reduced, by reason of Federal assistance, to what a vacant site would cost. This would provide additional financial assistance and the use of these procedures will provide for more flexibility in the selection of a proper site for the new school facilities.

The favorable report of the National Capital Planning Commission is as follows:

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1966.

Congressman BASIL L. WHITENER,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITENER: The National Capital Planning Commission has long recognized the existing physical and crowded conditions of the Shaw Junior High School and has consistently supported the need for a replacement. To aid in improving this situation, we have continually approved the proposed replacement of the Shaw Junior High School contained in the Six-Year Public Works Plans of the District of Columbia.

We believe, with the designation of the area for urban renewal planning by the Planning Commission and District Commissioners, that the enactment of your proposed legislation H.R. 15140, "To amend section 6 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, to authorize early land acquisition for the purpose of acquiring a site for a replacement of the Shaw Junior High School", is the best way to provide for the new school. This legislation would enable the District of Columbia to acquire the site for the Shaw Junior High School replacement at an early date from the Redevelopment Land Agency and would permit start of construction of the school during the planning period for the urban renewal area.

The National Capital Planning Commission recommends the enactment of the early land acquisition legislation, H.R. 15140.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. JAMES H. ROWE, Jr.,
Chairman.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 15859, which is identical in scope to the bill sponsored by the chairman, H.R. 15858.

My basic intent—the intent of the chairman—and the intent of these bills,

is to expedite quickly the construction of a new Shaw Junior High School in the disadvantaged Northwest section of our Nation's Capital.

For a variety of reasons—and it is not my intention to blame anyone—the 64-year-old Shaw school is still standing when it should have been replaced years ago. It is still standing—yes; but just. This creaky, crumbly, and vastly overcrowded relic which was built more than half a century ago—for conditions of half a century ago—has, during its later years, been virtually held together with wire and rubber cement.

I fully realize that replacement of this building was set for several years ago, but the ground selected and purchased for that purpose was used instead for the Kennedy playground—without the proper sanctions, perhaps, but we cannot cry over spilled milk. Thankfully, the playground does fill another desperate need for some of the city's poorer youngsters.

Nonetheless, the decrepit Shaw building still stands with its evil sanitation, with its crumbling masonry and plaster, with its obsolete and broken down equipment, with its shabby, depressing interiors, and with its woefully overcrowded classrooms. And it services an area of the city whose population has soared over the years. This is an area of the city whose children should get the very best of facilities and teaching quality in order to provide them with a surer grip on the ladder leading, hopefully, to a life of meaning and productivity instead of disillusionment, hopelessness, and despair. Inasmuch as the Shaw neighborhood is destined for eventual revitalization through the urban renewal process, it is the intent of these bills to allow the acquisition of the land for the construction of a new Shaw school—now—using Federal renewal authority and funds to do so at a much earlier date than would be set for renewal of the entire project area.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot overemphasize the critical need for action on this vital matter—whether through these bills or by some alternative method. There exists a crying need in this one specific instance, and I invite all Members of the Congress to visit Shaw to get the full impact of this need.

Overall, our Nation's Capital has a good school program. There are many up-to-date, functional, and well constructed school buildings in the system. It is guided by the School Superintendent, Dr. Hansen, whom I consider one of the finest school administrators in the Nation. His staff is tremendously motivated and dedicated. Amidst this promise, Shaw school stands out like a sore thumb. It is our responsibility to provide these wonderful people with the proper tools to help them in their invaluable task of educating our children.

I urge my colleague to give this legislation its thoughtful consideration.

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

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill H.R. 15857, to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries of officers and member of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 15857

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

TITLE I—SALARY INCREASES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

SECTION 101. Section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–823) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. The annual rates of basic compensation of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the following schedule of rates:

"SALARY SCHEDULE

"Salary class and title	Service Step						Longevity Step		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 1:									
Subclass (a) Fire private. Policy [patrolman] *private.*	$6,700	$7,040	$7,380	$7,720	$8,060	$8,400	$8,740	$9,080	$9,420
Subclass (b) [Patrolman] *Private* assigned as: Technician I. Plainclothesman.	6,990	7,330	7,670	8,010	8,350	8,690	9,030	9,370	9,710
Subclass (c) [Patrolman] *Private* assigned as: Technician II. Station clerk. Motorcycle officer.	7,280	7,620	7,960	8,300	8,640	8,980	9,320	9,660	10,000
Class 2:									
Subclass (a) Fire inspector.	8,060	8,400	8,740	9,080			9,420	9,760	10,100
Subclass (b) Fire inspector assigned as: Technician I.	8,350	9,690	9,030	9,370			9,710	10,050	10,390
Subclass (c) Fire inspector assigned as: Technician II.	8,640	8,980	9,320	9,660			10,000	10,340	10,680
Class 3 Assistant marine engineer. Assistant pilot. Detective.	8,690	9,030	9,370	9,710			10,050	10,390	10,730
Class 4:									
Subclass (a) Fire sergeant. Police sergeant.	8,975	9,315	9,655	9,995			10,335	10,675	11,015
Subclass (b) Detective sergeant.	9,486	9,825	10,165	10,505			10,845	11,185	11,525
Subclass (c) Police sergeant assigned as: Motorcycle officer.	9,555	9,895	10,235	10,575			10,915	11,255	11,595
Class 5 Fire lieutenant. Police lieutenant. Detective lieutenant.	10,710	11,138	11,566	11,994			12,422	12,850	
Class 6 Marine engineer. Pilot.	11,781	12,209	12,637	13,065			13,493	13,921	
Class 7 Fire captain. Police captain. Detective captain.	12,852	13,387	13,922	14,457			14,992	15,527	

"SALARY SCHEDULE—continued

"Salary class and title	Service Step						Longevity Step		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 8	$14,994	$15,529	$16,064	$16,599			$17,134	$17,669	
Assistant superintendent of machinery.									
Battalion fire chief.									
Deputy fire marshal.									
Police inspector.									
Class 9:									
Subclass (a)	17,671	18,206	18,741	19,276			19,811	20,346	
Deputy fire chief.									
Deputy chief of police.									
Fire marshal.									
Superintendent of machinery.									
Subclass (b)	18,742	19,277	19,812	20,347			20,882	21,417	
Deputy chief assigned as the:									
Assistant fire chief. Police executive officer.									
Commanding officer of the White House Police.									
Commanding officer of the United States Park Police.									
Class 10	22,491	23,026	23,561	24,096			24,631	25,166	
Fire chief.									
Chief of police."									

SEC. 102. The rates of basic compensation of officers and members to whom the amendment made by section 101 of this title applies shall be adjusted in accordance with this section, and on and after the effective date of this title, section 102 of the Act approved September 2, 1964 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–823c), shall not apply to any such officer or member whose rate of basic compensation is so adjusted in accordance with this section. Such rates of basic compensation shall be adjusted as follows:

(1) Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2), (3), or (4), each officer and member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this title at one of the scheduled service or longevity rates of a class or subclass in the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after the effective date of this title.

(2) Each private in service step 6, longevity step 7, or longevity step 8 in any subclass in class 1, upon completing a minimum of nineteen years of continuous service as a private, including service in the Armed Forces of the United States but excluding any period of time determined not to have been satisfactory service, shall be advanced to longevity step 9 in class 1, and receive the appropriate scheduled rate of basic compensation for such step in the subclass in which he is serving.

(3) Each officer in longevity step 7 in class 5 or 8, upon completing a minimum of fourteen years of continuous service in his respective class, including service in the Armed Forces of the United States but excluding any period of time determined not to have been satisfactory service, shall be advanced to longevity step 8 in his respective class, and receive the appropriate scheduled rate of basic compensation for such step in the class in which he was serving.

(4) Each officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force who is assigned as a dog handler on or after the effective date of this title shall receive in addition to his basic compensation an additional $610 per annum, except that if a police private is classed as technician II in subclass (c) of salary class (1) in the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 solely on account of his duties as a dog handler, such police private shall not be entitled to the additional compensation authorized by this paragraph.

SEC. 103. Section 303 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–829) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) As used in this Act, the term 'calendar week of active service' includes all periods of leave with pay, and periods of nonpay status which do not cumulatively equal one basic workweek."

SEC. 104. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the District of Columbia government or of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, or the White House Police force, who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f–61k), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, by an officer or member who dies during such period.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 105. For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an officer or member is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this title shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 106. This title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1966.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 201. (a) Each officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, or the United States Secret Service who has been retired under the provisions of the fourth paragraph of section 12 of the Act of September 1, 1916, during the period beginning before October 1, 1956, and continuing through July 1, 1966, on account of a permanent disability resulting from injury received or disease contracted in the line of duty, shall, on and after the first pay period which begins after July 1, 1966, have his retirement benefits computed and paid in accordance with the provisions of subsection (g)(1) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4–527(1)).

(b) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to reduce the relief or retirement compensation any person receives, or is entitled to receive, from the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this section.

SEC. 202. (a) Subsection (a)(3) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4–521(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The term 'widow' means the surviving wife of a member or former member if—

"(A) she was married to such member or former member (i) while he was a member, or (ii) for at least two years immediately preceding his death, or

"(B) she is the mother of issue by such marriage."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to any surviving wife of a "member" (as that term is defined in subsection (a)(1) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act) or former member irrespective of whether such wife became a "widow" (as that term is defined in such amendment) prior to, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that no annuity shall be paid by reason of the amendment made by this Act for any period prior to the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1966.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, in the Salary Schedule, strike out "patrolman" in the several places where it occurs, and insert in lieu thereof "private".

Page 4, line 13, strike out "assigned as" and insert in lieu thereof "performing the duty of".

Page 7, line 2, insert immediately after "September 1, 1916" the following: "(39 Stat. 718), as in effect prior to October 1, 1956".

Page 7, beginning in line 4, strike out "on account of a permanent disability resulting from" and insert in lieu thereof "and who is receiving maximum disability benefits under such paragraph for".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse the bill, H.R. 15857, providing for a realistic increase

in salaries for the Metropolitan Police Force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, as a matter of vital importance to every resident of and visitor to the Nation's Capital. It was with this feeling that I introduced an identical bill, H.R. 15867.

The salary schedule proposed in this legislation will not only restore the District of Columbia's police and fire departments to a reasonable level of competitiveness with other U.S. major cities and with the surrounding jurisdictions in Maryland and Virginia and provide a salary picture conducive to easier recruitment and retention of high-caliber personnel, but also will adjust pay alinement in several respects consistent with good administration and will correct two major inequities in the retirement program of these forces.

Since the last salary increase for policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia was enacted in 1964, classified employees in the Federal and District Governments have received an increase of 3.6 percent, and a further increase for these employees of approximately 3.2 percent this year appears to be a certainty. Moreover, since 1964 there has been an average increase of approximately 6 percent in policemen's and firemen's salaries in 12 of the 20 other major U.S. cities, and an increase of some 10 percent in such salaries in other communities in the Washington metropolitan area.

The schedule for salaries in this bill will materially improve the relative standing of the District of Columbia with the other major cities which have given salary increases to their policemen and firemen since 1964, and with the other jurisdictions in the metropolitan area. For example, the starting salary for members of the police force will change from 11th to 5th place among the 21 largest cities, and from second to first place in the area. The maximum salary for police privates will be increased from 6th to 5th place among the large cities, and from third to first place in the metropolitan area. As for firemen's salaries, their minimum starting figure will rise from 10th place to 5th among the major cities and will remain first in the area; and finally, the maximum pay for privates in the fire department will remain in fifth place among the largest cities and in first place in the Washington metropolitan area.

These increases, which will afford a starting minimum salary for privates in both forces of $6,700 and a maximum of $9,420 attainable in 19 years of service, are desperately needed as tools to combat a most serious problem of recruitment and retention of capable personnel in both departments.

Despite accelerated recruiting efforts, 218 vacancies existed on the Metropolitan Police force as of May 13 of this year, out of an authorized strength of 3,100 men. As a matter of fact, the force has not operated at full strength since February of 1964. Most disturbing is the fact that a number of promising young men have resigned from the Metropolitan Police force in recent months to accept appointment as policemen in nearby jurisdictions.

With the incidence of major crime in the District of Columbia showing an increase of 11.5 percent in 1965 as compared to 1964, and with the Nation's Capital rapidly acquiring a nationwide reputation of being unsafe for visitors, this shortage of capable policemen simply must be overcome.

While the problem of recruitment and retention of men in the District of Columbia Fire Department may appear less dramatic, it is nevertheless a very serious one. I am informed that the fire department has recently found it necessary to accept recruits who have scored only a mark of 70 on the relatively simple civil service examination required of all applicants, and that this score actually indicates that the applicant could answer correctly only 40 of the 80 questions comprising the test. This is far below the standards formerly imposed for acceptance on the District of Columbia Fire Department, and with firefighting becoming more and more technical, and the Department's in-training program becoming more demanding, this poses a serious problem indeed. It must be remembered that the recruits of today must become the leaders of the District of Columbia Fire Department in years to come, and thus any trend toward lowering of standards for entrance into this Department at this time will inevitably result in a deterioration in the future, in what has been recognized for many years to be one of the finest firefighting organizations in this country.

I realize that salaries alone do not constitute the only cause of this acute problem of recruitment and retention of well-qualified personnel for these forces. However, I am convinced that the salary schedule as proposed in this bill, particularly as weighted in favor of the lower salary classes, will have a highly salutary effect on this situation.

When the Congress enacted a cost-of-living salary increase to classified employees in the Federal and District of Columbia Governments last October first, and time did not permit consideration of an equivalent increase at that time for policemen, firemen, and teachers in the District, I stated that I would exert every effort to provide such an increase for these personnel during this session of the 89th Congress, retroactive to October 1, 1965, in simple fairness. As a matter of fact, I introduced a bill, recommended by the District of Columbia Commissioners, which would have granted the Metropolitan Police Force and the District of Columbia Fire Department two salary increases this year, one of which would have been retroactive to that date. The total of these two increases, however, would have been only 6.7 percent, with the same percentage increase for all salary classes.

Under the provisions of H.R. 15857, there will be a single increase averaging 9.9 percent overall, but weighted to provide an 11.4 percent increase in starting salary for private and a considerably higher increase for all personnel through salary class 4—sergeants—than for the officer personnel. This emphasis upon the lower salary classes is designed to provide a much stronger inducement recruitment into the forces than would the increase of only 6.7 percent as proposed by the Commissioners for all personnel. Our committee decided that in view of the greater percentage of salary increases proposed in this bill, it would be most practical to make the increase effective as of July 1, 1966, rather than to make any part of it retroactive as had formerly been contemplated. Thus, it is my feeling and that of my colleagues on the Committee that in providing a more generous increase in salaries, without any retroactive provision, the Congress will have kept faith with these dedicated public servants.

The two provisions of title II of this bill will correct two unjust situations of long standing. The first of these will provide that officers and members of the police and fire departments who were retired prior to October 1, 1956, for permanent and total disability incurred in line of duty will henceforth receive the same annuity benefits as presently are received by members who retired for this reason after that date. The difference is that a member who retired for total disability before October 1, 1956, receives an annuity of 50 percent of his last annual salary, while a member retiring under identical circumstances after that date enjoys a pension computed at 2 percent of his last annual salary per year of service, with a minimum of 66⅔ percent and a maximum of 70 percent.

For many years, I have felt that this whole system of distinction between retirement benefits contingent upon an arbitrary date of retirement, for men who faced the same dangers and perils, providing protection 24 hours per day for the lives and property of the residents of the city, is inequitable. And certainly in the case of these men who sacrificed their health and physical ability to earn a living, there can be no justification for maintaining a difference of from 16⅔ to 20 percent in their pensions. If there was a difference in their rates of contribution toward the retirement fund, it must be remembered that these contributions were in dollars of vastly different value, so that the older men contributed at least as much in terms of buying power as did the later retirees.

The other of these provisions is that retired members of the Metropolitan Police Force and the District of Columbia Fire Department who marry subsequent to their retirement, will leave their widows with annuity benefits, provided they have been married at least 2 years prior to the member's death. At present, the widow of a retiree who marries after retirement is entitled to no benefits whatever. Correction of this injustice, in my opinion, is long overdue.

The total annual cost of this bill is estimated at approximately $4.9 million. I feel strongly that this represents the minimum which this Congress should contribute to the welfare of these gallant forces in the Nation's Capital, and that the benefits of this legislation will in fact be enjoyed by every resident of and visi-

tor to the District of Columbia for many years to come.

PURPOSES OF THE BILL

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of H.R. 15857 are to increase the salaries of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to correct certain inequities existing in the present salary schedule, and to equalize the pensions of the members of these forces who have been retired for permanent total disability incurred in the line of duty regardless of the date of their retirement.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

On October 1, 1965, all Federal classified workers and all District of Columbia government employees with the exception of policemen, firemen, and teachers were granted a salary increase of 3.6 percent. In addition, another salary increase for these same government employees this year appears to be a certainty. Simple equity alone demands a substantial increase in salaries at this time for the gallant, dedicated officers and members of these vital forces who daily risk their lives in the protection of the property and lives of the residents of and visitors to the Nation's Capital. In this connection, implicit in the failure of the Congress to include the police and firemen in last year's cost-of-living salary increases was an assurance that this would be rectified with an increase in this session of the Congress which would be retroactive to the date of last year's pay raise to the other Government employees.

In addition, however, there is a very acute problem of recruitment for these forces in the District, and also of retention of the younger men in the ranks, which must be faced and which can be solved in part by realistic salary increases, particularly in the four lowest salary classes.

POLICE

Your committee is informed that the Metropolitan Police force has not been at full authorized strength since February 1964, and that since that time the number of vacancies has increased steadily until on May 13, 1966, there were 218 vacancies on the force with an authorized strength of 3,100 men. In an effort to solve this problem during the past year the number of recruiting teams was increased to 20, which were sent out to a number of cities in 11 of the Eastern and Middle States. The efforts of these teams have resulted in the appointment of 72 new policemen out of a total of 1,043 applicants who were examined. In addition, examination for applicants have been arranged for Saturdays and at night, and advertisements have been placed weekly in many newspapers. Despite these and other efforts, however, the Metropolitan Police force is operating below the authorized strength needed as a minimum to control and prevent crime in the District of Columbia.

During the past fiscal year, 112 men resigned from the Metropolitan Police force for various reasons, some of them to join police departments in other jurisdictions. During this same year, 102 men retired and there were 28 other types of separations.

Recent statistics show that major crime in the District of Columbia increased 11.5 percent in 1965 as compared to 1964. Also, since 1963, the District of Columbia has continued to rank fourth highest in the number of major crime offenses among the 16 cities with a population of 500,000 to 1 million.

In the face of this grave situation, it is incumbent upon the Congress to provide every means within its power to assure adequate and capable manpower to the Metropolitan Police force. In this connection, the President in his budget message on January 25, 1966, for the District of Columbia, stated:

> The Police Department has been encountering great difficulties in recruiting qualified candidates. An increase in the salaries of policemen is necessary to bring the police force to its currently authorized strength. Legislation to accomplish this will be proposed to Congress.

FIREMEN

The Fire Department of the District of Columbia also has a recruitment and retention problem, which may be somewhat less acute than that of the police department but nevertheless poses a dangerous situation for the adequate protection of the city against fire. Your committee is informed that in order to maintain an adequate firefighting force, the District of Columbia Fire Department in recent years has been obliged to accept applicants whose civil service examination scores are in the low seventies. Actually, a mark of 70 on this relatively simple examination is assigned for only 40 correct answers out of 80 questions. In these times when urban firefighting has become a highly technical occupation, demanding an in-training program with a heavy emphasis upon educational accomplishment, to be obliged to accept subpar recruits will inevitably lead to a deterioration in the quality of the force and also of its general morale and esprit de corps. The District of Columbia cannot afford to permit this deterioration to take place in its fire department which for years has been regarded as one of the finest in the United States.

At least a partial solution to the abovecited problems of recruitment and retention in these forces so essential to public safety lies in realistic salary increases, weighted appropriately to present an attractive career opportunity for qualified young men. It is the opinion of your committee that H.R. 15857 embodies a minimum such salary schedule with an average increase of approximately 9.9 percent effective as of July 1, 1966.

At present, only privates in the police force who are assigned as dog handlers are entitled to extra remuneration to compensate them for the expense of housing, feeding, care, and transportation of the dogs. However, since the innovation of the Canine Corps as a part of the Metropolitan Police force, it has been found expedient in some few instances to assign members of higher rank, including sergeants, to this duty of dog handler. Your committee has included a provision in H.R. 15857 to afford the same extra pay for all dog handlers in the force, regardless of rank.

RETIREES INJURED IN LINE OF DUTY

It has come to the attention of your committee that officers and members of the Police and Fire Departments who were retired prior to October 1, 1956, for permanent and total disability due to injury or illness incurred in line of duty, are entitled to a pension of only 50 percent of their last annual salary, while an officer or member retired for this same reason after the above-mentioned date receives an annuity of at least 66⅔ percent and a maximum of 70 percent of his last annual salary. Your committee feels strongly that this is a gross injustice, and that the Equalization Act of 1923 which bases all retirees' pensions upon increased annual salaries whenever there is a salary increase for the forces does not provide truly equitable treatment for these older disabled retirees, who sacrified their health and earning ability in the performance of their hazardous service. For this reason, H.R. 15857 provides that the pensions of these totally disabled retirees shall be computed on the same basis, regardless of the date of retirement.

Officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the District of Columbia Fire Department, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, or the U.S. Secret Service who were retired for permanent total disability prior to October 1, 1956, will receive retirement benefits after July 1, 1966, computed on the basis of the retirement law which went into effect after that date.

Under existing law—39 Statutes at Large 718—an officer or member who was retired for disability incurred in line of duty prior to October 1, 1956, receives a maximum annuity of 50 percent of his last annual salary. No minimum percentage was provided for such retirees, and your committee regards the granting of a 50-percent annuity as indicating total disability on the part of a retiree under that law. Public Law 85–157, however, approved August 21, 1957—71 Statutes at Large 391—provides that officers or members of these forces who are retired subsequent to October 1, 1956, for disability incurred in line of duty shall receive an annuity computed at 2 percent of his last annual salary per year of service, with a minimum of 66⅔ percent and a maximum of 70 percent. Thus, under H.R. 15857, the older retirees for total disability incurred in the performance of duty will have their annuities increased from the present 50 percent to at least 66⅔ percent of their last annual salary and in some cases to as much as 70 percent, depending upon their number of years of service.

Your committee regards this provision as a simple matter of justice to these disabled public servants, who faced the same hazards of service and suffered the same loss of physical ability to earn their living as did those who retired under identical circumstances at a later date, and for this reason, the existing difference of from 16⅔ to 20 percent in the annuities

with which they must face the same costs of living should be eliminated.

Your committee is advised that some 748 older retired members will be affected by this provision. No estimate of the annual cost is readily available.

WIDOWS

Under existing law, if a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia marries subsequent to his retirement, upon his death his widow is not entitled to any pension whatever. Your committee is of the opinion that this is an injustice, and hence have provided in this bill, as does the civil service retirement law, that a widow who has been married to and living with a retired member for at least 2 years prior to his death will be entitled to full pension rights.

In the event that a retired officer or member of the District of Columbia Police or Fire Department marries after his retirement, his widow will be entitled to full benefits as provided in subsection (a) (3) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act. However, such widow must have been married to the retired officer or member for at least 2 years prior to his death.

Under existing law, a widow in such circumstances would not be entitled to any annuity or benefits whatever. Your committee is of the opinion that this is an inequity and should be corrected. This provision is patterned in general after the similar provisions of civil service law as applied to classified Government retired workers.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Title I amends the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as follows:

First. A new salary schedule is provided for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

This new salary schedule will provide an increase of 11.4 percent for beginning privates, and increases for the other categories of privates ranging from 10.4 percent to 10.9 percent. Fire inspectors, who comprise class 2, will receive salary increases ranging from 9.7 percent to 10.5 percent. Members in salary class 3, which includes detectives, will be increased by 10 percent. The various grades of sergeants who comprise salary class 4, will be increased from 9 percent to 9.6 percent, and all officer personnel, who occupy the remaining salary classes 5 through 10, will receive an increase of 7.1 percent.

The average increase in salaries provided by this new salary scale is approximately 9.9 percent. The reason for weighting the increases in favor of the four lowest salary classes, and particularly in the starting salary figure, is that the critical problems of recruitment and retention of personnel in these vital forces are most acute in these areas.

This proposed salary schedule will place the minimum salary for privates in the Police and Fire Departments of the District at $6,700, with a maximum of $9,420 attainable in 19 years of service. These figures will change the relative position of the District of Columbia in respect to these salaries among the jurisdictions of the Washington metropolitan area and among the 21 U.S. cities of population greater than 500,000, as shown in the following table:

	In Washington metropolitan area		Among 21 largest cities	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Police:				
Present	2	3	11	6
Proposed	1	1	5	5
Firemen:				
Present	1	1	10	5
Proposed	1	1	5	5

In the opinion of your committee, this will afford the Metropolitan Police Force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia an excellent competitive position for the recruitment of qualified new personnel, and will go far toward a solution of this very serious problem.

Second. All privates who at this time are not at the top longevity step, but who have more than 19 years of service as a private, shall be advanced to the top longevity step. Previous legislation reduced the service time requirement from 28 years to 19 years for a private to reach the top longevity step. At present, however, there are a few privates who have more than 19 years of service but who because of previous legislation will have to wait until they have at least 21 years of service before being advanced to the top longevity step. This provision is designed to afford these privates the same benefits as newly appointed privates.

Third. All officers in longevity step 7 of class 5 or 8, with at least 14 years of service, shall be advanced to the top longevity step 8. This is for a reason similar to that described above, for privates.

Fourth. All officers and members of the Police Department assigned to duty as dog handlers shall receive extra pay in the amount of $610 per year, as compensation for their expense of feeding, housing, caring for, and transporting these dogs. This extra compensation has heretofore been extended only to privates who are assigned as dog handlers. At present, however, there are 5 sergeants acting also in this capacity, and it is the feeling of your committee that they should also receive this extra pay.

Fifth. Addition of a subsection to define a "calendar week of active service" as contained in the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, for step increase purposes when periods of leave with pay or periods of nonpay status may be involved. This subsection conforms with the nonpay status principle used for step increases for those District employees under the Classification Act of 1949.

Sixth. Certain technical provisions as to the effective date of the salary increases, which is the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1966, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, and redetermination of insurance amounts.

COST OF BILL

The estimated annual cost of this bill, as computed by the District of Columbia Personnel Office, is tabulated as follows:

	Police	Firemen
Salary increases	$2,401,800	$1,112,200
Retirement	556,100	262,200
Overtime	354,800	11,200
Holiday pay	38,600	43,000
District of Columbia share of U.S. Park Police salaries	76,600	
Total	3,437,900	1,428,600
Grand total	$4,866,500	

CONCLUSIONS

There was at least an implied understanding last year, when the imminence of adjournment of the first session of the present Congress left no time for proper consideration of a salary increase for the Metropolitan Police Force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia equivalent to the cost-of-living increase granted to classified government employees at that time, that members of these forces could expect an increase this year made retroactive to October 1, 1965, to compensate them for this temporary disadvantage. Your committee gave this matter serious consideration, when bills providing for a two-part salary increase, one part of which would be made retroactive to that date, were recommended by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners. The Committee's conclusion, however, was that H.R. 15857, which provides a single increase somewhat higher in percentage than was included in the Commissioners' bill and effective as of July 1, 1966, would be more desirable from every standpoint.

For example, your committee believes that the somewhat higher percentage increases for the four lowest classes in the salary schedule, as compared with the more modest increases for officers, will prove an invaluable aid to recruitment and retention of well-qualified personnel, to a far greater extent than could any across-the-board increase.

Therefore, your committee feels that this proposed salary schedule, slightly higher in average percentage than was recommended by the District of Columbia Commissioners and effective July 1, 1966, will properly compensate the members of the police and fire departments for having received no salary increase in 1965, and at the same time from the standpoint of all considerations comes reasonably close to the limitations contained in the Commissioners' bill.

Public hearings on this legislation were conducted by Subcommittee No. 5 on May 17 and 23, 1966. All witnesses concurred in the necessity for and desirability of increased compensation to the police and firemen of the District of Columbia.

The President of the United States has requested the assistance of the Congress in making the Nation's Capital a "model city," to which end this committee has earnestly labored through the years.

In his special message to the Congress against crime on March 9, 1966, the

President included in his first-stage recommendations—calling for immediate action—the following:

I recommend a substantial increase in police salaries to attract and retain the best qualified officers in the District of Columbia.

Your committee believes that H.R. 15857 as reported meets this desire.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to lend my support to H.R. 15857, to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act. The passage of this legislation is long overdue.

The proposed bill provides for an average increase in salary for police and firemen of 9.9 percent, and sets minimum salary at $6,700 per year and a maximum of $25,166.

The need for this legislation is demonstrated by the fact that all Federal classified workers and all District of Columbia employees, with the exception of police, firemen, and teachers, were granted a salary increase of 3.6 percent on October 1, 1965. Additional salary increases for these groups appear to be a certainty again this year.

The pending legislation, in addition to establishing a more equitable pay scale for all District of Columbia police and firemen, is designed to help alleviate the very acute problem of recruitment for the firefighting and police forces, and the problem of retention of their younger members. It does this by providing the greatest increases—from 10.4 percent to 11.4 percent—in the four lowest salary classes. Other salary increases average 7.1 percent.

The legislation is similar to a measure I introduced earlier this year, H.R. 15039. The principal difference between the pending bill and my proposal is that my bill provided a pay increase retroactive to October 1, 1965, when the classified Federal employees and most District employees received their last pay raise. I am sorry that this provision did not prevail in the committee's deliberation on the pending legislation. However, I note that in many cases the pay provided in the committee's bill is slightly higher than provided in my proposal, thus compensating, at least in part, for the lack of retroactivity, and I lend my wholehearted support to this measure and urge its enactment.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

COMMON-LAW MARRIAGES MAY NOT BE CONTRACTED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 5426) to provide that common-law marriages may not be contracted in the District of Columbia, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5426

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 "Domestic Relations Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. Section 1288 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901 (D.C. Code § 30–106), is amended by striking out "For the purpose of preserving the evidence of marriages in the District, every" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "No marriage may be contracted in the District of Columbia after the date of enactment of the Domestic Relations Act of 1965 unless it is celebrated by a person to whom a license to perform such marriage ceremony has been delivered pursuant to section 1290. Every".

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "1965" and insert in lieu thereof "1966".

Page 2, line 1, strike out "1965" and insert in lieu thereof "1966".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to question the wisdom of this legislation which invalidates common-law marriages in the District of Columbia. Although it is significant that one-half of the States of the Union do not recognize common-law marriages, and although nine other States have already limited the recognition of such marriages, the actions of these States should not necessarily alter or direct the course of our action with respect to the status of common-law marriages in the District of Columbia.

In the report setting forth the need for this legislation it is contended that the common-law marriage delays the determination of eligibility and provides a denial of eligibility of a surviving spouse or a child to the benefits of modern society in matters of inheritance, social security, and other Federal and State programs, including grants under public welfare and assistance programs.

If this legislation were adopted, it would have precisely the opposite effect. It would absolutely deny the benefits of social security, public welfare, and assistance, and the benefits of private insurance to the spouses and children of marital unions not consummated within the provisions of this law. It would restrict and limit these benefits to beneficiaries who are claimants under ceremonial marriage established in compliance with this act. Thousands of children and spouses would be removed from eligibility.

This law will not and cannot be expected to eliminate or deter the establishment of marital relationships within or without the law. It will simply serve to punish the innocent who become deprived of benefits because of the illegitimate status of the union which brought them into the world.

It is also contended that this legislation will avoid complications which occur when partners of a common-law marriage "fall out" and fail to obtain a divorce when they enter into another marriage. But look at what else it does—it legalizes a remarriage of either of the partners without a divorce—making it easier for persons in such a relationship to dissolve that relationship without any further obligation to society.

I cannot condone, forgive, or forget the conditions of social disorder which bring about a marital union without the benefit of ceremony. Yet, while I deplore the circumstances and conditions and the light treatment with which some people proceed into the marital relationship, my concern is directed toward the attack which this legislation will make upon the legitimacy of the issue of such relationships—the children. In my opinion, there are no illegitimate children. There may be and there always will be illegitimate parents. But every child brought into the world is entitled to a respectable, equal place in society—untouched by the wrongs of his parents.

Today we are in the midst of a social revolution in which we are more astutely identifying and firming up the rights of man. The rights of man begin at his birth—when he is first brought into this world. We strive to provide him with equality for at least that moment.

Children of parents who have not complied with the requirements of this bill which we now consider are entitled to all of the rights, privileges, and the immunities which are enjoyed by all other children. The actions of the parents should not be allowed to shadow the future life of such children. They are children of God, standing in equality and with the fullness of right with which every other child is endowed.

Unless and until the rights of these children are protected, I must oppose the bill in its present form.

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio for his most discerning and objective and well-founded statement alerting the Members of the House as to the dangers, explicit as well as implicit, in this legislation. I would like to fully associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 5426.

There is nothing diabolical or mysterious about this legislation. It is more or less a standard repealer that has been passed in many, many States of our Union. It provides that after the enactment of this bill, common-law marriages cannot be entered into in the District of Columbia.

At present common-law marriages are recognized in the District of Columbia. These relationships are established merely by living together and holding

themselves to the public as man and wife. Such marriages have exactly equal standing with those contracted in regular form and celebrated by persons authorized to perform marriages. The lack of records established in regard to these marriages causes a great deal of confusion, and certainly there is a lack of permanent marriage records.

Many of our States—and more and more every day—are doing away with the recognition of common-law marriages. As the previous speaker pointed out, now there are 25 States which have outlawed common-law marriages. In addition to that, nine more have recognized common law marriages only from the standpoint of a grandfather clause, but they have prohibited common-law marriages in the future, from the passage of the act. That is a total of 34 States that forbid common-law marriages from this time. Sixteen States do recognize common law marriages as bona fide marriages.

This bill does not invalidate existing marriages, under common-law provisions. If a marriage is recognized through previous arrangements, this bill does not retroactively affect that marriage, but allows it to continue as a legal marriage. It has no retroactive feature. It just places the District of Columbia with the States that no longer recognize the common-law marriages, but do have the grandfather clause.

I think this is good legislation. I was amazed when I became a Member of the District of Columbia Committee to find that such legislation had not been passed many years previous to this time.

Certainly I had one person call my office, after I asked the committee to consider this bill, and the person said "What about the poor people?" I would say—I believe without fear of contradiction—that anyone who cannot spend two or three dollars for a marriage license to get married certainly is in no position financially to enter into the blessings of matrimony.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill. I hope the House will pass it. I believe it is good legislation, and long overdue.

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Could the gentleman tell us whether there have been any hearings on this bill and whether objections were raised by some of the interested groups in the District of Columbia?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. To my knowledge there has been no group—nor any individuals—which has registered a protest to this bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. Were these hearings on the bill, and were the various groups, such as social agencies and others, invited to testify?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. There were no invitations to testify, this I admit, and no formal hearings of the type the gentleman explains. However, the bill was considered at great length in the committee. We went to a great deal of effort to determine what other States had done in this regard, and this information appears in the committee report. The bill is most simple in its purpose. I doubt if witnesses could have offered testimony that would have given the committee more complete understanding as to its provisions.

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

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

Mr. WHITENER. I believe the gentleman introduced the bill in February of 1965?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITENER. The committee just reported it. None of the agencies or individuals complained, did they?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I have never received a letter individually, nor has the committee received a letter of protest to this legislation.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. After passage of the bill, will the children of future marital unions without a ceremony be legitimate or illegitimate children?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. This is a provision in many, many States.

Mr. VANIK. I am asking about the effect of it in the District of Columbia, after passage of the bill.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Children born out of wedlock would be illegitimate children; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. VANIK. If there were no ceremony?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. If there were no ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 5426 which I authored, is to provide that, after the enactment of proposed legislation, a marriage may not be contracted in the District of Columbia unless the parties secure a license and present it to a person authorized to celebrate marriages in the District and who performs such ceremony.

Under present law, common-law marriages may be contracted in the District of Columbia. Such marriages are usually a marriage without ceremony of any sort where a man and a woman live together as man and wife and hold themselves out as such to the world. When the required elements of a common-law marriage are established, such marriages are given equal standing before the law of the District of Columbia as those marriages contracted and celebrated by persons authorized to perform marriages.

PRACTICE IN THE STATES

Because of the increasing number of problems and confusions resulting from the lack of accurate and permanent marriage records, the legislatures of the States of the Union have been amending their marriage laws to prohibit the contracting of common-law marriages. Accurate marriage records provide a basis on which the legal rights, responsibilities, and entitlements of such persons or the issue from any marriage may be determined.

As of 1961, according to the latest statistics furnished your committee, 25, or one-half, the States do not recognize common-law marriages; 9 States have a limited recognition of them; and 16 recognize them without limitation.

They are not recognized in the following States and Territory:

Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland.

Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Nevada, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Tennessee.

Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Puerto Rico.

They are recognized with limitations in these States:

California if entered into before 1895. Indiana if entered into before January 1, 1958. Michigan if entered into before January 1, 1957. Minnesota if entered into before April 26, 1941. Mississippi if entered into before April 5, 1958. Missouri if entered into before March 31, 1921. New Jersey if entered into before December 1, 1939. New York if entered into before April 29, 1933. South Dakota if entered into before July 1, 1959.

They are recognized without reservation in the following States, Territory, and the District of Columbia:

Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, District of Columbia, Virgin Islands.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

In an increasing number of situations, the establishment of a valid marriage contract becomes of importance to a surviving spouse or to the children resulting from a marriage. Family relationships must be established as a basis for eligibility for many benefits provided in our modern society, such as matters of inheritance; benefits under the Social Security Act for surviving spouses and minor children; benefits under veterans laws; claims under Federal group life insurance; and grants under public welfare and assistance programs.

The lack of accurate and complete marriage records often delays the determination of eligibility of a surviving spouse or a child. In some cases, the payment of benefits or approval of a claim may be denied for lack of records which meet the requirements set by law before payment may be made. In other situations, a person not legally entitled to payments may succeed in presenting suitable color of entitlement and secure an award in absence of the timely presentation of legally sufficient evidence by a person who has a valid claim.

Many persons who contract common-law marriages and thereafter separate for some reason, are not aware of the fact that such common-law marriage can be legally terminated only by the formality of a divorce. Such former husband and wife may later enter into another marriage by common-law cohabitation or by formal ceremony without realizing the invalid nature of the second marriage contract and its effect on the legal rights of the parties and the legitimacy of any children. Knowledge that common-law marriages may not be contracted in the future in the District of Columbia would avoid many complications and disappointments which may now arise.

INTENT OF THE LEGISLATION

The effect of the proposed legislation would be to prohibit common-law marriages in the future in the District of Columbia. The proposed amendment to existing law would not retroactively affect any common-law marriage validly established on the date of enactment of this legislation.

Your committee does not intend by this bill to invalidate marriages presently permitted under section 1288 of the act of March 3, 1901; namely, marriages of members of any church or religious society which does not by its custom require the intervention of a minister for the celebration of marriages, if such marriages are solemnized in the manner prescribed and practiced in any such church or religious society.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

It is clear from the debate thus far that this bill may have far-reaching consequences for the people of the District of Columbia.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], for his splendid statement pointing out some of the problems which are inherent in it. I do not believe we should be considering a bill with such ramifications when there have not been full hearings by the committee.

There is no record of any hearings before us. No hearings were held. Certainly none of the interested agencies—governmental or nongovernmental—in the District of Columbia has been invited to appear.

The committee report itself was not available until this morning. It does not matter whether the bill was introduced in 1965 or not; the report was not available to the Members until the morning of the day the bill was brought up.

I should like to ask whether the committee considered the effect of the bill on eligibility for public housing, for instance; whether it considered the effect on eligibility for survivors benefits under social security; whether it considered the effect on public welfare in the District of Columbia?

All of these questions are pertinent to this debate this afternoon. Without hearings and without adequate consideration, the House is asked to pass this bill. I certainly believe that the bill should be recommitted, and the committee should hold full hearings. Agencies in the District which are interested should be given an opportunity to appear before the committee. The committee should determine what the effect of this bill would be on social welfare programs.

When I learned that the bill would be called up, I inquired about the views of the Urban League of Washington, and found out that the Urban League was unaware that this bill was coming up. Representatives of the Urban League pointed out that it could have serious consequences on the poor and deprived people of the District of Columbia. The Urban League and other interested social agencies, which understand the desperate problems of the disadvantaged, should be asked to comment upon this bill.

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

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the author of the bill.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I am very happy to respond to the gentleman and to tell him that in every instance that legislation concerning the District of Columbia is introduced it is sent to the interested agencies of the Government of the District of Columbia. Therefore, this bill has been in the hands of the District officials for many, many months.

Mr. RYAN. Does the gentleman state that there were open, public hearings on this bill?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. No. I made that point clear to the previous speaker.

Mr. RYAN. That is the point. There were not, and the public was not invited to express their views.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. The committee provided a copy of this report for every Member of the House.

Mr. RYAN. At 10 o'clock this morning the committee report became available, and not before. It was not available last Friday. In fact, I understand it was not yet printed then.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I got a copy in the committee room on either Friday or Saturday. The bill was listed on the whip notice, I say to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. The committee report was not available in printed form until this morning.

Mr. GROSS. I know I was able to get a copy of it in the office of the District of Columbia Committee.

Mr. RYAN. I imagine the gentleman from Iowa received special consideration, then.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH], who, as many of you know, had a distinguished career as the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. In that work he has faced many of the tragedies which confront the children of men who have worn the uniform of the United States and who have given their lives and shed their blood in defense of our country. He has also been concerned, as have we all, with the problems of their widows and orphans.

Now we hear a great deal about how unfair this bill is. May I point out to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], who is so concerned about this bill, that in his State common-law marriages are not recognized unless they were entered into before April 29, 1933. My good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] is very much upset about this legislation. But you know, if these children he is worried about here in the District of Columbia were living out in California and their parents tried to go into a common-law marriage situation, they would have had to have done that before 1895 or it would have been illegal. Now, what are they complaining about? If it is so bad in Washington, it must be terrible in California.

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

Mr. WHITENER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of California. I hope the gentleman is not criticizing our State because of the compassion we have for our senior citizens.

Mr. WHITENER. I am afraid that the gentleman would be more correct if instead of saying "compassion" he would use the term "admiration."

Since he is worried about children, and the California common-law situation ceased to be legal in 1895, if that is the kind of senior citizen California has, I do not think that they need compassion, but, rather, they need our compliments and no doubt have our envy.

However, this bill is not a serious change. It merely says that if a man and woman want to live together as man and wife in the District of Columbia in the future and have that union recognized as a legal marriage, that they have to go downtown and pay $2 and say "I do" before someone who is authorized to perform a marriage ceremony.

I doubt if there is anybody in this House that did not spend a little more than that when they got married and did not go through a formal ceremony. If the gentleman is worried about children, I can tell him of a situation in the State of my good chairman from South Carolina, which adjoins my State. South Carolina recognizes common-law marriages. North Carolina prohibits common-law marriages. I can tell you of a case that arose not too long ago where a couple lived together in South Carolina in a state of common-law marriage for 25 years. They came to my county in North Carolina, 8 miles across the State line. Someone suggested to them, after they had lived there for 4 or 5 years, that they were living in sin, so to speak. So they went back off to South Carolina and were married. Six months later the husband died. I have been trying every since his death to get a bill through this Congress to get the lady qualified to receive social security benefits. These benefits are denied to her, because she was not legally married for 1 year prior to the death of her husband. She has grown children who are very fine citizens, just as was her late husband.

I think that when we are having so many claims for benefits in social security, veterans' benefits, and other Government programs, it is time that we have evidence of marriage—and a legal marriage—and not have little children dependent upon proof not of record as to whether they are legitimate or not or whether they are entitled to benefits or not.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Indiana for his bill. It needs no hearings. Anyone who is familiar with the facts of life knows that it is important that we have a record of marriage.

Mr. Speaker, it is important legislation, primarily for the children of the marriage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we approve the bill which has been introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

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

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] for his kind remarks about my service and would say that the circumstances which inspired this bill was not a desire to hurt anyone, but to establish bona fide records that are so very necessary in the administration of the veterans' benefits programs, and other programs of our Government.

Mr. WHITENER. And, the gentleman from Indiana knows that there are certain types of veterans' benefits where it is necessary to prove that a widow was married to the deceased veteran for a period of 5 years prior to his death.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. That is correct.

Mr. WHITENER. Suppose she started living with him without the benefit of a celebrated marriage 5 years and 2 months before he passed away? She would have one terrible time establishing to the satisfaction of the Veterans' Administration that she had been legally married to him under the common law marriage concept for a period of 5 years, I would ask the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I would say to the gentleman from North Carolina that she would be in serious trouble.

Mr. WHITENER. But if she could go down to the courthouse and obtain a certified copy of the marriage certificate, the Veterans' Administration would not question it, if the marriage had been celebrated only 5 years and 1 day prior to the death of the veteran.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. That is correct.

Mr. WHITENER. That is only an example of the reason the bill should pass.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with no reflection upon the able author of H.R. 5426, a past commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and the able and distinguished members of the committee who are recommending the bill to our favorable consideration, I shall vote to recommit the measure for further hearings.

I was much impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK]. I think we all must agree with him that the sins of the parents should not be visited upon innocent children.

What effect the enactment of H.R. 5426 will have on the rights of inheritance of children of common-law marriages of the past is undetermined. Whether it would in effect place a stigma upon them also is undetermined.

I do not doubt the good intentions of the author of H.R. 5426 or of the committee members. What doubtless they had in mind was to follow in the wake of many States that have abolished the common law form of marriage that in the earlier years of our Republic was more often the rule rather than the exception. I think it very likely that they did not intend that this bill should place a stigma upon the children of past common-law marriages, common-law marriages that had been entered into in all good faith and that had bound the parties in lasting marital loyalty. But the learned gentleman from Ohio, himself a former judge, has raised a serious question as to just how far this bill goes, where it starts, and where it ends. It would seem to me the course of procedure to send the measure back to committee in order that it might be the subject of exhaustive, informative, and beneficial public hearings on a matter that certainly is not without interest to the American people.

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

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

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

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from California opposed to the bill?

Mr. BURTON of California. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BURTON of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5426 to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 39, nays 328, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

YEAS—39

Albert	Friedel	O'Hara, Ill.
Ashley	Gonzalez	Patten
Bandstra	Green, Pa.	Powell
Barrett	Hawkins	Rees
Bingham	Kastenmeier	Reuss
Bolling	King, Calif.	Rosenthal
Brown, Calif.	Krebs	Roybal
Burton, Calif.	Long, Md.	Ryan
Cohelan	McVicker	Sickles
Corman	Macdonald	Smith, Iowa
Craley	Mink	Stalbaum
Edwards, Calif.	Moorhead	Vanik
Fraser	Nix	Yates

NAYS—328

Abbitt	Andrews, George W.	Arends
Abernethy	Andrews, Glenn	Ashbrook
Adair	Andrews, N. Dak.	Ashmore
Adams	Annunzio	Aspinall
Anderson, Ill.		Ayres
Anderson, Tenn.		Bates
		Battin
Beckworth	Greigg	Pelly
Belcher	Grider	Pepper
Bell	Griffiths	Perkins
Bennett	Gross	Philbin
Berry	Grover	Pickle
Betts	Gubser	Pike
Boggs	Gurney	Pirnie
Bolton	Hagen, Calif.	Poage
Bow	Haley	Poff
Brademas	Hall	Pool
Bray	Halleck	Price
Brock	Hamilton	Pucinski
Brooks	Hanley	Quie
Broomfield	Hansen, Idaho	Quillen
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Hansen, Wash.	Race
	Hardy	Randall
Broyhill, N.C.	Harvey, Mich.	Redlin
Broyhill, Va.	Hathaway	Reid, Ill.
Buchanan	Hébert	Reid, N.Y.
Burke	Hechler	Reifel
Burleson	Helstoski	Reinecke
Burton, Utah	Henderson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Byrne, Pa.	Holifield	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Holland	Rivers, S.C.
Cabell	Horton	Rivers, Alaska
Cahill	Hosmer	Roberts
Callan	Howard	Robison
Cameron	Hungate	Rodino
Carey	Huot	Rogers, Colo.
Carter	Hutchinson	Rogers, Fla.
Casey	Ichord	Ronan
Chamberlain	Jacobs	Rooney, Pa.
Chelf	Jarman	Rostenkowski
Clancy	Jennings	Roudebush
Clark	Joelson	Roush
Cleveland	Johnson, Calif.	Rumsfeld
Clevenger	Johnson, Okla.	Satterfield
Collier	Jonas	St. Onge
Conable	Jones, Ala.	Saylor
Conte	Jones, Mo.	Schisler
Cooley	Jones, N.C.	Schmidhauser
Corbett	Karsten	Schneebeli
Cramer	Karth	Schweiker
Culver	Kee	Scott
Cunningham	Keith	Secrest
Curtin	Keogh	Selden
Curtis	King, N.Y.	Senner
Daddario	King, Utah	Shriver
Dague	Kirwan	Sikes
Daniels	Kornegay	Sisk
Davis, Ga.	Kunkel	Skubitz
Davis, Wis.	Laird	Slack
Dawson	Landrum	Smith, Calif.
de la Garza	Latta	Smith, N.Y.
Delaney	Leggett	Smith, Va.
Dent	Lennon	Springer
Denton	Lipscomb	Stafford
Derwinski	Love	Staggers
Devine	McClory	Stanton
Dickinson	McCulloch	Steed
Diggs	McDade	Stephens
Dingell	McEwen	Stubblefield
Dole	McFall	Sweeney
Donohue	McGrath	Talcott
Dorn	McMillan	Taylor
Dow	MacGregor	Teague, Calif.
Dowdy	Machen	Tenzer
Downing	Madden	Thomas
Duncan, Oreg.	Mahon	Thompson, Tex.
Duncan, Tenn.	Mailliard	Thomson, Wis.
Dwyer	Marsh	Todd
Dyal	Martin, Ala.	Trimble
Edmondson	Martin, Nebr.	Tuck
Edwards, Ala.	Mathias	Tunney
Edwards, La.	Matsunaga	Tupper
Ellsworth	Matthews	Tuten
Erlenborn	May	Udall
Everett	Meeds	Ullman
Fallon	Michel	Van Deerlin
Farnsley	Miller	Vigorito
Farnum	Mills	Vivian
Fascell	Minish	Waggonner
Feighan	Minshall	Waldie
Findley	Mize	Walker, Miss.
Fino	Moeller	Walker, N. Mex.
Fisher	Monagan	Watkins
Flood	Moore	Watson
Foley	Morgan	Watts
Ford, Gerald R.	Morrison	Weltner
Ford, William D.	Morse	Whalley
Fountain	Morton	White, Idaho
Frelinghuysen	Mosher	White, Tex.
Fulton, Tenn.	Moss	Whitener
Fuqua	Murphy, Ill.	Widnall
Garmatz	Murphy, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Gathings	Natcher	Wilson, Charles H.
Gettys	Nedzi	Wolff
Giaimo	O'Brien	Wright
Gibbons	O'Hara, Mich.	Wyatt
Gilligan	Olsen, Mont.	Wydler
Goodell	Olson, Minn.	Young
Grabowski	O'Neill, Mass.	Younger
Gray	Ottinger	Zablocki
Green, Oreg.	Passman	
	Patman	

NOT VOTING—65

Addabbo	Halpern	Multer
Baring	Hanna	Murray
Blatnik	Hansen, Iowa	Nelsen
Boland	Harsha	O'Konski
Callaway	Harvey, Ind.	O'Neal, Ga.
Cederberg	Hays	Purcell
Celler	Herlong	Resnick
Clausen, Don H.	Hicks	Rogers, Tex.
Clawson, Del	Hull	Roncalio
Colmer	Irwin	Rooney, N.Y.
Conyers	Johnson, Pa.	St Germain
Dulski	Kelly	Scheuer
Evans, Colo.	Kluczynski	Shipley
Evins, Tenn.	Kupferman	Stratton
Farbstein	Langen	Sullivan
Flynt	Long, La.	Teague, Tex.
Fogarty	McCarthy	Thompson, N.J.
Fulton, Pa.	McDowell	Toll
Gallagher	Mackay	Utt
Gilbert	Mackie	Whitten
Hagan, Ga.	Martin, Mass.	Williams
	Morris	Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hicks with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Mackay with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Langen.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Fogarty.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Roncalio.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Shipley.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. St Germain.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. McDowell.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Irwin.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Mackie.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Murray with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Toll.

Mr. LONG of Maryland changed his vote from "nay" to "yea".

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISING POSTAL RATES ON CERTAIN FOURTH-CLASS MAIL

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14904) to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14904, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I sponsored H.R. 14904 on the basis of the official recommendation of the Postmaster General. Our Subcommittee on Postal Rates held 19 days of hearings on this legislation, starting on March 1, and ending on April 28. We afforded as many witnesses as possible an opportunity to be heard and arranged the subcommittee schedule to meet the conveniences of the witnesses, including the scheduling of hearings on Mondays, Fridays, and even on Saturday. More than 200 statements were presented to the subcommittee or submitted for the record.

Following the hearings, the legislation was thoroughly considered by the subcommittee and ordered reported to the full committee by a vote of 6 to 1. The full committee ordered it reported to the House by a vote of 17 to 3.

Mr. Chairman, the 3-year moratorium granted by Public Law 88–51, on the prohibition on the use of funds appropriated for the postal service, will terminate on June 30, 1966, and the prohibition will be resumed automatically unless this legislation is enacted to place parcel post on a near break-even basis, or other legislation is enacted removing the prohibition.

The major difficulties concerning parcel post stem from two statutes. First, the provisions of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1951, approved September 27, 1950, as amended (31 U.S.C. 695), require a break-even operation within 4 percent for fourth-class parcel post and catalogs, with no prior deductions for public service cost. Second, the size and weight limitations (Public Law 82–199) have resulted in a sharp contraction of parcel post volume, mostly in the more profitable parcels.

These two statutes have blocked the attainment of the break-even goal and have precipitated a crisis in parcel post service. Parcel post cannot be maintained on a break-even basis.

Our committee was faced with two alternatives—first, remove the maximum size and weight limitations on parcels mailed between first-class post offices more than two zones apart and increase rates so as to maintain parcel post on a break-even basis or, second, provide for a subsidized parcel post system.

The committee bill, H.R. 14904, will place the parcel post system on a near break-even basis by rate increases and changes in size and weights. Also, procedural changes are provided, which together with the continuation of the rate-fixing authority of the Postmaster General, will require that the parcel post system be continued on a near break-even basis.

The major provisions of H.R. 14904 may be summarized, as follows:

First. Zone-rated parcel post rates are increased 8 cents per piece, rounded off to increments of 5 cents. The increase is expected to yield additional net revenue of $60 million.

Second. Zone-rated catalog rates are increased approximately 12 percent of revenues and are expected to yield $3 million.

Third. Authority is continued for the Postmaster General to submit a request to the Interstate Commerce Commission to reform rates and other conditions of mailability—other than size and weight—with the requirement that the request will be considered as having been approved unless action is taken by the Interstate Commerce Commission within 30 days to reject the request or to order an investigation, with the further requirement that final determination must be made within 180 days. The 30 and 180-day requirements were added by the committee and have been approved by the Postmaster General.

Fourth. The 4 percent cost-revenue certification required by the Postmaster General before the Post Office can spend funds for postal purposes is continued.

Fifth. Postal zone determinations will be based on the 552 sectional centers rather than on the existing 4,000 different geographic area units. This change will greatly simplify stamp dispensing by postal clerks and by automatic equipment. The operating economies from the more simplified operations are expected to more than offset the revenue shrinkage of approximately $1 million.

Sixth. The maximum size is changed from 72 inches to 100 inches for parcels mailed from one first-class post office to another first-class post office, and the maximum weight is changed from 20 to 40 pounds for parcels mailed between first-class post offices which are more than two zones apart—approximately 150 miles. The additional net revenue is expected to be $40 million.

Mr. Chairman, this is a reasonable bill. It takes into consideration the interests of people living in rural and urban areas. There is more than a little irony in that the maximum size and weight limits imposed by Public Law 82–199 have hit the farmer hardest of all. While rural areas were exempt from those restrictions, the parcel post patrons in these areas have not been able to avoid the sharp rise in parcel rates which, in part, was a direct result of Public Law 199.

In 1951, postage for a 5-pound carton shipped by a farmer to a customer 100 miles away was only 21 cents. Today that postage rate is 57 cents, and the bill proposes to raise it again to 65 cents. If parcel size and weight limits are not revised as proposed, the rate would have to be 71 cents.

Since 1952, the general public, particularly farmers and businessmen, have been forced to pay more than one-half billion dollars extra, or about $40 million a year, representing amounts paid for parcel post rates higher than the rates which otherwise would have been

required if the volume losses of heavier-weight parcels having a favorable revenue-cost relationship had not occurred because of size and weight limitations.

Of all consumers, the farmer and other occupants of rural areas are hardest hit by the unending rise in parcel post rates. They did not have the wide range of transportation modes available for shipments between urban areas. Our committee expects that the changes in size and weights will reduce the amount of rate increases otherwise required.

The bill takes into consideration the interests of private business. The parcel post system does not have a monopoly. It operates as a supplement to private carriers. For example, one shipper of small parcels handled over 250 million parcels in calendar year 1965, as compared with the parcel post volume of 742.4 million parcels in fiscal year 1965.

I believe this legislation does protect the private business interests of small parcel shippers by requiring parcel post rates to be maintained on a level sufficiently high to continue the parcel post service on a self-sustaining basis. One of the main justifications offered for Public Law 199 was that stringent parcel post size and weight limits were necessary to further free enterprise, but there now is a serious question as to whether our private economy benefited from that law. I recited several instances in my statement on House Resolution 875 of how this law discriminates against first class mail patrons.

Parcel post volume has fallen from a high of 1,046 million in 1952 to 742 million in 1965, during a period when all other mail and business volume in general were increasing.

Parcel post rates were raised four times in the last 15 years, yet deficits existed in every year but one. A 25-percent increase was effective on October 1, 1951, and a 36-percent increase on October 1, 1953. These two increases resulted in a loss of 40 million in the number of pieces of parcel post and a loss of 800 million pounds. A 17-percent increase on February 1, 1960, was followed by a piece loss of 47 million and a pound loss of 456 million. A 13-percent increase on April 1, 1964, was followed by a piece loss of 35 million and a pound loss of 291 million.

Our committee received testimony supporting this legislation from representatives of private business organizations representing many thousands of private shippers. Even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which always advances the cause of private enterprise, has not objected to enactment of this legislation.

I am convinced that the increase in the maximum size and weight limitations will stimulate new business in the shipment and sales of small parcels. The more liberal size and weight limits will provide a greatly expanded potential for private shippers heretofore denied economical transportation and delivery service.

One company reported to our committee of having eliminated 11,000 merchandise items from its catalog since 1952, mainly because of the size-weight limits of Public Law 199. Another large mailer indicated about 1,500 items are listed in his catalog, with a stipulation that they are not mailable at first-class post offices. These companies indicated that revision of size and weight limits will permit a relisting of these items for catalog sale and parcel post delivery. In that way, there would be a regeneration of traffic not now moving by any transportation mode.

Mr. Chairman, it is reasonable to expect that there will be some diversion of parcel shipments from private carriers to parcel post, but we believe it will be minimal.

The Post Office Department estimates that the parcel post service will gain about 51 million parcels. On a piece count basis, there will be a partial offsetting shrinkage where split parcels are consolidated into fewer, larger ones. The total net gain to the system is expected to be about 29 million parcels, taking into consideration the consolidation of split parcels.

Part of the volume to be gained from the size-weight revisions will be the result of a broad and thinly diffused diversion from many sources. Much more important, however, is the fact that the removal of the limitations is expected to stimulate business and result in new volume.

I am convinced that on the whole this legislation does not present any undue infringement on private enterprise. I am convinced that the pre-eminence of the public interest in being assured of having a parcel post system which will serve the needs of all the public overrides any sharp reduction in the business of private parcel carriers, which may occur upon enactment of this legislation.

Most important of all, the bill strengthens the financial condition of postal revenues by eliminating most of the subsidy on parcel post. The legislation would increase the efficiency of the parcel post system by simplifying the postal zone structure and the size and weight limitations.

There has been much concern expressed over the effect this legislation will have on employees of certain private carriers. Also, some railroad employees have expressed their misgivings about the bill. Our committee considered all these matters very thoroughly. As I indicated earlier, I will offer an amendment on this matter at the appropriate time.

We also believe that passage of the legislation will increase parcel post volume and result in greater parcel post volume to be transported by the railroads because the major part of parcel post is transported by railroads.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that modification of Public Law 199 is a must if we hope to put an end to parcel post deficits. It is a must if you agree that Public Law 199 has failed to further the general interests of the public by depriving 140 million persons of essential shipping service. It has failed, too, because it created a service void which no one has been able to fill.

Rates higher than those proposed in this bill will be no alternative. It would be a delay in action to be followed again by the problem that confronts the Congress and the Department today.

We are not faced with a problem that will find its own solution in a few months, but at the price of extreme rate increases and more attrition in the parcel post service. We have already asked the American public and private enterprise to pay too much because of the restrictive size and weight limits of Public Law 199. We should not expect more from our patrons by perpetrating the full effect of a law which is demonstrably unfair and incapable of achieving a purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I urge favorable consideration of H.R. 14904.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] such time as he desires.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14904, but in opposition to section 3 of the bill, which would put parcel post in unnecessary direct competition with private transportation enterprise.

Frankly, I have always conceived of parcel post as a supplement to our national system of private carriers. I think it is perfectly sensible that only a limited size package be eligible to be sent by parcel post. Let private carriers handle the big bulky packages. I do not think that the Post Office will add to its revenues by handling this new class of package. It could very well be that the opposite will occur. Probably the Post Office will lose more money and the taxpayers will pay so that the large business shippers can have cut-rate freight service through our Government postal service.

I am also a little discouraged to think what the proposed parcel post change would do to postal efficiency. I understand that about half the space of postal facilities taken up by the postal load is now taken up by parcel post. I have figures saying that the change contemplated would push parcel post up to the point where it takes up 70 percent of the space occupied by all mail. The post offices will be bursting at the seams, and in my opinion, they are all too crowded already.

Crowding the post offices with parcels is not going to help mail delivery. It is going to slow it more than the present. I am not going to vote for slow mails so that a few big business shippers can cut their freight costs.

Now all this suggests something to me which I have said before. I do not like the idea of passing legislation to help a few big businessmen who do not like paying their present freight costs. I particularly do not like it when it is going to put a number of companies and tens of thousands of employees out of a job. I am tempted to use a phrase which I have used before. This is a bill for the fat cats in the mail-order business. I wish we be had figures before us on how much money the big shippers are going to save. I imagine the Postmaster General knows. I wonder if they are going to use the money they save to buy Government bonds?

I do not think this bill is a fair one. I urge that it be modified by deletion of section 3.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, I will more or less repeat what I had to say when we debated the resolution.

There is a very small segment of this population that is in favor of this legislation, and there are a few large mail-order houses and some people in the Post Office Department, and a few misguided organizations and individuals, as evidenced by a few letters and wires which all of us received in the last day and this morning. Mine were in almost identical language, indicating that somebody has told these people to send these wires and letters in.

In contrast, there are all these organizations—four pages, single spaced—opposed to this legislation. There are 22 labor organizations. The railroad brotherhoods are united in opposition. There are many others, and I will not read them, because we sent them around to all the Members.

There are four pages, single spaced, from people who know that this is not wise legislation.

It was testified in our committee by the representatives of the brotherhoods that if this legislation should ever pass it will cost 44,000 jobs among railroad employees. It was also testified that it would cost up to 5,000 jobs among the union members working with REA. So there is an overwhelming amount of opposition to this particular legislation.

I might say this is not a partisan issue. I understand that my dear friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], who I thought was a great believer in private enterprise, favors this. There have been Members on the majority side in our committee who have been opposed to this legislation.

So I hope that the Members will not look upon this in any partisan way.

I understand two members of the Rules Committee, who represent the majority party, are opposed to this. I presume they will speak in opposition to it.

Mr. Chairman, my dear friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, knowing that there is so much heat on this bill, I am sure, and all of these employees who are going to be displaced, has stated that he is going to offer an amendment.

The gentleman is going to offer an amendment which will, in effect, say that the Post Office Department is going to hire all these approximately 48,000 or 49,000 displaced employees, who are going to retain, according to the amendment, as I understand it, their seniority rights, their pension rights their insurance rights, and all the other rights for which they have worked so many years.

Well, I have been a member of this committee for 10 years, and I can say that this is ridiculous, it is not legal, and it will not work.

But let us say that it will work, and let us say that I am a displaced railroad worker and my dear friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], is a postal worker, and that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] has 15 years of seniority, and as a displaced railroad worker I have 17 years of seniority. That would mean if the Post Office Department hired me I would displace the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] so far as seniority is concerned. I would "bump" him.

If anything like that ever happened, we know what our dedicated post office workers would do and how they would feel about it.

But I say this cannot be done legally.

When a person goes on the civil service roll, he goes in at the bottom, and pension rights cannot be retained, and all the other seniority rights, et cetera, cannot be retained.

I have never before seen these employees so united and angry as they are with respect to this piece of legislation, and the brotherhoods in particular.

I said earlier today they even went so far as to form a picket line around the Ben Franklin Station last Thursday or Friday in protest against this. They are dedicated people.

I said earlier, also, that under two Presidents, President Kennedy and President Johnson, we have been sent messages, in the Congress, that the transportation system should be revised, overhauled, and coordinated, and they paid particular attention to the plight of the railroad industry and the number of jobs being lost by employees in the railroad industry.

So we have seen two Presidents say we ought to do something to help, and yet another agency of the Federal Government, the Post Office Department, wants to pass this legislation which will do just the opposite.

So I say there must be a little confusion down within the Post Office Department, and I believe it ought to be in tune with the late President Kennedy and with President Johnson.

Now I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana to recite to this committee any letter, communication, or report from the Civil Service Commission that the amendment which he proposes to offer, to hire these displaced employees and to continue their seniority and other benefits, is legal. I should like to have the gentleman present that to us.

Mr. MORRISON. I can tell the gentleman that this was taken up carefully with the Postmaster General, with the head of the Civil Service Commission, and with the legislative counsel of our committee and the legislative counsel of Congress; and this was the amendment that they came up with, that they all agreed on, and that it could do just opposite to what the gentleman says it could do, in that it could give them the same pay, could give them their retirement benefits, and could give them whatever rights they had in the way of years of service.

They would all be taken in by the Post Office Department.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I know sometimes things are said just to sweep us off of our feet, but I want some evidence and something in the form of writing, which is the usual procedure, from the Civil Service Commission that says this can be done and that it is legal.

Mr. MORRISON (reading:)

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the recent hearings of the Subcommittee on Postal Rates, relative to this Department's proposals to reform the parcel post laws, the concern was expressed that the recommended changes in parcel post size and weight limitations would force REA Express to curtail its work force and cause some REA workers to lose their jobs.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I ask the gentleman whose letter that is?

Mr. MORRISON. Just a second. You asked me for some written evidence, and I am giving it to you and, if you will be patient, you will get it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am wondering who it is from.

Mr. MORRISON. I will tell you that in a minute, as soon as I finish reading it:

Testimony before the subcommittee has demonstrated that the prospect of such unemployment has been greatly exaggerated. However, to provide all possible assurance to those who may be genuinely concerned, the Post Office Department has declared its willingness to hire any REA employee, or the employee of any other parcel shipment company, who may lose his job for causes in any way traceable to enactment of section 3 of H.R. 14904. Such employees would be given civil service status and permanent jobs as has been agreed to by the Civil Service Commission and reported to the committee.

This letter confirms and underscores that commitment.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Would the gentleman read the last three lines again, please?

Mr. MORRISON. Read the last three lines?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON. Again?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON. I would suggest that you pay attention.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I'm paying attention as I have the floor but the gentleman reads too fast.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. MORRISON. Do you want me to read that?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If you will, please.

Mr. MORRISON (reading:)

Such employees would be given civil service status and permanent jobs as has been agreed to by the Civil Service Commission and reported to the committee.

This letter confirms and underscores that commitment.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This is what Mr. O'Brien said during our hearings up until the last lines. He mentions the Civil Service Commission. Does the gentleman from Louisiana have anything in writing from the Civil Service Commission to that effect?

Mr. MORRISON. Well, this amendment in connection with what the Postmaster General said was taken up with

the Civil Service Commissioners and with the people in charge of their legislation, so that this amendment of mine would do exactly what I have said on two occasions today it would do.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Then, would the gentleman agree, if I am a railroad worker and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], for example, is a postal worker and I have 17 years of seniority and he has 15, that I bump him?

Mr. MORRISON. There will be no bumping. If you have 17 years of service with the railroad or the express company and you come into the postal service, you will have 17 years in which you will get credit under the Railroad Retirement Act. The required number of years you need to retire with that 17 years will be counted the same as if you were in the Post Office Department the entire time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In other words, then, I would jump ahead of Mr. FRIEDEL so far as my retirement is concerned?

Mr. MORRISON. You would jump ahead not only of a fellow who had been there 15 years but a fellow who had been there 12 years and a fellow who had been there 5 years and a fellow who had been there 1 year, or you would jump ahead of a fellow who was there for only 1 month.

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, there is no proof in the form of a letter but mere information through, perhaps, a telephone conversation that the Postmaster General had with someone at the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see something in writing, because I do not see how it can be done. I do not believe it is legal.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I do not believe there is any Member sitting here this afternoon who has not received numerous complaints about the handling of parcel post as of today. I certainly have received such complaints, and I have spoken on this floor of the House about them. They cannot even handle the various parcels that they now have, let alone those that are going to be twice larger in size than the present parcels.

Mr. Chairman, we had testimony from an expert in the business of postal facilities, whose specialty is these conveyor belts, and he said it is impossible for the Post Office Department to handle these larger parcels. He further stated that one of the crying needs today, and the reason the post office service is so poor, is the lack of facilities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, they are going to throw a whole bunch of new parcels into these various post offices around the country, as well as all of the rest of the mail—first-, second-, and third-class mail and this mail is going to suffer.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say this is bad legislation and I certainly hope that the members of the committee will recognize the fact that there are all of these people involved and 22 labor organizations involved which are fighting mad about this proposed legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill will be defeated.

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

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, in the June issue of the Railway Clerk magazine, there is an article concerning parcel post. This article is so full of errors, misrepresentations, and outright falsehoods as to resemble a kind of jungle. There is so much wrong with this article and the cartoon which accompanied it, that it is difficult to know where criticism should begin.

I think perhaps the best answer to these gross misrepresentations is to state the facts concerning H.R. 14904.

Before Public Law 199 was enacted in 1951, the Post Office Department operated a uniform parcel post system. Packages less than 70 pounds and 100 inches could be mailed anywhere in the United States. Then, largely due to the precarious financial position of the Railway Express Agency—REA—Congress acted through Public Law 199 to restrict shipments via parcel post.

Since rural areas were largely outside the REA service areas, and since REA would not have been interested in the largely unprofitable business to those areas in any event, they were permitted to retain 70-pound and 100-inch limits, while shipments between first-class offices were placed in two zones. Those more than 150 miles apart were limited to 20 pounds and 72 inches; those less than 150 miles apart, 40 pounds and 72 inches.

These regulations had six major effects:

First. The Post Office Department was forced to continue high cost business, but could not balance such business with the higher volume, low-cost service.

Second. The 140 million urban patrons were denied good parcel post service and millions have been turned away from mailing windows.

Third. All kinds of anomalous situations arose. For example, a business in my hometown, Jersey City, N.J., can send a 70-pound, 100-inch package to a village in Alaska, but cannot send a 10-pound, 73-inch package across the Hudson River to New York City.

Fourth. Since another provision of the law required the Postmaster General to certify that receipts from parcel post were within 4 percent of costs—otherwise no funds to operate any aspect of the postal service could be secured from the Treasury—the removal of the low-cost service resulted in higher rates. This further depressed volume and again necessitated higher rates. This dual spiral continues.

Fifth. Farmers, who were supposed to be protected by present law, are being hurt by the steeply climbing rates.

Sixth. Small business firms are splitting shipments, mailing from other than first-class offices—a self-defeating operation since increased revenues move second-class post offices to first-class offices—and taking other steps to avoid the present restrictions, with the result that the costs are higher for poorer service.

The parcel post service faces a crisis. Unless steps are taken to reform the law, there will remain but a high-cost service that will require a subsidy.

This legislation is a compromise that would balance the interests of urban and rural patrons, business, and commercial carriers. It would produce $107 million in additional net revenue. And it would restore a service now badly damaged and in danger of disappearing.

Realizing these facts, the mail-order houses and mail users, who are depicted in the cartoon in the Railway Clerk as victims of H.R. 14904, are actually in favor of this legislation, even though rates will be somewhat higher. They are in favor of it because it is fair, because it will increase competition, because it is good for business and good for the consumer.

But, gentlemen, you do not have to take my word for the attitude of mail-order houses and of mail users, they have made it absolutely plain themselves.

Let us take a good look at their testimony before the Subcommittee on Postal Rates:

First. Permit me to quote Warren A. Clohisy, executive secretary of the Mail-Order Association of America. In testimony before the House Subcommittee on Postal Rates on H.R. 12367, which is essentially the same as H.R. 14904, Mr. Clohisy said, in part:

> Let me say that the parcel post legislation being considered is, in the truest sense, consumer legislation. It is the American consumer who will benefit by the simplification and changes in the law, which will be the result of enactment of H.R. 12367.
>
> We support H.R. 12367 as a major step toward correcting the problems caused by the existing postal regulations. At the outset, I would like to state our fullest backing of the total bill. We believe that after almost 3 years of study, the weaknesses in the postal situation that need correction are well defined, and each of the proposed changes are, in our opinion, necessary and vital if the service is to be preserved and improved.
>
> We have another interest in the proposed legislation; namely, we would like to restore to our catalogs the thousands of items which we cannot list because of the existing size and weight regulations. These items represent sales that today no one enjoys because we cannot afford the expense of refusals and returns and the local merchant cannot afford the inventory investment and the risk of low sales.
>
> It must be borne in mind that we too are private enterprise. We employ over 412,000 people directly, and indirectly many more through the 50,000 suppliers with whom we do business * * *. So we would like to restore those items to our catalogs, first to satisfy more customers, second to enjoy the sales, and third to improve our contribution to the growth and development of our economy.

Second. Robert F. DeLay, president of the 2,200-member Direct Mail Advertising Association, testified:

> Despite the proposed rate increase, DMAA supports the bill because it is vital to our members' interests that the parcel post service continue to be a viable and valuable nationwide delivery service. We further recog-

nize that passage of these compromise reformations of the restrictions will probably cause some loss of business to REA express, but an analysis of the potential loss leads us to believe it will not be as serious as some speculate. In any case, in our expanding economy there is room for various types of delivery services.

Third. Josh S. Weston, president of the Parcel Post Association, stated:

I want to thank you for this opportunity to present the views of the more than 200 small- and medium-sized businesses, located in 32 States, which comprise the association membership. Many of these requested to be heard today because they are quite outspoken in the way the parcel-post system and the small businessman and the average citizens have had to suffer for the lack of a reasonable medium parcel service at reasonable rates the last 15 years. Out of consideration for your time, we have agreed that I shall speak for all of them.

Parcel Post Association endorses and supports H.R. 1237. We think it will substantially serve the needs of the people in general and of the postal system. While the bill does not go far enough on size-weight reform, we believe the virtues of H.R. 12367 far outnumber the drawbacks. The change proposed in size-weight restrictions to 40 pounds by 100 inches will give postal patrons a much-needed service currently lacking in our larger towns and cities. Also, size-weight reform is the only way to obtain all the revenues needed for full cost recovery in parcel post.

Fourth. Thomas C. Hope, executive director of the National Council on Business Mail, Inc., not only supports this reform legislation, and has given reasons for expressing such support, but he has also eloquently outlined the failure of the present law. Mr. Hope told the subcommittee:

We should like to state our reasons for being so concerned and dissatisfied with the present status of Parcel Post. We have had 14 full years of unreasonable service and artificially created expenses under Public Law 199.

The effect of Public Law 199 since 1952 has been destructive to service and postal economics.

Discrimination against mailers between first-class post offices has caused many negatives.

It has deprived the Post Office Department of the highest revenue parcels.

Large and small mailers have lost business and have suffered higher expenses because of the artificial and arbitrary limitations, as—

Items were removed from sale to the public.

Unwanted slow and expensive alternative services often were employed.

Costly censorship of orders by additional employees became necessary.

Some mailings were split into two or more packages to comply, increasing postage, labor and material.

Normal mailings were diverted to other than first-class post offices creating increased postal operating costs.

Customary business terms of sale were disrupted and completely interfered with.

The summary effect has been to deprive people residing in first-class post office communities of adequate services, to harm their businesses and to interfere abnormally with their necessities while losing the highest revenue volumes for the Post Office Department.

Many small businesses affected by the present discriminatory laws also testified in favor of reform legislation. Hence, this legislation, far from "hanging" the interests of the mail-order houses and mail users, as the cartoon would make us believe, advances their interests, and is favored by these groups. If I could sum up the essence of this cartoon, I would say that it is a small scale use of the "big lie" technique.

But the midget sized big lie does not stop with the mail-order houses and mail users. Postal employees and REA Express employees are also shown as victims of the Daniels-Morrison hangman's duet.

Let us see how each of these groups would fare under the proposed legislation.

The Postal employees are supposedly being "hung" by the certification provision of H.R. 14904. Well, the certification provision already exists in the present law, so it is nothing new. As a matter of fact, it is a principle that has been embodied in parcel post law since its inception. For a true view of how postal employees feel about this proposed reform legislation, permit me to quote Jerome Keating, president of the 180,000 member National Association of Letter Carriers, and a man who should know.

Mr. Keating testified that:

The legislation before you—H.R. 12367—will go a very long way toward restoring the image of parcel post, by making it more attractive to the average citizen and more widely available to the average manufacturer and businessman.

Postmaster General O'Brien has estimated that this legislation will attract 20 million new parcel post customers who aren't using any service whatsoever today.

It will greatly simplify the rate structure to terms that the average citizen can readily understand.

It will, in short, go a long way toward making parcel post once again what Congress originally intended it to be, a useful service to all the American people, and a necessary stimulus to the entire economy.

And, by making parcel post more attractive, it will increase volume and revenues sufficiently so the Postmaster General will not be forced to continue the endless process of raising the rates, and thus pricing this useful service out of the market.

The REA Express employees, who are the main target of the combination hogwash and napalm contained in the Railway Clerk article, cannot possibly lose by the size and weight increases proposed in H.R. 14904. For, if the free enterprise economy acts, as it usually does when restrictions are removed, more business will be generated, not only for the Post Office Department, but also for the railroads. And, in the unlikely event that somewhat less business flows through REA Express channels, any employee who is displaced will be hired by the Post Office Department through a thoughtful, generous, and statesmanlike offer of the Postmaster General and the amendment to be offered by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Rates, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

I urge your support of H.R. 14904. In my judgment this bill is in the public interest. The public has the right and is entitled to an economical, efficient, and sensible parcel post service.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], a member of the committee, 15 minutes.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the proposed legislation.

We are all painfully aware of the "mail explosion" this Nation has experienced in the last decade. The growth of mail volume has continually exceeded the capacity of the Post Office Department to handle it.

I am sure all my colleagues have, as I have, received numerous complaints from constituents concerning the slow delivery of mail, the loss of mail, or the damage of parcels.

What we are being asked to do today is to increase the number of parcels being transported by the postal service. We are being asked to add to a volume which cannot, even now, be properly handled, and thus to aggravate an already serious problem.

If this legislation is enacted into law, we will be transporting more large parcels, we will be transporting more heavy parcels, and we will be moving these parcels on equipment which is not able to stand the load it already carries, let alone what it would be required to carry under this bill.

One of the leading experts in the field of postal conveyers, Mr. Richard Frodge, testified before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee regarding the ability of the conveyors presently in our post offices to carry the increased volume they would be required to carry under this bill. Mr. Frodge told the committee:

I am here today to urge that parcels size and weights not be raised.

It is my belief the proposed changes, if adopted, would seriously disrupt mail service, substantially increase damage, cause employee injury, require sizable site acquisition and construction, and increase rather than decrease postal deficits. Mail service would be disrupted because many of the existing conveyor systems are not designed to handle the revised size and weights.

Mr. Chairman, the statements to which I have just referred demonstrate that if this bill is enacted the House of Representatives will be contributing to, instead of solving, a very serious problem, the proper delivery of our mails.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject the legislation pending before the House today.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that many Members have reported being swamped with telegrams and communications over this weekend, it is obvious that those letters from their constituents should arouse great interest in this legislation. I can see that is reflected in the attendance on the floor. We have the largest attendance we have had since the President's state of the Union message, which demonstrates that Members are giving special attention to the missives they have received from constituents.

If I were being belligerent in this debate, I would call the arguments in favor of this bill sheer, unadulterated nonsense. But I am not saying that because to do so would sound belligerent. I would call it nonsense because the very title of the

bill is misleading. The title is "To revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, and for other purposes." If this were an honest title, it would state the facts and state that it is to increase postal rates—not revise, but increase. And what are the "other purposes?" "For other purposes" merely means that it is going to drive a taxpaying entity, the Railway Express Agency, out of business and foist on the poor taxpayers and mail users of this country an inefficient post office method of handling parcels that heretofore have been processed through the REA.

This bill is against the public interest. It cannot be justified on economic grounds, but it is sailing through like "Grant taking Richmond." I guess that is what happens under the great social genius of the Great Society.

Earlier in the debate the gentleman from Louisiana in effect promised the House that by the end of July the other body would complete hearings on the bill and give the Postmaster General the relief he requires from the present law. Yet the majority of the committee—and when I say the majority, I mean of both parties—have kept insisting that the reason their bill is so wonderful is that they put in many, many months, many, many hours—specifically 19 days of hearings over 2 months—to produce this wonderful piece of legislation. Certainly they do not expect the other body to rubberstamp their findings. I would presume they may take 19 days for hearings and 2 or 3 months themselves. We have no evidence whatsoever that this hasty, premature House action this afternoon will be rubberstamped by the other body.

I should also point out to the Members who are on the floor that we are witnessing a very intense debate, with repeated references made to the almost overwhelming support of this bill by members of the committee on both sides. Yet, so far only three members on the committee have spoken in favor of this bill. The others, even those who voted for the bill, are reluctant to stand here in the well and express their opinions. They want to avoid the heat, because they realize they would have to speak for bad legislation.

That is why only three Members of the majority are leading the fight for the bill. The others are remaining discreetly silent.

I should then like to point out to the Members that the main argument being advanced for this bill is that the Post Office Department, by moving into this larger category of package and parcel post, will produce more and more profits in handling this parcel post, and wipe out the present deficit under that operation. The argument, therefore, seems to be that with greater volume we solve all the problems in the Post Office Department.

There is nothing in this bill giving the Post Office Department the mechanization or any other facilities needed to handle this increased volume. One of the problems with the Post Office's handling of parcel post is that they cannot handle the present volume. What are they going to do when this great anticipated volume pours in on them?

I expect a greater snafu. I certainly hope that the Members who are so brave in passing this legislation will turn to their constituents and admit that they were responsible for adding the increased confusion that will come if this bill in its present form becomes law.

I am reminded of the story, in connection with this increased volume and its magic effect, of the street peddler who was hawking neckties and telling all passersby who drifted past that he was selling these neckties at below cost, and, of course, at this bargain, below-cost price, he would make some sales.

One naive couple did stop to ask how he could possibly sell neckties below cost and still make money. The answer was, "I lose a little money on each tie, but I make it up on volume."

That is the argument of the Post Office for this bill. They admit they are losing money on their present operations, yet somehow, in a magic fashion, they will go into volume operations and produce a wonderful profit.

Just the other day I happened to glance at an article from the New York Times.

My eye was attracted by a headline: "O'Brien Orders Mail Speedup as Volume Keeps Rising."

The O'Brien referred to was the Honorable Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien.

The article says:

> Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien, who is admired for his knack of making friends, sent his 650,000 employees a message the other day that began, "Shabby postal service will not be tolerated."
>
> The tone of his letter, which was on the first page of the Postal Bulletin, was sometimes harsh, sometimes blunt, rarely optimistic.

So here is poor Mr. O'Brien, admitting now that the Post Office Department is hardly meeting minimum expectations with no answer for this great volume of mail anticipated if this bill is passed.

I might point out that the Post Office Department at the moment suffers from overcrowded postal facilities. Where are they going to handle this greater volume coming in?

Of course, we have not even begun to discuss the loss of income to the Federal Government, and the loss of jobs for railway employees, of the income tax paid by railway companies and Railway Express Agency, the loss to State governments, and the loss to the school boards of local taxes that come from these groups. This has not been discussed at all.

A great part of the time of the subcommittee was spent in very patiently listening to the objections offered to the bill by the Railway Express Agency, and specifically its president, Mr. William J. Taylor.

The Railway Express Agency people gave 2 days of very devastating testimony against this bill, which was never answered either by the Post Office Department or by any member of the committee. If the Members want some interesting reading, they should look at the committee sessions. They will find not a single argument raised by the REA has been refuted, yet the bill is sailing along.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the Members the brief statement of minority views. In the minority views we thought the best way to call attention to the problems was to direct the attention of Members not only to the minority position but to the majority report, so we asked the Members to read not our views but the majority report, because by its inconsistency it should give Members reasons for turning down this bill.

I should like to point to one specific thing, and that is perhaps some of the problems we are starting to develop under this legislation.

The committee emphasizes the fact that the precedent for this bill is the fact that the Post Office Department should be a break-even operation. The Post Office, of course, will never make a profit. But the Post Office deficit is too great to be poured onto the ever-suffering public, so that Post Office should be as efficient as possible and should be a break-even operation. That is the philosophy embodied in this bill.

I should like to ask the majority Members of this committee, who are putting through this great piece of legislation, if they are going to apply this principle to first-, second- and third-class mail? If they do, they will have to lower the first-class rates, because that is the only segment in the Post Office rate structure which is making money. Of course, they are not going to raise the second- and third-class rates, in order to break even. Think of the lobbyists who would pour down on Washington from all sorts of publications, newspapers and magazines, et cetera, objecting to the philosophy that the second- and third-class mail should be carried on a break-even basis.

But that is the philosophy of this bill.

I should like also to point out to the Members the final paragraph of some supplemental views submitted by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS]. I quote from page 42:

> I want to raise one further question with respect to the inclusion of section 3 in the proposed legislation. It seems wholly inconsistent to me that, while the Congress is called upon to appropriate a billion dollars or more to provide employment opportunities, it should at the same time—based solely on the tenuous expectation of realizing a $40 million savings in the Post Office Department expenditures—endanger the jobs of the 35,000 employees directly involved and the many other thousands of people indirectly affected by the operation of REA Express.

This to me is a very logical, devastating criticism of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, my problem is that I have so much information against the bill I could go on for the remainder of the day, and then, of course, I would be on the verge of conducting a filibuster, which would be unbecoming of this body.

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

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

Mr. POOL. During the first part of your remarks I got the impression of

criticism of Postmaster General Larry O'Brien. Is that what the gentleman is doing?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I have not reached that point. I will. I did not mean to give that interpretation. I was quoting from a New York Times article about Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. POOL. Then what I should like to say, if the gentleman is going to do that, is that I want to go on record—and I believe the Members of the House will agree with me—as saying that Larry O'Brien is making the finest Postmaster General in the history of the United States. He is not only a statesman and an astute politician, but he is a great businessman. He is doing a tremendous job. He has a staff that is excellent. Within a few years' time we are going to have the greatest Post Office Department ever known in this country. That is what he is trying to do.

That is what this bill is all about.

I wanted to correct the gentleman about that.

I do not think you really meant to be overly critical.

Mr. DERWINSKI. No. I thank the gentleman from Texas for pointing this out. I certainly did not mean to criticize the Postmaster General. As a matter of fact, I would say that the gentleman from Texas is not being polite enough or going far enough when he discusses the Postmaster General. For example, I do not believe Mr. O'Brien is a politician. I think he is one of the greatest statesmen of our generation.

Mr. POOL. I agree with you.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Then I could also say, although I am not a member of the majority party, if I were a Democrat, I would not say that the present Postmaster General is the greatest in the history of our country, but I would say he is a second Jim Farley. I think to a Democrat that is a high compliment.

Mr. POOL. I want to thank the gentleman for his cooperation with the Postmaster General, if that is what you mean now.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I did not say I will cooperate. I merely said I considered him a great statesman and one of the most effective people of our generation in Government. But I still think this bill is 100 percent bad regardless of my personal appreciation for him.

Mr. POOL. The gentleman is going ahead and obstructing. Is that my understanding?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I certainly will say to the gentleman from Texas that the best way we can help our great heroic, struggling, courageous Postmaster General is to defeat this bill and not saddle him with this monstrosity.

Mr. POOL. Then, on June 30 they will not be able to draw any money out of the Treasury, and then where will we be?

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman from Louisiana stated that the Postmaster General told him he had about 30 days leeway.

Mr. POOL. Oh. He does have 30 days leeway?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes. I am quoting the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], now.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the colloquy between the gentleman in the well and the gentleman from Texas. I suppose you could measure greatness by the extent of the criticism developing because of the slowness of mail and the lack of service. I would be glad to refer the flood of complaints I have been receiving along that line to the gentleman in the well or to the gentleman from Texas and perhaps one of them could pass the complaints along to the Postmaster General in the hope that he might use some of that great ability in correcting the deficiencies which now exist and speeding up the delivery of the mail.

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

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

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

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

Mr. JONAS. I am moved to raise this question because of a statement made by the gentleman from Illinois in the supplemental views signed by him and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] calling our attention to statements in the main report by the majority of the committee which you state were inconsistent or which actually would support the position now taken by the gentleman from Illinois. In reading that report I am struck by an admission made on page 17 of the report in which the members who are responsible for the report admit that they are unable to determine that the enactment of this bill will not force some private enterprise carriers into bankruptcy. As I understand it, it is the position of the gentleman in the well that that result will probably occur with the enactment of this legislation. I take it from the comment on page 17 that the majority members who are responsible for the committee report are unable to deny that.

Mr. DERWINSKI. That is correct. And I would also like to remind the gentleman from North Carolina that the Interstate Commerce Commission was requested to make a report and the distinguished majority members were compelled by the pressure of time to move ahead and they did not even wait for the Interstate Commerce Commission to inform them as to the possible ill effects of this bill.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, not having the privilege of serving on this committee and listening to the testimony, and having only for consideration what has been said here today and what appears in the committee report and the supplemental views, I find myself worrying about whether I should become a party today to action here by the Government of the United States that will force, or which is likely to force, into bankruptcy, one of the taxpaying free-enterprise businesses of our country.

Since this worries me, I would like some assurance that we are not taking a position here today which all those who heard the testimony either agree on will not deny that this action is likely to force a private enterprise, tax paying enterprise into bankruptcy?

Mr. DERWINSKI. May I advise the gentleman from North Carolina that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and I have a solution. If the Members of the Committee would note the committee report on pages 2 and 3, the committee summarizes the bill with these nine affirmative points. We agree upon eight of those points. The only point we do not agree with is the increase in weight and the increase in size of parcels. The balance of these adjustments we are perfectly willing to cooperate with and we believe this will be to the advantage of the Post Office Department and to its great Postmaster General.

Also, Mr. Chairman, recognizing that the Members are preoccupied with so many problems in their committees, we were not so egotistical to think that our minority views would receive such tremendous attention.

I would like to summarize these views very briefly.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, we maintain that there is no evidence to support the claim on the part of the opponents of this bill, that it will produce a $40 million improvement in the financial situation of the Post Office Department.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department representatives tell us that they will gross $95 million a day, $40 million net profit. This is ridiculous. There is not a corporation in the United States which operates that effectively. No one in his right mind could say that the Post Office Department of all departments of Government would make $40 million on the $95 million increase in volume.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Members of the Committee that there has been very little consideration here of the position of the private carriers. We have had quite a debate here over protecting the job rights of the employees. What about the investors in some of these private carriers? Are they going to be spared bankruptcy by the noble administration?

Mr. Chairman, what about the number of confiscations of private property which is inherent when you take over a profitmaking operation? None of these things have been adequately discussed.

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

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, that additional time is all I want, because I realize, judging from the expression of the Members on the majority side, they

have almost become so convinced by my eloquence and figures that they may very well throw in the towel at this stage.

Mr. Chairman, let me also say that I have a certain amount of sympathy for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] who was upset at this cartoon which appeared in the Railway Clerks' magazine. I thought it was a very interesting bit of art work; that is, aside from the subject matter, and it was impressive, even if the artist reached what perhaps he thought was not a proper conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to emphasize that the key to this matter is that we need not punish free enterprise. We need not go on record as being against free enterprise and as being antiunion by voting for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have two alternatives which the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] will offer in the form of an amendment to strike out section 3 of this bill. If we succeed in striking section 3 of the bill the balance of it is fine.

We should all vote for it, in the way we do for the military authorization bill—by unanimous vote. Failing in that we will offer a motion to recommit—a substitute bill—which will have the same practical effect. It will spare free enterprise, giving the Post Office flexibility—and it will spare the taxpayers and spare the users of the Post Office from the chaos that is about to be created.

We can do all these wonderful things and still give the Postmaster General the flexibility he deserves.

I would say in closing, if I may direct my remarks to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] who so eloquently rose to the defense of the Postmaster General, certainly the Postmaster General we all recognize is the political arm of the administration. He is going to have an awful lot of work to do this fall trying to save some of the loyal administration members from repudiation at the polls. Why saddle him with these parcel post problems if he is not going to be able to help you politically?

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, in rising to support H.R. 14904, I would like to commend the able chairman of the Postal Rates Subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], and the members of his subcommittee who sat through a total of 29 days of hearings and received testimony in person or in writing from some 200 witnesses while considering this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the parcel post system was established in 1912 because a majority of the Congress believed at that time that there was no adequate economical service to fill the needs of farmers, the average family, and small business firms. Commercial shipping rates were then geared to 100-pound lots and the occasional or day-to-day shipper of small packages in limited quantities was forced to pay exorbitant minimum charges. It was intended that in addition to the promotion of public service, the parcel post system should also achieve the second objective of break-even financing.

In 1951, Public Law 199 was enacted, with the Congress believing that the Railway Express Agency could take over a large share of the parcel post city-to-city delivery function without sacrificing the broader public interest. However, events of the past 15 years have shown that commercial carriers could not, or would not, completely take over the responsibilities that were shorn from parcel post in 1951. As a result, the service void that prompted enactment of parcel post statutes early in this century is again an acute problem for millions of small parcel shippers.

REA express—which the Congress expected would take over the parcel post urban service for larger packages—has in recent years changed the basic character of its operations. According to statements by REA officials, diversification has been far reaching and parcel-post-type business is now defined as an "occasional shipment," or as a "convenience" and "accommodation" service.

According to REA's own data, Public Law 199 was enacted when its dependence was mainly on class-rated traffic. But now, REA's interests are largely in bulk-rate volume traffic and in air express. This change in business concentration was confirmed in a recent report by three regulatory agencies, including the Interstate Commerce Commission. These agencies reported that, while express companies over the years have been handlers principally of parcel-size shipments in express service, REA since 1959 has been diversifying into containerized and palletized shipments, at sharp reductions in rates, and into the aggregate and volume areas.

It is especially noteworthy that while REA express has aggressively promoted volume shipments through "sharp reductions in rates," minimum rates for nonvolume shipments—once the bulk of REA shipments—have risen over 300 percent since 1951. In that year these shipments were subject to minimum rates of 95 cents. But now REA quotes minimum rates of $4 for parcels up to 5 pounds and $4.50 in excess of 5 pounds.

Public Law 199 also imposed reductions in parcel size and weight and these limitations in effect hindered the attainment of a break-even operation by our Post Office Department. Since 1952, our parcel post system has had a succession of volume losses and rate increases.

Clearly, these circumstances indicate the need for parcel post reform which ought to include a modification of package regulations and an increase in rates. It is to meet this need that the legislation under discussion is proposed.

Mr. Chairman, the bill on the floor will restore the original public service aspect to our parcel post system and make possible the attainment of the break-even financial basis upon which the system was placed at its inception.

I urge a favorable vote for H.R. 14904.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 14904 because it is right, because it is needed, and because careful study has shown it to be justified.

The arguments for and against this testimony have received what can be described as intensive scrutiny by the Postal Rates Subcommittee and the full House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The record of their examination of the facts runs to 767 pages.

I can recall no recent instance of comparable careful assessment of the facts. Certainly the members of the committee should be congratulated on the manner in which they carefully and conscientiously performed their duty.

After hearing all sides, after examining all pertinent questions, both a subcommittee and the full committee reported this legislation by overwhelmingly favorable votes.

The facts presented in favor of H.R. 14904, when examined carefully, lead to one overwhelming conclusion: This legislation is in the public interest. I have received hundreds of letters from citizens and businessmen who support this legislation.

Right now the American people are paying more than ever before for less parcel post service than before 1951, when present parcel post law was passed.

This 1951 law sharply reduced the size and weight of parcels that could be shipped between first-class offices.

This law was the equivalent of saying to the Post Office: "We are going to take away all of your first-class mail that is easy to deliver, such as, say, gas bills, electric light bills, for delivery within a single city, and leave you with the first-class mail that must cover a long distance, say between Key West, Fla., and Point Barrow, Alaska. And if you cannot break even under these conditions, you must raise rates."

Well, if the Congress did enact such a law, a law which left the Post Office Department the mail which was expensive to deliver and removed from it the mail which was easy to deliver, then first-class mail, which now more than pays for itself, would soon be in the red, and costs would climb, and continue to climb.

What does not make sense for first-class mail, certainly cannot make sense for fourth-class mail.

I am for injecting both sense and economy into our postal operations and I hope that all who agree with me will join in voting for the passage of H.R. 14904.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleagues that the parcel post system raises some of the most complex and controversial issues ever considered by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee or by this body.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, I am well aware of the many difficulties the Post Office Department is encountering in its efforts to im-

prove parcel post delivery, particularly their efforts to reduce the damage incurred in handling packages.

Also, as the ranking majority member on the Subcommittee on Postal Rates, which considered this legislation, I took an active part in the extensive hearings that were held both last year and this year.

I want to congratulate our very able chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Rates, the Honorable JAMES H. MORRISON, for the patience and fairness he has exhibited during these hearings. The representative of one group who are opposed to this legislation went out of his way during the hearings to express his appreciation to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] for the fair and unbiased manner in which he conducted the hearings, particularly in his efforts to assure the opponents an opportunity to present their case. These are my sentiments exactly.

My review of the whole situation has convinced me that this legislation goes too far too fast. I am convinced that substantial legislative changes are needed, but I am as equally convinced that those private businesses which will be damaged by enactment of this legislation should be afforded a reasonable time during which they can make any necessary adjustments. I believe the effects of this bill should be spread over a period of years.

Parcel post problems have been with us for the last 60 years, and now we are attempting to solve all the difficulties within 90 days after date of enactment of this bill. The system has lost money every year but one in the last 20 years in spite of positive provision of law requiring the system to be operated on a break-even basis, and we now propose to impose inflexible restrictions to bring about a break-even basis within 90 days.

My primary concern about this legislation rests on the unproven allegations that the increase in the maximum limits of the size and weight of parcels will ruin the REA express agency within 6 months and result in the layoff of thousands of employees of the express company and of the transportation carriers which handle the express business.

I am fully aware that these allegations are denied by the proponents of this legislation, but here again these are unsupported denials. I see no necessity for taking such hasty action as proposed by this bill in the face of the unproven allegations, however remote their predictions may prove to be, without affording the express company and the employees who will be affected adequate time to make whatever adjustments may be necessary should those predictions come about.

Obviously, 90 days after date of enactment, as proposed in this legislation, is not sufficient.

I am of the opinion that the changes in the maximum size and weight limits should be spread over a period of time—3 years would be reasonable. This suggestion, accompanied by a greater increase in rates, I believe, would place the parcel post system on a near break-even basis.

I offered two amendments which were rejected during our committee deliberations of this bill, to carry out these recommendations. I felt that an increase in size from 72 to 85 inches, instead of to 100 inches as proposed by the bill, and an increase in weight from 20 to 30 pounds, instead of to 40 pounds as proposed by the bill, accompanied by a 10-cent increase per package in lieu of the 8 cents proposed by the bill, with further adjustments as may be necessary after a reasonable period of time—say 3 years—would help solve the major problems that have been raised in connection with the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, without these amendments, I am opposed to this legislation in its present form.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, the parcel post reform legislation now before the committee would do many things to improve the service.

It would also save the U.S. Government and the taxpayers $107 million a year.

This bill is designed to end the parcel post deficit.

But it will also end discrimination against the 140 million Americans who live in urban areas, as well as be of enormous benefit to numerous private enterprises, small and large.

It will break a logjam of parcel post restrictions and produce the added revenue—$107 million worth—in the process.

Passage of this bill will permit the Post Office to operate parcel post services in a fiscally responsible manner.

Failure of the Congress to enact this bill will force the Post Office to continue operating parcel post services at an unwarranted loss. The changes made in parcel post regulations in 1951 established restrictive limits on shipment of packages between first-class post offices.

A limit of 20 pounds and 72 inches was set on packages shipped between first-class offices more than 150 miles apart, and 40 pounds and 72 inches was imposed on packages between first-class offices less than 150 miles apart.

The limit on packages shipped from second-, third-, and fourth-class offices remained at the traditional level of 70 pounds and 100 inches.

The restrictions imposed by the 1951 law have had a number of effects, all bad.

The Post Office had been forced to continue providing service on relatively large parcels shipped to and from rural areas. The cost of providing this service is high.

But the Post Office Department has been severely restricted in the parcels it can handle in urban areas.

The Department has lost much of the high volume, low cost service generated in urban areas.

The 140 million Americans living in urban areas are denied adequate parcel post service. Millions have been turned away from post office mailing windows as a result of the limitations. These restrictions have produced confusion and frustration.

The loss of so much of its high volume, low-cost service forced the Post Office to increase rates.

This rate increase caused a further decline in volume and additional rate increases were required. This undesirable spiral continues.

Although farmers and others in rural areas were supposedly not affected by the 1951 law because no change was made in the size of parcel post packages they could mail, they have suffered along with everyone else from the higher rates made inevitable by the restrictions on urban service.

The pending bill is a good one and should be passed.

I urge its favorable consideration.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY].

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, there are more than 2 million small- and medium-size companies engaged in manufacturing, wholesale and retail business throughout the Nation who are affected by this bill. For most of these, a healthy parcel post service is essential to continuing their business. For most of these, parcel post is essential to receiving raw materials and to sending goods to customers. Most of these companies are not big enough, nor centrally situated so they can afford their own truck fleets or services of common carriers providing a limited scope of operations. This is the segment of our economy that was so adversely affected by Public Law 199.

Hampers, rugs, floor polishers, playpens, tape recorders, hassocks, and lamps are just a few of the thousands of items on which Congress declared a legal embargo some 15 years ago. Passage of this bill will once again permit the unrestricted manufacturing and commerce of these and many other items. It is estimated that size and weight reform will generate between 50 to 80 million new parcel shipments not now existing since the passage of Public Law 199.

These new parcel shipments will once again be created as small businessmen find they can ship and receive these medium size parcels at reasonable prices with reliable service.

These new parcels will be generated once the average citizen learns it is possible again to send medium size gifts and other type parcels through the mails at a reasonable price. The public has been forced by Public Law 199 to think small when selecting gifts because of the unreasonable restrictions on size and weight of parcel post. Bulky items which formerly were mailed as a matter of convenience are now handcarried because there is no readily available service for medium-size parcels.

The exasperation experienced by the average citizen when he presents a medium-size parcel at a post office service window only to learn that it exceeds

72 inches or 20-pound limit and, therefore, is nonmailable, has alienated many who formerly relied on the parcel post service. The more realistic size and weight limits incorporated in this legislation will permit the American people to make use of parcel post and parcel post will once again be a reliable means for the shipment of medium-size parcels. And, as I indicated earlier, 50 to 80 million parcels would be new business.

If we are to achieve a parcel post service that is healthy and compatible with the needs of the 2 million small businesses, the American people in general, and small towns and rural areas in particular, passage of this bill is imperative.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Gentlemen, to conclude the debate, I point out that in all these hearings the REA express company never made a case that they were going to go out of business. Instead of going out of business, or planning to go out of business if this legislation is enacted, at this time they are planning a huge reorganization to handle more and more parcels of different types than the ones we are considering here today.

During the full committee hearings, our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] made a very fine argument, as he has today, but he did not convince many of the members of the full committee, because we voted this bill out 17 to 3.

I do not believe, and I know the majority of the members of the committee do not believe, that all these people of the REA express company, or the railway clerks, will lose many jobs. But if they do lose these jobs, as many as do lose jobs will be taken care of by the amendments that will be offered as soon as the bill is read and open for amendment.

I believe this legislation should be enacted. I believe the committee has gone into it on a solid basis. The Postmaster General and other officials have made a good case. The REA express company made a very poor case, as far as concerns showing they would go out of business. I do not believe the majority of the members of the committee ever believed they would.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I recently called—in the last few minutes—the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and I spoke to him personally. He was not aware of this provision at the time our conversation was held, and he said he would look into it. I do not know if he will have time to call me back tonight.

I am expecting shortly a legal brief from the Railroad Brotherhoods, in which they will point out that this proposed amendment is entirely unworkable and perhaps illegal. Furthermore, if we would take the figure of 35,000—which is low—of the REA and railroad employees who are going to be displaced and who will be hired by the Post Office Department, this would cost the Post Office Department $245 million. Where in the world will the Post Office Department, all of a sudden, place 35,000 employees, even if it were legal to do so?

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not workable. I am sure it is not legal. I believe it is something to take the sting out of all the opposition that has been registered against this piece of legislation.

The statement by the council of affected employees follows:

COMMENTS ON EMPLOYEE PROTECTIVE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORRISON TO SECTION 3 OF H.R. 14904 BY AFFECTED EMPLOYEES COUNSEL

As effective protection, Mr. MORRISON'S amendment is deficient in the following six categories:

1. The Civil Service Commission is the final arbiter of any dispute as to whether an employee has or has not been affected by the operation of the provisions of Section 3. This is equivalent to permitting one of the parties in interest to judge the outcome of the case.

2. Assuming the CSC could be completely objective in each individual case, its decision that an employee was entitled to government employment could be vitiated by offering him a Post Office job at a distant point thereby requiring him to move to another city. There is no provision for moving expenses or for loss on the sale of a home, etc. Most employees would undoubtedly turn down any such offer thereby eliminating any obligation which the government might have to them under this amendment.

3. There is no restriction as to the type of job which might be offered an employee. For example, a man who had worked at a desk for 20 years might be given a job of a postman, which he physically could not handle.

4. There is no provision for training or retraining and employees could be placed in jobs and then disqualified for incompetence.

5. Subsection (c) of the amendment purports to protect employees against loss of railroad retirement benefits, etc., but is worded so as to be meaningless since the benefits referred to, in many cases, have not vested in the employees who would be affected. Also, the subsection seems to protect against subsection (b) affecting an employee's rights whereas it is subsection (a) which would affect those rights.

6. There is no protection afforded the employees of REA Express or other carriers who will be placed in lower paying jobs or required to move to other points because of the abolishment of their jobs and their subsequent exercise of seniority in order to maintain employment with their respective carriers. The amendment would only protect those employees who ultimately lose employment with REA Express or other carriers and provides nothing for those employees who would remain with their present employers but who would be placed in lower paying jobs or otherwise adversely affected.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, I point out that the number of employees the Railway Express Agency stated would lose their jobs was 4,700 employees at the most. The number would not be anywhere near what the gentleman from Nebraska stated it would be.

I believe the majority of the committee felt that even that figure was high. We doubted that even half that many employees would lose their jobs.

As far as the legality of this amendment is concerned, we have checked and verified it with all the people who are in charge of the legal proceedings of the Post Office Department, with the Civil Service Commission experts, with counsel of our committee, and with the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana is talking about the 4,700 REA employees. What about the 44,000 brotherhood employees? What are they going to do?

Mr. MORRISON. Nothing is going to happen to them. They will probably need more employees on the railroads, if they keep the passenger trains on, to carry the additional parcels the Post Office Department will have under this bill to give to the railroads.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is not true.

Mr. MORRISON. It is true.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. They will lose jobs. We have a definite statement to that effect. Other employees, not railroad employees, will be handling those parcels.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not agree that anyone would lose a job, but if anyone does he will be able to be hired by the Post Office Department.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Then the gentleman disagrees with Mr. Dennis, the head of the Railroad Brotherhoods, who is a very fine man and who knows his business.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my constituents in the State of North Carolina, I urge enactment of H.R. 14904, to end the present confusing and discriminatory provisions limiting certain parcel post mailings between first class post offices and to provide other needed revisions in parcel post law.

To illustrate how discriminatory these provisions can be: a resident of Wallace, N.C., may mail a parcel with 73-inch dimensions to Apex, N.C., but he cannot send the same parcel post package to Concord, N.C. He may send a 21-pound parcel to Chapel Hill, N.C., but not to Asheville, N.C.

I submit these provisions, limiting parcels between some offices and not between others—between some citizens and not others—are inequitable and have long needed revisions, as our hearings in the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee have shown so graphically.

I shall vote for approval of this measure, in the interest of my constituents, and in the general public interest, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, like many of my colleagues, I originally had serious misgivings about the parcel post bill, H.R. 14904, before us today. Specifically, I was deeply troubled about the potential impact of the bill on many thousands of workers employed by the Railway Express Agency. Although the Postmaster General had stated his intention to hire any REA workers who might be dislocated by the effect of passage of this bill, I did not see how this

could be done under existing civil service laws.

The assurances of employment opportunity now to be written into the law pursuant to the amendment proposed by the gentlemen from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], has set my doubts to rest and I am satisfied that the employees of REA will be adequately protected.

I am therefore supporting the bill, because it offers many advantages for the people I represent in New York City. For example, although the parcel post rates would be increased by about 8 cents a package by this bill, failure to pass it would result in a 14-cent-per-package increase under the terms of existing law.

Second, and equally important, the discrimination against big city residents in terms of the size and weight of parcel post packages would be removed by this bill. Right now, one of my constituents can use parcel post to a major city more than 150 miles away only if the package weighs not more than 20 pounds and the measure of the length plus the girth of the parcel is not more than 72 inches. If either the sender or recipient is served by a second-, third- or fourth-class post office—outside the large cities—the package could weigh up to 40 pounds and the measurements could total up to 100 inches. The result of the discrimination has been to penalize big city residents who were forced to use other means of shipment, such as REA, with minimum charges of $4 per parcel. This discrimination is eliminated by this bill.

Finally, enlargement of the parcel post service which can be rendered by the Post Office will, we are told, actually reduce the cost per package. This should keep down parcel charges and thereby help in the fight against rises in the cost of living which oppress the middle-income people whom I represent. Every effort that can be made to combat the upward trend in the cost of living should be pursued if it does not reduce valuable public services. This bill appears to me to move in the right direction without requiring any group of workers to make a sacrifice.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 14904, a bill to seriously alter, among other things, the size of packages which can be handled by the Post Office, is one of the most difficult bills to come before this House.

On the one hand we are mindful of efforts to reduce Federal expenditures by helping make the postal service pay its own way as much as possible. The proposal before us today is to permit the Post Office to handle larger size packages. There would appear to be no problem in this decision, except for the fact that we have been told by hundreds of people employed today by the Railway Express that if this bill goes through, they will have to drop many of their employees because of the anticipated drop in volume by REA.

I have no intention of supporting legislation which will drive people from their jobs. I am encouraged, however, Mr. Chairman, by the chairman of the committee reporting this bill that for a 2-year period after enactment of this legislation—if it is indeed approved by the House and the Congress—any employee of REA or any other package delivery company who can show he lost his job as a result of this legislation, will be hired by the postal service in the same grade and rate of pay received from his present employer.

I am further assured, and I make this statement here today for the express purpose of establishing legislative intent, that any displaced employee hired by the postal service will be given full credit for his years of service with his former employer and those years of credit will not only apply to the civil service grade which such employee will assume upon joining the postal service, but furthermore all years of previous employment will be credited toward retirement.

Those people who are now employed by REA and other such services, Mr. Chairman, have a right to expect, on the basis of statements presented here during debate today, that even if there shall be a reduction in force in their present private employment because of this legislation, the individual worker will not suffer any economic hardship or loss.

The only question remaining, Mr. Chairman, is how will we determine that a person has been dislocated from previous employment because of increased competition from the Government postal service?

Again, in order to establish legislative intent, I understand the chairman of this committee and the Government officials involved, including those from the Civil Service Commission, will accept from a private employer a simple certification that he has found it necessary to eliminate an employee or a group of employees because his volume has dropped off as a result of competition from the Government postal service. I stress this, Mr. Chairman, so that the Civil Service Commission will not, subsequent to the passage of this bill, establish a cumbersome and legalistic procedure which will make it impossible for a terminated employee to take full advantage of this legislation and obtain employment in grade in the postal service.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that when an employee is severed from his present private employment because of competition from the postal service, he will be given an assignment with the Post Office in the same locality or general area where he is now employed. I stress this to establish an intent of Congress that we do not intend to have people offered jobs in the postal service in faraway or remote areas from their present residence.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the intent of Congress, which I have spelled out here in these remarks today, will help assure those who have expressed deep concern over this legislation that their jobs and means of livelihood will not be adversely affected.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 67 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"§ 4556. Postage rates on parcel post

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section and subject to section 4558 of this title, the rates of postage on fourth-class parcel post are based on the zones described in section 4553 of this title in accordance with the following table:

"CENTS PER PARCEL

"Weight 1 pound and not exceeding (pounds)	Zones							
	Local	1 and 2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2	35	50	50	55	60	65	75	80
3	40	55	55	65	70	80	90	100
4	40	60	65	70	85	95	110	120
5	45	65	70	80	95	110	125	140
6	45	70	75	90	105	125	140	160
7	45	75	85	95	115	135	160	180
8	50	80	90	105	125	150	175	200
9	50	85	95	110	135	160	190	220
10	55	90	100	120	145	175	205	240
11	55	95	110	125	155	185	220	255
12	55	100	115	135	165	200	235	275
13	60	105	120	140	175	210	250	290
14	60	110	125	150	185	220	270	310
15	65	115	130	155	195	235	285	325
16	65	120	140	165	205	245	300	345
17	65	125	145	170	215	255	315	360
18	70	130	150	180	230	270	330	380
19	70	135	155	185	240	280	345	395
20	75	140	160	195	250	295	360	415

"Weight 1 pound and not exceeding (pounds)	Zones							
	Local	1 and 2	3	4	5	6	7	8
21	75	145	165	200	255	305	375	430
22	75	150	170	205	265	315	385	450
23	80	150	175	215	275	325	400	465
24	80	155	180	220	280	335	415	480
25	85	160	185	225	290	350	430	500
26	85	165	190	235	300	360	445	515
27	85	170	195	240	305	370	455	535
28	90	170	200	245	315	380	470	550
29	90	175	205	250	325	390	485	565
30	90	180	210	260	335	405	500	585
31	95	185	215	265	340	415	515	600
32	95	185	220	270	350	425	525	620
33	100	190	225	280	360	435	540	635
34	100	195	230	285	365	445	555	650
35	100	200	235	290	375	460	570	670
36	105	205	240	295	385	470	585	685
37	105	205	240	305	390	480	595	705
38	110	210	245	310	400	490	610	720
39	110	215	250	315	410	500	625	735

"CENTS PER PARCEL—Continued

"Weight 1 pound and not exceeding (pounds)	Zones							
	Local	1 and 2	3	4	5	6	7	8
40	110	220	255	320	420	515	640	755
41	115	220	260	330	425	525	655	770
42	115	225	265	335	435	535	665	785
43	115	230	270	340	445	545	680	800
44	120	235	275	350	450	555	695	820
45	120	240	280	355	460	570	710	835
46	125	240	285	360	470	580	725	850
47	125	245	290	365	475	590	735	865
48	125	250	295	375	485	600	750	880
49	130	255	300	380	495	610	765	900
50	130	255	305	385	505	625	780	915
51	130	260	310	390	510	635	790	930
52	135	265	315	400	520	645	805	945
53	135	265	320	405	525	655	820	960
54	140	270	320	410	535	760	830	980
55	140	275	325	415	545	680	845	995
56	140	275	330	420	550	690	885	1,010
57	145	280	335	430	560	700	870	1,025
58	145	285	340	435	565	710	885	1,040
59	150	285	345	440	575	720	895	1,060
60	150	290	350	445	585	735	910	1,075
61	150	295	355	450	590	745	920	1,090
62	155	295	360	460	600	755	935	1,105
63	155	300	365	465	605	765	950	1,120
64	155	300	370	470	615	775	960	1,140
65	160	305	375	475	625	790	975	1,155
66	160	310	380	480	630	800	985	1,170
67	165	310	385	490	640	810	1,000	1,185
68	165	315	390	495	645	820	1,015	1,200
69	165	320	395	500	655	830	1,025	1,220
70	170	320	395	505	665	845	1,040	1,235

parcels weighing less than ten pounds and measuring more than eighty-four inches but not more than one hundred inches in length and girth combined are subject to a minimum postage rate equal to the postage rate for a ten-pound parcel for the zone to which the parcel is addressed.

"(c) Subject to section 4558 of this title, the postage rate on gold mailed within Alaska or from Alaska to other States and possessions of the United States, including the Canal Zone and the Trust Territory of

"(b) Subject to section 4558 of this title, the Pacific Islands, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is 2 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof regardless of zones.

"§ 4557. Postage rates on catalogs

"(a) Subject to section 4558 of this title, the rates of postage on fourth-class catalogs, having twenty-four or more pages at least twenty-two of which are printed and weighing sixteen ounces or more but not exceeding ten pounds, are based on the zones described in section 4553 of this title in accordance with the following table:

"CATALOGS

"Weight (pounds)	Zones							
	Local	1 and 2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
1.5	23	29	30	31	33	35	38	41
2	24	30	32	33	36	39	42	46
2.5	25	32	33	36	39	42	46	51
3	26	33	35	38	42	46	51	57
3.5	27	35	37	40	44	49	55	62
4	28	36	39	42	47	53	59	67
4.5	29	38	41	45	50	56	64	72
5	30	39	42	46	53	60	68	77
6	32	42	46	51	59	67	77	88
7	34	45	50	56	64	74	85	98
8	36	48	53	60	70	81	94	109
9	38	51	57	65	76	88	104	119
10	39	54	60	69	81	95	112	129

"(b) Subject to section 4558 of this title, the rates of postage on catalogs conforming to subsection (a) of this section, when mailed in quantities of not less than three hundred individually addressed pieces at one time and when prepared and mailed in accordance with conditions established by the Postmaster General, consist of a piece rate in addition to a bulk rate per pound, based on the zones described in section 4553 of this title, in accordance with the following table:

"Zone	Piece rate	Bulk pound rate
	Cents	*Cents*
Local	17	1.9
1 and 2	21	3.0
3	21	3.6
4	21	4.6
5	21	5.7
6	21	7.1
7	21	8.7
8	22	10.4

"§ 4558. Reformation of conditions of mailability

"(a) Whenever the Postmaster General finds that, as a continuing situation,—

"(1) the acceptance, as fourth-class mail, of mail matter otherwise legally acceptable in the mails is being prevented, or

"(2) the revenue from the fourth-class mail service is less than the cost of such service or that the revenue from such service is greater than the cost thereof, or

"(3) any other condition exists with respect to the fourth-class mail service which is impairing the efficient and economic operation of such service,

by reason of—

"(A) the rates of postage on fourth-class mail (other than the rates prescribed by sections 4422, 4554, and 4651 to 4654, inclusive, of this title), or

"(B) the classification of articles mailable as fourth-class mail, or

"(C) the postal zone structure or the method used in establishing such structure, or

"(D) any other condition of mailability as fourth-class mail (other than size and weight limits),

he shall file with the Interstate Commerce Commission a request to—

"(i) increase or decrease, as he deems advisable, any rate or rates of postage on fourth-class mail (other than the rates prescribed by sections 4422, 4554, and 4651 to 4654, inclusive, of this title), or

"(ii) reform any condition or conditions of mailability within the purview of subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) of this subsection, or

"(iii) take both such actions.

"(b) The request of the Postmaster General under subsection (a) of this section for an increase or decrease in any rate or rates of postage or for reformation of any other condition or conditions of mailability, or both, shall be deemed approved on the thirtieth day following the date on which the Postmaster General files such request with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and shall become effective in accordance with the terms of the request, unless, prior to the expiration of such thirtieth day—

"(1) such request is rejected by the Commission, or

"(2) the Commission orders an investigation of such request.

If final determination by the Commission, on the basis of such investigation, is not made prior to the expiration of the one hundred and eightieth day after the date of the filing of such request with the Commission, such request shall be deemed approved at the close of such one hundred and eightieth day and shall become effective in accordance with its terms.

"§ 4559. Certification on fourth-class mail revenue-cost relationship

"The Postmaster General shall not withdraw from the general fund of the Treasury any funds appropriated to the Department for any fiscal year, until he has certified in writing to the Secretary of the Treasury that—

"(1) he has reason to believe that the revenues from the rates of postage on fourth-class mail (other than fourth-class mail for which the rates are prescribed by sections 4422, 4554, and 4651 to 4654, inclusive, of this title) will not be greater than the costs thereof by more than 4 per centum and will not be less than the costs thereof by more than 4 per centum; or

"(2) he has filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission a request for the establishment or reformation of rates or other conditions of mailability, or both, in accordance with section 4558 of this title, with the objective that the revenues of such fourth-class mail will not be greater than the costs thereof by more than 4 per centum, or will not be less than the costs thereof by more than 4 per centum.

Certificates required by this subsection shall be based on the volume data published in the most recent Cost Ascertainment Report of the Department.".

(b) The table of contents of such chapter 67 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"4556. Postage rates on parcel post.

"4557. Postage rates on catalogs.

"4558. Reformation of conditions of mailability.

"4559. Certification on fourth-class mail revenue-cost relationship.".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4553 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) The Postmaster General shall use units of area containing postal sectional cen-

ter facilities as the basis of a postal zone as described in subsection (b) of this section. The zone shall be measured from the center of the unit of area containing the dispatching sectional center facility. A post office of mailing and a post office of delivery shall have the same zone relationship as their respective sectional center facilities, but this sentence shall not cause two post offices to be regarded as within the same local zone.

"(d) In addition to the eight zones described in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, there is a local zone as defined by the Postmaster General from time to time.

"(e) The foregoing provisions of this section are subject to section 4558 of this title.".

(b) Section 4303(d)(1) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "established for fourth class mail" and inserting in lieu thereof "described in section 4553, or prescribed pursuant to section 4558, of this title".

(c) Section 4359(e)(3) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "established for fourth class mail" and inserting in lieu thereof "described in section 4553, or prescribed pursuant to section 4558, of this title".

SEC. 3. Section 4552 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The maximum size of fourth class mail is one hundred inches in girth and length combined, and the minimum weight is sixteen ounces.

"(b) The maximum weight of fourth class mail is forty pounds, except that the maximum weight is seventy pounds for parcels—

"(1) mailed at, or addresed for delivery at, a second-, third-, fourth-class post office or on a rural or star route;

"(2) containing baby fowl, live plants, trees, shrubs, or agricultural commodities but not the manufactured products of those commodities;

"(3) consisting of books, films, and other materials mailed under section 4554 of this title;

"(4) addressed to or mailed at any Armed Forces post office outside the fifty States;

"(5) addressed to or mailed in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the States of Alaska and Hawaii, or a possession of the United States including the Canal Zone and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and

"(6) consisting of reproducers of sound reproduction records for the blind or parts thereof, and of braille writers and other appliances for the blind or parts thereof, mailed under section 4654 of this title.".

SEC. 4. (a) The paragraph under the heading "GENERAL PROVISIONS" under the appropriations for the Post Office Department contained in chapter IV of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (64 Stat. 1050), as amended by section 213 of the Postal Rate Increase Act, 1958 (72 Stat. 143; 31 U.S.C. 695), is repealed effective as of July 1, 1966.

(b) Section 207(b) of the Act of February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1067), as amended by section 7 of the Act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 942), is repealed as of the effective date of the first section of this Act.

SEC. 5. The provisions of the first section and sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins at least ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORRISON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORRISON: On page 8, line 20, insert "(a)" immediately following "SEC. 3."; and

On page 9, immediately following line 20, insert the following:

"(b) Each person—

"(1) who, on the date of enactment of this Act, is in the employment of a private carrier engaged in the transportation and delivery of parcels other than United States mail,

"(2) who, within two years after the effective date of this subsection, is involuntarily separated from such employment by reason of a reduction in the activities of such carrier which is, in the determination of the United States Civil Service Commission made on the basis of evidence satisfactory to the commission, directly or indirectly attributable to the operation of the provisions of this Act,

shall be entitled, upon his application filed with the Commission at any time after notice is given by such carrier to such person of his prospective or actual involuntary separation but not later than one year after the date of such involuntary separation, to the benefits of the following provisions:

"(A) If the Commission finds that such involuntary separation was directly or indirectly attributable to the operation of the provisions of this Act, the Commission shall notify the Postmaster General to that effect. Pursuant to such notification, the Postmaster General shall appoint such person, with competitive status, to a regular position in the competitive civil service in or under the Post Office Department.

"(B) Such appointment shall be to a position in a salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule, or in a grade of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, for which (i) the minimum per annum rate of basic compensation is less than his rate of compensation in effect immediately prior to his involuntary separation and (ii) the maximum per annum rate of basic compensation exceeds his rate of compensation in effect immediately prior to his involuntary separation.

"(C) Each employee so appointed shall be placed in the lowest step of the salary level or grade to which he is appointed for which the rate of basic compensation exceeds his rate of compensation in effect immediately prior to his involuntary separation.

"(D) In the determination of length of service for the purposes of leave, retirement, veterans' preference, group life and health insurance, severance pay, tenure, training, promotion, and status, all service performed by such person in the employment of such carrier shall be included and credited.

"(c) Subsection (b) of this section shall not be held or considered to reduce any retirement benefit or pension benefit to which any person within the purview of such subsection (b) is entitled under any other law.

"(d) A regular employee in the postal field service shall not be reduced to substitute status by reason of the operation of subsection (b) of this section.

"(e) For the purposes of subsections (b) and (c) of this section, the term 'person' means an 'employee' as defined in section 1 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U.S.C. 151), or as defined in section 2 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. 152)."

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that I spoke about when we were debating the rule on this legislation. It gives any employee on any carrier or the Railway Express Agency who loses his job an opportunity to have a job and he will be given a job with the Post Office Department. The Postmaster General has said that with all of the estimates of those who will lose their jobs given—and even if they have above the estimates given before our committee—the Post Office Department would still be able to employ all of them and even employ an additional number if their estimates were found to be relatively low.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is something that will give any man who might lose his job a permanent postal job. You certainly have to look at this fact: Since 1952 the Railway Express Agency laid off over 10,000 employees. For not one of those employees did the Railway Express Agency try to save seniority or try to find another job at the same salary that they were making.

That is what this amendment does. It fixes it so that any Railway Express company employee or carrier employee who loses his job because of the bill will have a job with the Post Office Department with status and seniority rights. In addition to that, he will be placed in a position by the Postmaster General at a salary higher than the compensation he was receiving from his private employer. He will be granted full civil service status immediately upon appointment. He will receive credit for service with his former employer for the purpose of leave, retirement, veterans' preference, group life and health insurance, severance pay, tenure training, promotion, status, and all other rights and benefits conferred by law on Government employees. These are substantial benefits which should be equal or greater than those provided in his prior employment.

The amendment will also guarantee that it will not operate to reduce any retirement or pension benefits to which an employee is entitled and will not cause a regular employee in the postal field service to be reduced to a substitute.

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

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

Mr. MILLER. When this law went into effect in 1952 reducing the size of parcel post, it caused some dislocation in the Post Office Department. Did the Railway Express Agency make any effort to pick up the postal employees who lost their jobs and their ratings as a result of turning this business over to the REA?

Mr. MORRISON. No, they did not try to relocate a single one of them.

Mr. Chairman, I will conclude by saying that the gentleman from California is correct in that thousands of post office jobs were lost. The public was inconvenienced tremendously, and the express company was not saved, as they said they would be, because they laid off over 10,000 people. They did not try to place their separated employees in other jobs when they laid them off.

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

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

Mr. DANIELS. I might point out when the 1951 law did go into effect it

was unnecessary for the Post Office Department to lay off any employees because there is a natural attrition in the Post Office Department of about 60,000 employees each year. This occurs by reason of resignations and by reasons of death or retirement.

Mr. Chairman, I believe if the members of the committee will look at the figures or if they will read the testimony that came before the committee, they will find that there is a natural turnover of 50,000 to 60,000 jobs annually.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this legislation. It is my opinion that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has done a very fine job in putting it together.

Mr. Chairman, in March of this year the Reader's Digest published a study in depth of what it called the "Crisis in the Post Office." This magazine has a circulation of 26 million—the largest in the world. Its viewpoint is significant. What it has to say to the American people ought to be of interest to the Congress.

And what it has to say about the crisis in the Post Office is summed up in bold red type at the head of the article. It is:

Postal authorities know just what's wrong with the mail system, and they know how to fix it. The question is: Will they be allowed to?

This is exactly the question confronting the House today. Will the Postmaster General be allowed to remedy the arbitrary nature and insolvent position of the parcel post system or will the powerful pressure groups generally bent on preserving the status quo once again be successful.

The Postmaster General has made his case. He has shown that he knows how to fix it.

His case is that 140 million Americans living in urban areas are being arbitrarily discriminated against with respect to the size and weight of parcels they can mail.

The Postmaster General had documented the fact that tens of thousands of these citizens are turned away at post office windows at Christmastime and at other times when their packages do not meet these artificial size and weight requirements that are not imposed upon other Americans.

He seeks an increase in parcel post and catalog rates to make his parcel post service financially self-sufficient.

He wants to simplify postage computations so that the average citizen can more easily use the parcel post service provided by the Government.

And finally, with this assistance, he will continue to face up to the legal requirement that he certify annually to the President and the Congress that he has taken action to bring revenues into line with costs.

The postal service today is a matter of national concern. The laudable efforts of Postmaster General O'Brien to improve this service was the subject of a front page article in the Sunday New York Times earlier this month. This article makes it clear that he is doing everything possible to improve this service.

But Congress cannot escape part of the responsibility. The time is passed when we can blame it all on the Postmaster General. Specifically, the issue before the House today is whether legislative restrictions shall be lifted so that the postal service may be broadened, improved, and made more solvent.

In another study in depth of the postal service entitled "What's the Matter With the Mails?" published in the Reporter magazine in February 1965, the point is made that to very significant degree the Postmaster General is saddled with the responsibility but does not have the power to meet that responsibility which resides with the Congress.

The Congress decides what prices shall be charged to the postal service and what wages shall be paid to postal workers. And in the issue before the House today it decides what kind of parcel post service will be rendered to America.

I suggest that we decide that that service should and will be improved and that we authorize the Postmaster General to improve it by approving this bill recommended by the overwhelming majority of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Members should know something about the REA.

Mr. Chairman, the REA was in bad shape, up until about 1957, I believe it was, when a very intelligent young man by the name of Johnson came in to head it up. Since then they have expanded all over the country. They have built new terminals. They have just broken even one might say in the last couple of years, and I believe that now they may be making a little profit and they continue to grow and provide expanding services.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us not go back to the old, old days when the REA was not in good financial condition; for what reasons, I do not know. Today the REA is a vigorous organization and I hate to see it destroyed.

I would say also, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, that this bill has received so much criticism that this amendment, if adopted, is designed to attempt to fool some people and take some people off the hot spot.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, this amendment shows how speedily this bill moved. It was never offered in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I do not know why it was not offered in the committee, if it were such a good amendment. It should have been offered there and we could have come in with a clean bill. However, it was not offered. My colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS], offered an amendment along the same vein but not in this exact language. The gentleman's amendment was overwhelmingly shouted down in the committee.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want the Committee to know that this amendment was never considered by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the amendment.

The Clerk read the substitute amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. MORRISON: On page 10, immediately following line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. Each former employee of a private carrier engaged in the transportation and delivery of parcels, who incurs an involuntary separation from his position with such carrier, at any time after the effective date of this section, as a result of a loss of business in any way traceable, in the judgment of the United States Civil Service Commission, to the operation of this Act shall be entitled, upon application submitted to the Commission within six months after such involuntary separation, to appointment on a competitive status basis to a position in the Post Office Department in the competitive civil service, and shall be entitled to receive special appropriate courses of training which the Postmaster General shall provide. Such appointment shall be at the lowest rate of compensation of the appropriate grade or salary level which is not less than his rate of compensation immediately before his involuntary separation. Service performed by such person for such carrier shall be counted in determining his length of service for purposes of employment rights and benefits of Federal employees, including leave, retirement, severance pay, training, promotion, and status. A regular employee in the postal field service shall not be reduced to substitute status by reason of the provisions hereof."

On page 10, line 7, renumber "SEC. 5." as "SEC. 6.".

On page 10, line 8, strike out "2 and 3" and insert in lieu thereof "2, 3, and 5".

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, if it were not contrary to the normal practice in the House, I would refer to this amendment as the Derwinski-Morrison substitute. But technically I cannot include the name of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana in connection with my proposal at this point.

They are very close together. The only difference between the substitute that I have offered and the original amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana is that in the amendment offered by Mr. MORRISON there is a 2-year limit in which the REA and other railroad employees would be hired by the Post Office. My substitute has no limitation whatsoever. So it is more flexible and more practical in that regard.

Then also, as I pointed out to the Members earlier, because of the great regard I have for our great Postmaster General, I have tried to incorporate much of the phraseology of his letter, which has been referred to, into my amendment so that when the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] uses the language "directly or indirectly attributable to the operations of the provisions of the act," I use the Postmaster's language and say that "any employee whose loss of a job is in any way traceable to this act shall be hired" and that then certain procedures will then take place.

The other difference is that the gentleman from Louisiana allows for 1 year after the date of involuntary separation for someone to be hired by the Post Of-

fice. I provide for 6 months because I wish to keep the unemployment period as brief as possible.

The other provisions are the same. We ask in this substitute amendment for a special training program for employees, which is not provided in the original Morrison amendment. Otherwise, it is the same in regard to the employee benefits, the retention of pension rights, and so forth and so on. It protects the Post Office employees—which is the same phrase used by the gentleman from Louisiana.

Now I would like to point out to the Members, however, that these amendments dramatize one interesting thing. The statement has been made repeatedly that any employee of the REA who loses his job as a result of this bill will be hired by the Post Office Department and appropriately protected.

I would ask anyone of the members of the committee if this means that if the president of the REA should lose his position or if that firm should go bankrupt would he be hired at the same salary by the Post Office Department? If so, where could we fit him in the Post Office Department—above or below our great Postmaster General? Because under this amendment by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] technically the president of the REA would be entitled to a Post Office position and I imagine at a rather high salary position at that.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DANIELS. Is the gentleman now in the well of the House aware of the salary of the former president of the REA, Mr. Johnson, just prior to his retirement?

Mr. DERWINSKI. No, I am not.

Mr. DANIELS. Would you be alarmed to know that he received a salary of $85,000 per year?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would not be alarmed—I would like to change places with him.

Mr. DANIELS. Then what would you make him—President of the United States instead of Postmaster General?

Mr. DERWINSKI. This, may I say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] is the problem that you distinguished gentlemen face because you promised to hire these people. I imagine you might make him a roving ambassador to the railroads of the world or other such things of that nature.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that we would not need this amendment if we did not have section 3 in the bill. All that I am doing by my substitute is to try to put extra language in this fine amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana and perhaps expedite this entire proceeding if my substitute were accepted and we could all move along in much more effective fashion.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's substitute amendment is not specific. It is very vague. It is inadequate and it just confuses the whole wording of my amendment.

The gentleman has brought up a point about the president of the REA. If the gentleman had listened to my remarks earlier in general debate, he would have heard that I said only employees and minor officials would be included. These are the ones who are described this way in my amendment for the purposes of subsection (b) and (c) of this section, the term person means employee as defined in section 1 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, or as defined in section 2 of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947. Nobody higher than minor officials would be included.

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

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Would the gentleman think that some of the skilled talent in the upper echelons of the REA might be effectively used to upgrade the services of the Post Office Department?

Mr. MORRISON. The talent of the Railway Express Agency is in such demand, I understand, that the former president of the Railway Express Agency, Mr. William Johnson, has recently gone to work for the Illinois Central Railroad as president at a good salary. I am sure he richly deserves the salary, as he has always done an outstanding job. Even if he did come under the Railway Retirement Act, which he does not, I do not think he would be interested in going to work for the Post Office Department.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Of course, one of the reasons that he is given such a high salary is that he is required to pay stiff income taxes necessary, in part, to pay for the Post Office deficit.

Mr. MORRISON. The gentleman is against this bill. He voted against it in committee. He spoke against it here. All his substitute would do would be to confuse and hurt my amendment and the bill as well. I urge that the amendment be rejected.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I supported this bill in committee and I support it now, but without either of these amendments. Both of them—the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], and certainly the substitute by the gentleman from Illinois—go much too far. I have had differences with Postmaster Generals in the past and I carry no torch as such for the present Postmaster General. But I am willing to rely upon the letter, which he provided the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, asserting he would give jobs to those who might become unemployed and who are qualified to hold positions in the Post Office Department.

Mr. Chairman, just before this bill was reported out of the full committee an amendment of practically the same content as that now pending by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] was offered. It was rejected almost out of hand.

I urge you here this afternoon not to set a precedent of guaranteeing employment to those who may lose their jobs. What will be the situation if all other departments and agencies of the Government are forced by law to hire the unemployed of any company or corporation which has had a direct or indirect relationship with the Federal Government? No department or agency should be mandated in this fashion and I ask for the defeat of both the Morrison amendment and the Derwinski substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 48, noes 30.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. I believe it will correct an injustice that was done in 1952.

I was then on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, as were several of the older Members. I remember quite well we were told if we reduced the size of the parcel post and took it out of certain first-class offices, a service equal to that then given to the people of the United States would be provided by the Railway Express Agency.

I will cite the conditions in my own hometown of 70,000 people. We had an agency of the REA in that town. Within a year that office was closed. If I wanted to send a parcel weighing more than 20 pounds, I had to go to Oakland, about 4 miles, to get to an REA office. Three or four years ago the agency downtown in Oakland was closed down, and the only office open in the metropolitan area of Oakland and its three surrounding cities was the railroad station, about 5 miles through traffic from the city in which I live.

It is true the Railway Agency said, "We will offer you a service," but if we had a package to ship by Railway Express we had to call up and ask for a truck to come. Quite frequently, when the truck got there, they would say "We do not have a scale on this truck. We cannot weigh this package. It has to be sent c.o.d."

Many times when we wanted to send personal effects back here, when Congress was about to open, we called the Express Agency and were told "The truck will be out this afternoon." It did not show in the afternoon. That meant someone had to remain home all day, if we did not want to make the trek over to their office.

Surely, if I called up and told them who I was, they would say "Oh, yes, Mr. MILLER. We will have a truck there."

And the truck was there in 30 minutes, with the scale on it.

But how about the man who is not a Member of Congress? How about the man who exercised no influence, just the little guy? Did he get that service? I did not get it if I did not identify myself, and I doubt if he got it.

That is one of the reasons I believe this bill should be adopted, because it will serve the great mass of people in this country and give them a service comparable to that they had before we reduced the size and weight limits of parcel post packages.

I believe the Express Co. had an opportunity to show good faith, and it did not live up to what it implied in promises they made when the bill was enacted into law.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORRISON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORRISON: On page 10, strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 5. The provisions of the first section and sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall become effective on Januray 15, 1967."

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, all the amendment would do is, instead of having the act go into effect 90 days after enactment, to have it go into effect at a date certain, January 15, 1967.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. O'NEILL OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MORRISON:

"Strike out section 5, page 10, line 7, and substitute:

"'SEC. 5. The provisions of the first section and sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall become effective on January 15, 1969.'"

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I know of no legislation which has been more controversial than the legislation pending today. I, as one Member of Congress, have received more than 1,000 letters on both sides of this issue. There are those who say it has merit. There are those who are opposed to it.

I pledged myself to support this bill earlier in the year.

A neighbor of mine came to my home and said, "I understand that this so-called REA bill is pending before the Congress. I understand that they are making proposals that the employees will be taken care of." He also said, "Take my situation as an example. I have been with REA for 31 years. I have a busted knee and a hernia. How can I pass any civil service examination? How am I going to be protected in this matter? What will happen to my pension rights?"

There were at least 15 or 20 of my neighbors exactly like this man, all of whom came to me. All of them had problems.

We surely want to do something about the deficit. There is no question about that. But we must have some human compassion.

There are all kinds of various bugs in this bill. One side argues one way on sections 1 and 2. The other side argues another way.

I am politically "hep" enough to know that this legislation is going to pass here today, even though I am going to oppose it.

I know that Mr. Lawrence O'Brien, the Postmaster General, who is one of my close personal friends, is one of the most popular men who has ever been on the Hill, the greatest liaison man a President ever had, who is able, talented, and personable. I would hate to have him opposing me on any issue, because he has been so good to so many of us so many times.

But, in order to clear the bugs out of this bill, I believe in fairness we ought to have time, in which they can see if they can take care of the old timer who has 31 years, and all of the other bugs which may come out. So I merely ask that instead of January 15, 1967, upon the enactment of this legislation it be placed in effect January 15, 1969.

I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

All the substitute amendment would do is add another 2-year moratorium. We have already had a 3-year moratorium.

Our committee has gone through this legislation step by step, day by day, and week by week.

The Postmaster General said that he needs this $100 million a year of additional revenue for the operation of the parcel post service of the post offices.

What the substitute amendment would do is take out that $100 million of increased revenue, which the Postmaster General says he needs.

Our committee has gone into this fully. We have come up with a good bill. We have come up with a bill which will save the taxpayers of this country millions and millions of dollars a year.

We should face the issue now, instead of putting it off 2 more years from now, which would result in a large cost to the taxpayers, because we would not get the $100 million a year that the bill provides in additional revenue.

I urge that the substitute be voted down.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts urged a delay of several years. He said he would like to iron out the bugs first with reference to employment opportunities, but I do not see how you can iron out any bugs until you have the law actually in operation. So I do not see that this offers really much of a solution. I know that Massachusetts is the home of revolution and we have a difference of opinion here.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Do you have any precise plan that the Post Office Department is willing to lay before the Congress today that can show in detail what they are going to do in order to protect the jobs of these people? Is there anything from the Civil Service Commission that shows us how these men will definitely be taken care of?

Mr. JOELSON. I am concerned about the REA employees. It is for that reason I withheld judgment to the last minute. I hope that the amendment that has been passed will protect the interests of these employees.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the able gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the able gentleman, with the assistance of the able chairman of the subcommittee, advise the House as to whether or not his amendment would protect the seniority rights of the employees of the REA who might lose their employment?

Mr. MORRISON. If the gentleman will yield, I will be glad to answer that.

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON. They will positively protect the seniority rights.

Mr. PEPPER. I was advised, if the gentleman would permit me to say so, by the general counsel of the Post Office Department that that was not correct. As the gentleman carefully stated in his earlier statement, they would in respect to the Government, be given all of the rights of seniority, but in respect to other postal employees they would not have the right to get a preference.

Mr. MORRISON. Let me put it this way: For instance, a man is laid off by the Railway Express Agency and he has 8 years of seniority. All right. He comes into the Post Office Department. Well, that 8 years of seniority, when he retires, is added toward his retirement credit. So if he has 22 more years which he serves in the Post Office Department and he is 55 years old, with this bill (H.R. 14122) which is now before the other body which provides that you can retire after 30 years of service when you are 55, then that 8 years with the Railway Express Agency will count toward his retirement. If he had over 12 years with the Railroad Retirement Board, and let us say he is a railway employee or a railway clerk, then that will be added to his seniority rights when he gets in the Post Office Department.

Mr. PEPPER. If the gentleman will yield further, I am so advised, but the gentleman carefully again distinguished between the rights of the employee with respect to the Government, that is, pension rights and the rights he would have vis-a-vis the Government.

Mr. MORRISON. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that it would

only be fair to let those who have been in the Post Office Department for all these years have the preference as far as jobs assignments are concerned. But the former private carrier employees would have a definite job at the same amount of money that he had with the Railway Express Agency. In all probability he would get more money.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman. I thought the House was entitled to the knowledge and the facts that insofar as preferment is concerned, seniority with respect to a postal employee, these employees would not have preferment although they have the same years of service as against the postal employee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 44, noes 68.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELANEY: On page 8, line 20, strike out all of section 3.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe at this time we should pause just a moment and go back to the enactment of the law that is now on the books.

Mr. Chairman, at that time the then Postmaster General, Postmaster General Donaldson, pleaded to take the Post Office Department out of the freight business, and allow them and permit them to deliver the mail.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I feel that we should keep the Post Office Department out of the freight business and concentrate on delivering our first-class mail.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said here today about taking care of employees who are now employed in the REA. However, by the amendment they admit that there will be layoffs, and numerous ones. I defy anyone in this Congress to tell me how you can freeze men who are working for a private organization into civil service and give to them all of their rights. It just cannot be done. It cannot be operated. It is impractical.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words here about a Railway Express Agency which has some 32,000 employees, and in my Sunnyside Yards in Long Island City, 1,500 of these men are involved. They come to me day in and day out. Some of them have been working for 20 and 30 years handling freight. They ask me, "Are you going to vote to have me lose my job?"

Well, Mr. Chairman, we have an antipoverty program up here. The purpose of the antipoverty program, the job section, is to create jobs.

Mr. Chairman, the other day we had testimony to the effect that at one installation of the Job Corps it cost $28,000 to prepare a person for a job, not knowing whether he will work for a day or a week.

Mr. Chairman, the average cost—and listen to this—throughout the Job Corps is anywhere from $9,000 to $13,000 just to prepare them for a job.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have an admission, even from the proponents of the bill, that there will be layoffs. Otherwise it was a futile effort to offer the amendment that was just adopted. That means that men will be laid off and that there will be no jobs for them.

Mr. Chairman, these are our taxpayers. They rear families. The REA has paid its taxes on each of its employees.

Mr. Chairman, will we force these men who are in their fifties and sixties to eventually go on welfare? I am opposed to that.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should have more coordination here between taking jobs away from people, when we will have before the House within a week or two an effort to expend the cost of $13,000 a job in order to provide jobs for individuals.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to go on and get to one or two other thoughts.

Mr. Chairman, REA has been struggling for a number of years. It is just now beginning to get on its feet. However, the favored competitive position which this measure that is pending before the House gives to the taxpayer-supported parcel post system would be a disastrous blow to the company.

More importantly, this legislation reflects a callous disregard for the employees of REA, many of whom have been with the company as I said for 30 years. They are in no position to seek employment.

I believe strongly that a subsidized parcel post system is not in the best interests of the Nation, and that the Post Office Department should derive its revenues from the mailers who use it.

In this regard, the 1965 Annual Report of the Postmaster General shows a postal deficit in excess of $792 million—table 102, page 185. Of this deficit, nearly $380 million was attributable to second-class mail—newspapers and periodicals; more than $348 million to third-class mail.

And listen to this—$143,835,981 to fourth class mail which includes parcel post mail.

And this, if you want to check on it, you can find in table 803, page 244 of the Postmaster General's report.

Mr. Chairman, this bill even if it passes, will have no significant impact on this immense overall deficit. It will not at all affect the second- and third-class mail deficit, which is five times greater than that of parcel post. And there is no assurance that even the parcel post deficit will be reduced to the break-even point.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, all of us are in favor of reductions in Federal expenditures. But, surely, equity and justice are outraged when a token reduction such as this is to be primarily at the expense of one company and its employees. I strongly object to such inequitable legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this bill in my opinion is for the benefit of special interests.

Mr. Chairman, the people who will benefit are the big mail-order houses such as Sears Roebuck and Montgomery Ward just to name a couple.

Let me tell you people from the rural areas who are worried about this—they already enjoy a subsidy on their catalogs, and so forth. This will have a bad effect on the business of the small businessman in your towns who will suffer as a result of the direct mail which will be increased when subsidized rates by the Post Office go into effect.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you to strike out this section. The rest of the bill to provide $60 million additional revenue is satisfactory to me and I know to most of the Members of this Committee.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman from New York had heard all of the testimony in our hearings because I think then he would not make the argument that he is making here today if he had been in the same position of the members of the committee when we heard all of the testimony on this bill.

Now the one thing that the gentleman did not mention and the one thing that I think is more important than anything else, is the person or the millions of Americans who want to use the parcel post system in the Post Office Department. For example, you could take a 40-pound package to the Post Office Department here in Washington and send it to Richmond, Va. But you cannot send that same 40-pound package to Knoxville, Tenn. What you have to do is chop it in two and fix it so that you ship it in two 20-pound packages. If you cannot chop it in two and make two 20-pound packages out of it, then you cannot ship it by parcel post.

Talk about special interests, I think that the REA express company has been protected so far as their transportation service goes at the expense of the patrons who number over 140 million people who are doing business with the first-class mail in post offices throughout the United States and who are being discriminated against to subsidize the REA express company.

Eighty percent of all parcel post is handled through the first-class post offices and that parcel post is limited to 20 pounds and not 40 pounds when you ship it more than 150 miles.

With this amendment, you go to the heart of the bill and take the heart out of the bill. We might as well not have any bill if we vote for the amendment of the gentleman from New York, because we would take $40 million of revenue from the bill. The Postmaster General has testified. He has made a wonderful and a good case for the need of the Department for the $100 million that this bill will bring in. We might as well not

have a bill if we are going to take this gentleman's amendment. I think his amendment should be defeated. It is certainly an amendment which would really destroy and gut the bill.

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

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

Mr. DELANEY. In 1951 and 1952 the gentleman was on the Post Office Committee. The gentleman advocated the law that we have on the statute books at the present time.

Mr. MORRISON. We tried then because the Railway Express Agency said they were going to keep all their employees. We passed the bill, and instead of keeping their employees, they laid off over 10,000 employees, and their business has been going down steadily since. All we did was to hurt the multitude of patrons of the post office. We hurt the Post Office Department, or people; and the Railway Express Agency kept laying off people and the railroads kept taking off passenger and mail trains.

Mr. DELANEY. The gentleman is admitting that he was wrong then.

Mr. MORRISON. I did not say I was wrong in voting for it. I just said it was done in 1951.

Mr. DELANEY. At that time you were one of the proponents of the bill. You were on the committee and you were one of the proponents. You were wrong then and you are wrong now.

Mr. MORRISON. At that time I was way down the line in seniority, and even though I may have voted for it, it did not help REA and it has hurt our people and the Post Office Department.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Delaney amendment.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. May I point out to the Members that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] has a well-deserved reputation amongst us. He has a well-deserved reputation for having a heart of gold and a heart of compassion, not only for his constituents, but for the people across the country. His amendment is absolutely vital. We could accept the Delaney amendment and still give the Postmaster General practically all that his Department has asked for, because by accepting the amendment we would still give the Post Office Department the increase in rates, which is really what they are after—an increase in revenue.

The Delaney amendment would have the practical effect of providing the Post Office Department with additional revenue and at the same time maintaining the effective service that the public is receiving from the Railway Express Agency.

I would also like to point out to the gentleman from Louisiana that he has repeatedly made the statement that immediately upon the passage of this legislation back in 1951 the REA laid off 10,000 people. That statement is completely without foundation. First, any loss of employees in the Railway Express Agency was basically one of attrition and phaseout, because, if anything, there was an immediate resurgence of the Railway Express Agency. However, if you check the statistics presented to our committee, you will find that the profit margin of the Railway Express Agency is at the point of about 2 days' income, and they have no flexibility. They have no cushion to fall back on. As a result of that, this particular amendment is necessary to keep them functioning. I do not believe the Members want to superimpose the Post Office Department on the taxpaying entity. That is the real issue.

I would also like to point out to the gentleman from Louisiana that he in effect counseled the gentleman from New York against offering any amendments. He stated since the gentleman had not served on the subcommittee, he was not aware of the consideration. If that philosophy is followed, none of us who serve on any committee should ever be allowed to offer any amendment except to bills reported by the committee on which we serve. Certainly the gentleman does not wish to shut off consideration and the offer of amendments by Members who are not serving on committees handling bills.

The gentleman from New York made a completely effective case for his amendment. I believe, as I see it, the gentleman from Louisiana has augmented the argument. The gentleman from Louisiana proves the necessity of the Delaney amendment. I urge its adoption.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Delaney amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are 100 or so of us here, who were also here at the time we thought we had solved this matter in 1951. At that time, as the gentleman from New York related, the effort was being made to solve this bothersome parcel post deficit problem by getting the Government out of the freight business and reducing the size of parcel post packages across the board.

Many of us thought we were willing to do that. But at the time it was pointed out this would leave some people in the more isolated areas of this country without any adequate package service. That was the basis on which it was decided that, rather than reducing these packages down to the smaller size across the board, that as a compensation to those who would not have any private agency available to them in the more isolated areas, that those larger sizes would remain in some of those isolated areas.

So now we have a similar problem. Once again we find the parcel post service running at a deficit. What is the solution being offered now? It is that we should permit them to go back into the freight business, and to carry those larger packages which they recommended we ought to get rid of as an operation in 1951.

This bill, in other words, seeks to pull us back, to swing the pendulum back, in exactly the opposite direction for the same purpose it was recommended to this Congress in 1951, and in accordance with which the Congress did pass Public Law 199.

Now having decided in 1966 to go this far, members of the committee obviously found their conscience pricking them. They found that a significant segment of private enterprise in this country was to be irretrievably harmed. So we had what I can only describe as a dangerous and ridiculous amendment offered here, and adopted this afternoon, which says in principle if our Government is going by competition to drive the private segment of the economy of this country out of business, we will take those people off the private payroll and put them on the Government payroll.

I defy any agency of this Government, whether it be the Postal Department, or anyone else, to administer the kind of amendment that was written into law here this afternoon. I defy thinking Members of the Committee to look into the situation and see what we have committed ourselves to. What will be next? Next, if through some public enterprise in communications we drive an important segment of the communications industry out of business, are we going to say to the people who are displaced in that private operation, "We are going to take you into the arms of an all-powerful social government, and provide you with jobs"? Are we prepared to take that kind of commitment this afternoon? I am not.

I am prepared to make the commitment, to vote for whatever increases in the parcel post rates are required to keep our basic moral commitment to make this a paying proposition. I would do that. I would feel I am doing it by supporting this bill without section 3, and I support the Delaney amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

In the colloquy between the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Louisiana said he wished the gentleman from New York had been at all the hearings, and heard all the testimony, and if he was then he would not take this position. I was at the hearings—as many as the gentleman from Louisiana—and I heard all the testimony, and I believe in the position of the gentleman from New York. So I do not think that is a very good argument.

But I want to say this: I would say to the big-city Congressmen, and the medium-size city Congressmen, that they certainly ought to support the Delaney amendment, because if it is not adopted there will be a loss of jobs in your cities and to our constituents.

Those in the rural communities may have some concern, but I do not believe their concern is justified. Parcel post was set up in the old days when a farmer did not get into town more than once every 3 or 4 or 5 weeks, so he ordered by catalog. Now the farmer gets into

town almost every day, or certainly every other day.

If we allow this bill to pass as is, it would be more convenient for the farmer to order by catalog. Some rural person in Nebraska might order from a big firm in New York or Chicago or some other place. This would be very harmful to the small businessman in the rural communities in Nebraska.

We have talked about rural communities and how we want them to survive.

If the Delaney amendment is not adopted, these small businessmen in all of these towns throughout the country will continue to suffer, and they will not prosper. I say, therefore, to the rural people, when the small businessmen hear that through the passage of such legislation as this they are going to lose business and they will not be happy.

I urge the Members to support the Delaney amendment.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I say to my friend from Nebraska, as a small businessman myself in a rural community, of some 3,500, I have found one facet of this problem quite interesting.

My newspaper, for example, has ordered parts from various places. The other day I was asked to pick them up. They would not deliver to our town. We have to drive 20 miles to get parts, and they come by REA express.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Who are "they?"

Mr. ASHBROOK. I wonder how this would hurt the businessmen in a small town, many of whom drive 20 or 30 miles, for things that come by REA express. It would seem the other way around, that this would help the people in the small towns.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I say to my dear friend I live here a good deal of the time and I have to drive 15 miles to buy a suit, to a shopping center. With modern transportation it is no hardship, and if the gentleman from Ohio was concerned he would see to it that a small businessman had an opportunity to set up a business in his town and the citizens would not have to drive 20 miles to get parts but could get them in the hometown. Your argument bears no weight whatsoever.

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

I could not resist the opportunity to make one or two comments, to agree with the amendment as has been proposed by the gentleman from New York, and to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for his very persuasive argument in behalf of that amendment.

Mr Chairman and my colleagues, I believe if this amendment is carried it will accomplish the objectives the Postmaster General wishes in part—and I believe the major part. That is, it would give increases in parcel post rates so that he might at least eliminate some of the deficit. Second, it would eliminate the possibility of losing one job from the REA and the other private parcel carriers directly resulting from passage of this legislation.

Of course, we have this revolutionary new proposal, whereby we are going to guarantee Government jobs to those who probably will lose their jobs as a result of decreased private business. As already pointed out, it is indeed a revolutionary proposal.

I am sure later on we will consider legislation such as the new safety regulations for automobiles, which might have an adverse effect on automobile production. There very well could be losses of jobs. Are we going to guarantee Government jobs to those who might be displaced?

Most important, if we carry through with this amendment, we are going to eliminate the possibility of any loss of jobs to private carriers, so there will be no necessity for the triggering of this Government guaranteed job provision.

I say in conclusion, frankly, some postal carriers have contacted me and urged my support of this legislation. In confidence I have talked with them about it. I said, "Seriously, you are not telling me, my friend, that you want to carry larger packages of 40 pounds when you are already overworked with the current volumes of parcel post packages and since you will receive no extra pay for the additional work."

They have confided to me to the effect that actually their support of this legislation is based upon instructions or requests from the Department rather than a desire on their part to carry the proposed 40-pound packages instead of the present 20-pound packages. In addition, passage of this amendment will eliminate any possibility of confusing our civil service system by having to introduce these employees with seniority from the private carriers into the civil service system. So it would appear to me that the passage of this amendment would accomplish the objects of the Post Office Department in producing additional revenue, would not impose additional work on postal employees, would protect the jobs of private carriers and would not have an adverse and disruptive effect on the civil service system.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct an impression that the last gentleman speaking gave. One is that the Postmaster General would almost approve this amendment. He is totally against this amendment. You might as well not have a bill today if you have this amendment passed, because this bill would lose more than 50 percent of the revenue and 50 percent of the value of what it is worth if this amendment passes. Not only that, I might add, when they talk about big cities, I think the big city Congressmen should vote against the amendment and for the bill because there are thousands and thousands of people in the big cities who have packages in the post office where they cannot ship a parcel over 20 pounds more than 150 miles. If they have this bill, they are not discriminated against any longer in all first-class post offices and can ship to any of the eight zones no matter how far away they are with a package not 20 pounds, as it is today, but 40 pounds.

There is another thing I would like to correct, which is, that, if you pass this bill and take the heart out of it and the REA lays off some men then we are obligated by the amendment we just passed to take them on. Since the law was passed in 1951 to protect them the Railway Express Agency has lost money, year in and year out and have laid off over 14,000 men. A few minutes ago I said 10,000, but counsel showed me the additional figures. It is over 14,000. And the REA did not try to put one of those 14,000 people in another job. They did not lift a finger to help the employees they laid off. It is certainly true that there is no guarantee that even REA will stay in business, if you do not have this bill, because they have steadily lost money year in and year out and you are trying to protect them with a law that does not work and has not worked, and you are trying to protect them at the expense of the taxpayers plus the fact that the people in the first-class post offices are discriminated against and cannot send a package weighing over 20 pounds more than 150 miles.

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

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The reason why they have lost business over the years, I will tell you frankly, is because they could not care less whether they gave you any service or not. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] pointed out, half of the towns in Ohio gets no service. You have to drive 15 or 20 miles or farther when you get a notice from them, if they bother to send you a notice, that there is a package waiting there for you. I can tell you my experience. I used to get packages from the South through REA, but I do not buy there any more because I cannot be bothered with the kind of service that they give. They talk about losing money. They could not care less whether they lose customers, and that is why they do so.

Mr. MORRISON. I think this amendment boils down to one thing. If you are against this bill, then vote for the amendment. If you are for this bill, then vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY].

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, as far as I know there will not be any other amendments offered, and I am really taking this time to explain what will be the motion to recommit. I regret that the amendment that was just offered by the gentleman from New York was rejected. It would have removed any necessity for a motion

to recommit. But a motion to recommit will be a bill that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and I have introduced which does the following:

First. It establishes a nine-member bipartisan temporary Commission on Parcel Post. The Commission will conduct a thorough and complete study on all phases of the parcel post system and report to Congress, through the President, no later than March 1, 1968. The report shall include specific recommendations for a declaration of congressional policy along with recommended legislation. Specific areas of study shall include:

(a) A review of the postal policy of the Congress, as set forth in the Postal Policy Act as applied to the distribution of articles of commerce and industry by the parcel post system.

(b) The extent, if any, to which the parcel post system is a necessary part of the postal service.

(c) A review to determine the areas, if any, served exclusively by the parcel post system and the reasons therefor.

(d) The effect of past changes, and the projected effect of proposed changes, in the size and weight limitations on, and the rates for, parcel post on the distribution of parcels by private parcel carriers and on the national transportation system.

(e) The advisability of expanding, restricting, or eliminating the parcel post system in the interest of expanding, restricting, or eliminating the competition of the parcel post system with private parcel carriers.

(f) The extent, if any, to which the cost of public services should be allocated to the cost of the parcel post system.

(g) Those factors which should be considered in establishing the rates for parcel post and the relative importance of each such factor.

(h) The appropriate authority for fixing rates, sizes, and weights of parcel post, whether by administrative action or by law.

Second. Incorporates administration proposal for increases in rates on zone-rated parcels of 8 cents per piece. Also incorporates administration proposal for increases in rates on zone-rated catalogs of 12 percent.

Third. Proposes no change in size and weight limitations of parcel post.

Fourth. Suspends the authority of the Postmaster General to revise rates of fourth-class mail until June 30, 1969, or until Congress acts.

Fifth. Extends for an additional 3 years until June 30, 1969, the moratorium on the "break-even law." Under this statute the Postmaster General is prohibited from using any funds appropriated for postal operations unless he certifies that he has taken action to bring parcel post costs and revenues within 4 percent of a break-even basis.

Sixth. Incorporates the administration proposal to authorize the use of sectional centers as basing points for the determination of parcel post zone distances.

Mr. Chairman, in other words, this motion to recommit will give the Postmaster General everything he has asked for in this bill, except it will not provide at this moment for the size and weight increase.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very practical motion of recommittal and it is deserving of the support of the Members of the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it would be a fine conclusion to the stimulating debate which we have had on this legislation to have the motion to recommit adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the gentleman in his statement with reference to his recommittal motion is attempting to write an entirely new bill in a recommittal motion and to appoint a committee to make a study and to do this and to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman defined it clearly: "If you are for this bill, you will vote against the motion to recommit," because I do not think it is possible for a single person in this House to know what he means in his recommittal motion.

Mr. Chairman, we have taken up similar matters in our committee time and time again and voted them down. I feel that we should certainly vote against this recommittal motion and vote for this bill on final passage.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14904) to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 875, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called employee protection amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put the question on the other amendments en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment upon which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 20, insert "(a)" immediately following "SEC. 3."; and

On page 9, immediately following line 20, insert the following:

"(b) Each person—

"(1) who, on the date of enactment of this Act, is in the employment of a private carrier engaged in the transportation and delivery of parcels other than United States mail,

"(2) who, within two years after the effective date of this subsection, is involuntarily separated from such employment by reason of a reduction in the activities of such carrier which is, in the determination of the United States Civil Service Commission made on the basis of evidence satisfactory to the commission, directly or indirectly attributable to the operation of the provisions of this Act,

shall be entitled, upon his application filed with the Commission at any time after notice is given by such carrier to such person of his prospective or actual involuntary separation but not later than one year after the date of such involuntary separation, to the benefits of the following provisions:

"(A) If the Commission finds that such involuntary separation was directly or indirectly attributable to the operation of the provisions of this Act, the Commission shall notify the Postmaster General to that effect. Pursuant to such notification, the Postmaster General shall appoint such person, with competitive status, to a regular position in the competitive civil service in or under the Post Office Department.

"(B) Such appointment shall be to a position in a salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule, or in a grade of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, for which (i) the minimum per annum rate of basic compensation is less than his rate of compensation in effect immediately prior to his involuntary separation and (ii) the maximum per annum rate of basic compensation exceeds his rate of compensation in effect immediately prior to his involuntary separation.

"(C) Each employee so appointed shall be placed in the lowest step of the salary level or grade to which he is appointed for which the rate of basic compensation exceeds his rate of compensation in effect immediately prior to his involuntary separation.

"(D) In the determination of length of service for the purposes of leave, retirement, veterans' preference, group life and health insurance, severance pay, tenure, training, promotion, and status, all service performed by such person in the employment of such carrier shall be included and credited.

"(c) Subsection (b) of this section shall not be held or considered to reduce any retirement benefit or pension benefit to which any person within the purview of such subsection (b) is entitled under any other law.

"(d) A regular employee in the postal field service shall not be reduced to substitute status by reason of the operation of subsection (b) of this section.

"(e) For the purposes of subsections (b) and (c) of this section, the term 'person' means an 'employee' as defined in section 1 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U.S.C. 151), or as defined in section 2 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. 152)."

Mr. MORRISON (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DERWINSKI moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 14904, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with instructions to report the bill forthwith with the following amendments, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE I—PARCEL POST REVISION

"Increase in postage rates for fourth-class parcels and catalogs; postage rates on other matter

"SEC. 101. (a) Chapter 67 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections.

"§ 4556. Postage rates on parcel post

"The rates of postage on fourth-class parcel post are based on the zones described in section 4553 of this title in accordance with the following table:

"'CENTS PER PARCEL

"'Weight 1 pound and not exceeding (pounds)	Zones							
	Local	1 and 2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2	35	50	50	55	60	65	75	80
3	40	55	55	65	70	80	90	100
4	40	60	65	70	85	95	110	120
5	45	65	70	80	95	110	125	140
6	45	70	75	90	105	125	140	160
7	45	75	85	95	115	135	160	180
8	50	80	90	105	125	150	175	200
9	50	85	95	110	135	160	190	220
10	55	90	100	120	145	175	205	240
11	55	95	110	125	155	185	220	255
12	55	100	115	135	165	200	235	275
13	60	105	120	140	175	210	250	290
14	60	110	125	150	185	220	270	310
15	65	115	130	155	195	235	285	325
16	65	120	140	165	205	245	300	345
17	65	125	145	170	215	255	315	360
18	70	130	150	180	230	270	330	380
19	70	135	155	185	240	280	345	395
20	75	140	160	195	250	295	360	415
21	75	145	165	200	255	305	275	430
22	75	150	170	205	265	315	385	450
23	80	150	175	215	275	325	400	465
24	80	155	180	220	280	335	415	480
25	85	160	185	225	290	350	430	500
26	85	165	190	235	300	360	445	515
27	85	170	195	240	305	370	455	535
28	90	170	200	245	315	380	470	550
29	90	175	205	250	325	390	485	565
30	90	180	210	260	335	405	500	585
31	95	185	215	265	340	415	515	600
32	95	185	220	270	350	425	525	620
33	100	190	225	280	360	435	540	635
34	100	195	230	285	365	445	555	650
35	100	200	235	290	375	460	570	670
36	105	205	240	295	385	470	585	685
37	105	205	240	305	290	480	595	705
38	110	210	245	310	400	490	610	720
39	110	215	250	315	410	500	625	735
40	110	220	255	320	420	515	640	755
41	115	220	260	330	425	525	655	770
42	115	225	265	335	435	535	665	785
43	115	230	270	340	445	545	680	800
44	120	235	275	350	450	555	695	820
45	120	240	280	355	460	570	710	835
46	125	240	285	360	470	580	725	850
47	125	245	290	365	475	590	735	865
48	125	250	295	375	485	600	750	880
49	130	255	300	380	495	610	765	900
50	130	255	305	385	505	625	780	915
51	130	260	310	390	510	635	800	930
52	135	265	315	400	520	645	805	945
53	135	265	320	405	525	655	820	960
54	140	270	320	410	535	670	830	980
55	140	275	325	415	545	680	845	995
56	140	275	330	420	550	690	855	1,010
57	145	280	335	430	560	700	870	1,025
58	145	285	340	435	565	710	885	1,040
59	150	285	345	440	575	720	895	1,060
60	150	290	350	445	585	735	910	1,075
61	150	295	355	450	590	745	920	1,090
62	155	295	360	460	600	755	935	1,105
63	155	300	365	465	605	765	950	1,120
64	155	300	370	470	615	775	960	1,140
65	160	305	375	475	625	790	975	1,155
66	160	310	380	480	630	800	985	1,170
67	165	310	385	490	640	810	1,000	1,185
68	165	315	390	495	645	820	1,015	1,200
69	165	320	395	500	655	830	1,025	1,220
70	170	320	395	505	665	845	1,040	1,235

"'§ 4557. Postage rates on catalogs

"'(a) The rates of postage on fourth-class catalogs, having twenty-four or more pages at least twenty-two of which are printed and weighing sixteen ounces or more but not exceeding ten pounds, are based on the zones described in section 4553 of this title in accordance with the following table:

"CATALOGS

"Weight (pounds)	Zones							
	Local	1 and 2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
1.5	23	29	30	31	33	35	38	41
2	24	30	32	33	36	39	42	46
2.5	25	32	33	36	39	42	46	51
3	26	33	35	38	42	46	51	57
3.5	27	35	37	40	44	49	55	62
4	28	36	29	42	47	53	59	67
4.5	29	38	41	45	50	56	64	72
5	30	39	42	46	53	60	68	77
6	32	42	46	51	59	67	77	88
7	34	45	50	56	64	74	85	98
8	36	48	53	60	70	81	94	109
9	38	51	57	65	76	88	104	119
10	39	54	60	69	81	95	112	129

"'(b) The rates of postage on catalogs conforming to subsection (a) of this section, when mailed in quantities of not less than three hundred individually addressed pieces at one time and when prepared and mailed in accordance with conditions established by the Postmaster General, consist of a piece rate in addition to a bulk rate per pound, based on the zones described in section 4553 of this title, in accordance with the following table:

"Zone	Piece rate	Bulk pound rate
	Cents	*Cents*
Local	17	1.9
1 and 2	21	3.0
3	21	3.6
4	21	4.6
5	21	5.7
6	21	7.1
7	21	8.7
8	22	10.4

"'§ 4558. Postage rates on other matter

"'(a) Parcels weighing less than ten pounds and measuring more than eighty-four inches but not more than one hundred inches in length and girth combined are subject to a minimum postage rate equal to the postage rate for a ten-pound parcel for the zone to which the parcel is addressed.

"'(b) The postage rate on gold mailed within Alaska or from Alaska to other States, territories, and possessions of the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is 2 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof regardless of zones.'.

"(b) The table of contents of chapter 67 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'4556. Postage rates on parcel post.

"'4557. Postage rates on catalogs.

"'4558. Postage rates on other matter.'.

"Use of sectional center units of area in postal zone rate determination

"SEC. 102. (a) Section 4553 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(c) The Postmaster General shall use units of area containing postal sectional center facilities as the basis of a postal zone as described in subsection (b) of this section. The zone shall be measured from the center of the unit of area containing the dispatching sectional center facility. A post office of mailing and a post office of delivery shall have the same zone relationship as their respective sectional center facilities, but

this sentence shall not cause two post offices to be regarded as within the same local zone.

"'(d) In addition to the eight zones described in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, there is a local zone as defined by the Postmaster General from time to time.'

"(b) Section 4303(d)(1) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'established for fourth class mail' and inserting in lieu thereof 'described in section 4553 of this title'.

"(c) Section 4359(e)(3) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'established for fourth-class mail' and inserting in lieu thereof 'described in section 4553 of this title'.

"Additional three-year suspension of certain restrictions on use of postal appropriations

"SEC. 103. The Act entitled 'An Act to provide a three-year suspension of certain restrictions in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, on the withdrawal from the Treasury of postal appropriations', approved June 29, 1963 (77 Stat. 71; Public Law 88–51), is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'at the close of June 30, 1969'.

"Three-year suspension of authority of postmaster general to reform conditions of mailability of fourth-class mail

"SEC. 104. The last paragraph of section 207 (b) of the Act of February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1067), as amended by section 7 of the Act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 942), shall not be in effect during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending at the close of June 30, 1969.

"Effective dates

"SEC. 105. This title shall become effective as follows:

"(1) This section and section 104 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

"(2) Sections 101 and 102 shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins not earlier than the ninetieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

"(3) Section 103 shall become effective as of July 1, 1966.

"TITLE II—TEMPORARY COMMISSION ON PARCEL POST

"Establishment and membership of commission

"SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established a temporary commission, to be known as the 'Commission on Parcel Post', herein referred to as the 'Commission'.

"(b) The Commission shall consist of nine members, as follows:

"(1) five members appointed by the President of the United States, not more than three of whom shall be of the same political party;

"(2) two members appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall not be of the same political party; and

"(3) two members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall not be of the same political party.

"(c) The President shall appoint a Chairman and a Vice Chairman of the Commission from among the members of the Commission.

"(d) A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

"(e) No civilian or military officer or employee of the Government of the United States, appointive or elective (except a retired officer or employee), shall be eligible for appointment to the Commission.

"(f) Members of the Commission each shall be entitled to receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of the powers and duties of the Commission, including travel time, and may receive 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.

"Powers and duties

"SEC. 202. (a) The Commission is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough and complete study of the parcel post system of the United States mails. Such study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following matters:

"(1) A review of the postal policy of the Congress, as set forth in chapter 27 of title 39, United States Code, as applied to the distribution of articles of commerce and industry by the parcel post system.

"(2) The extent, if any, to which the parcel post system is a necessary part of the postal service.

"(3) A review to determine the areas, if any, served exclusively by the parcel post system and the reasons therefor.

"(4) The effect of past changes, and the projected effect of proposed changes, in the size and weight limitations on, and the rates for, parcel post on the distribution of parcels by private parcel carriers and on the national transportation system.

"(5) The advisability of expanding, restricting, or eliminating the parcel post system in the interest of expanding, restricting, or eliminating the competition of the parcel post system with private parcel carriers.

"(6) The effect, if any, to which the cost of public services identified in section 2303, title 39, United States Code, should be allocated to the cost of the parcel post system.

"(7) Those factors which should be considered in establishing the rates for parcel post and the relative importance of each such factor.

"(8) The appropriate authority for fixing rates, sizes, and weights of parcel post, whether by administrative action or by law.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission or any member of the Commission designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member.

"Cooperation with Commission by executive agencies

"SEC. 203. (a) The Commission is authorized to request any department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the Government to furnish suggestions and information to the Commission in carrying out the functions of the Commission under this title. The head of each such department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such suggestions and information to the Commission upon request of the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

"(b) Upon request of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission, the head of each department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the Government is authorized to detail any officers and employees under his jurisdiction for service with the Commission without reimbursement therefor.

"(c) Upon request of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission, the head of each department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the Government shall otherwise cooperate with the Commission in the performance of the functions of the Commission and shall provide the Commission with such additional assistance as may be available.

"Staff of Commission

"SEC. 204. (a) The Commission shall appoint an executive secretary without regard to the civil service laws, prescribe his duties, and fix his compensation at a rate not to exceed the maximum rate payable under the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1113(b)).

"(b) The Commission is authorized to appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, and fix the compensation of, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, such personnel as it deems advisable to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(c) The Commission may procure, in accordance with section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), the temporary or intermittent services of experts and consultants. Individuals so employed shall be paid compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Commission but not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and, while away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistance, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Report and termination of Commission

"SEC. 205. (a) The Commission shall submit to the President, not later than March 1, 1968, for transmittal to the Congress on such date, a report of the activities of the Commission under this title together with its recommendations, including specific recommendations for a declaration of congressional policy on parcel post and for legislation together with a draft of such recommended legislation.

"(b) From and after the submission of its report under subsection (a) of this section, the Commission shall conduct supplementary studies of the parcel post system and shall submit, not later than March 1, 1969, a supplementary report and recommendations to the President, for transmittal to the Congress on such date.

"(c) The Commission shall cease to exist at the close of June 30, 1969."

And amend the title so as to read as follows: "To revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, to suspend for an additional three-year period certain restrictions on the use of postal appropriations, to create a temporary Commission on Parcel Post to study parcel post problems, and for other purposes."

Mr. DERWINSKI (during the reading of the motion to recommit). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the motion to recommit be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Thirty-four Members having arisen, not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Twenty-eight Members having arisen, not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

SEATTLE-TACOMA AIRPORT FACILITIES FOR TODAY'S TRAVELING SERVICEMAN

Mr. ADAMS. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to report that efforts are being made at the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport to handle the problems caused by the increased number of U.S. servicemen traveling to the Orient.

The Federal Government recently approved a grant to the Travelers Aid Society to assist in the relocation of new workers moving to the area, and we hope this will strengthen our local Travelers Aid Society group so that they may devote more of their resources to assisting the servicemen in their travels to the Orient.

I am including copies of two recent articles on this matter from the Seattle Times and Seattle Post-Intelligencer pointing out some of the problems of our servicemen and the attempts being made to find solutions:

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer, June 16, 1966]

PORT TO EASE GI WAIT AT SEA-TAC

(By Don Page)

The Seattle Port Commission Tuesday authorized emergency facilities for thousands of servicemen and military dependents flooding through Seattle-Tacoma International Airport.

The Port is cooperating with the military and United Good Neighbors' agencies to serve mushrooming demands at the airport. Airport Manager Don Shay estimates unclassified military travel through the airport now at 12,000 men a month.

Army authorities have warned that by summer's end that one service alone may account for 12,000 to 14,000 servicemen and 4,000 to 6,000 military dependents a month.

In Tuesday's action the Port Commission approved an estimated $60,000 in improvements to remodel second floor space in the airport Administration Bldg. into separate lounges for servicemen and dependents and to set up a service counter for military personnel on the main floor.

The Travelers Aid Society has submitted a plan to the UGN for manning of the lounges on the 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week basis requested by the military.

Services will include such comforts as coffee and cookies, cards, television, reading materials and lounges where the travelers may relax during layovers that may range from a few hours to as much as a day.

Mrs. Virginia Cowling, executive director of the Travelers Aid Society, estimates cost to the UGN of $2,000 a month, not counting volunteer help.

The Pierce County UGN will share in support of the service, and military installations of the Army, Navy and Air Force have been asked to contribute.

The military buildup here stems from movement of servicemen and dependents on rotation or reassignment between here and posts in Okinawa. Most direct Viet Nam travel funnels through San Francisco. The travelers arrive by charter flights or scheduled airlines.

Their layovers here may range from a few hours to as much as a day.

Many are traveling at reduced military fares, space available, and bumping may extend their time here.

Also many are inexperienced at arranging their own transportation. Some need funds. They crowd the Western Union office at the airport, wiring messages home.

In Tuesday's action the Port made 1,800 square feet available for the servicemen's and dependents' lounges.

Dependents' lounge will be located in an old kitchen area at the north end of the second floor. Servicemen's lounge will be at the south end. The Port will install it adjoining a Travel Cinema. Approved by the commission earlier this is a movie sponsored by travel organizations, that should provide additional free entertainment for servicemen and dependents in transit.

The port will furnish the lounges partly with comfortable green leather lounges and chairs that were used in a main airport lounge before that was redecorated.

The Port will build a military service counter to be staffed 24 hours a day by Army personnel to assist with travel orders, ticketing, ground transportation and information.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, June 15, 1966]

SERVICEMEN TO GET LOUNGE AT AIRPORT

A $60,000 expenditure to improve facilities for servicemen and their dependents at Seattle-Tacoma International Airport was approved yesterday by the Seattle Port Commission.

The Commission authorized remodeling of second floor space in the Airport Administration Building into lounges for servicemen and dependents and installation of a service counter for service personnel on the main floor.

Port officials estimated, unclassified military travel through the airport now at about 12,000 men a month.

By the end of the summer, totals from one service alone are expected to run between 12,000 and 14,000 servicemen and 4,000 and 6,000 dependents.

Additions and alterations to Concourse B at Seattle-Tacoma International Airport were authorized by the Port of Seattle Commission yesterday.

The work is expected to cost more than $1.3 million.

Young, Richardson & Carleton, architect, was retained to draw the plans.

In order to obtain space for an air-cargo facility, the commission authorized the sale of homes and business buildings on property which it owns near the airport.

The property is between 24th Avenue South and 26th Avenue South, from South 160th Street to South 170th Street.

The area includes 28 homes, which are rented.

Condemnation of property which the Port is acquiring west of the airport was authorized.

The land, including 186 parcels, is being obtained so a new runway can be built west of the main north-south runway.

More than 12,000 servicemen and dependents go through the airport each month, the commission was told.

To help accommodate them, the commission approved the establishment of a lounge for military personnel and to lease space to the Army for a counter to aid the travelers.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON'S TRIBUTE TO THE FAIRPORT BAPTIST HOME

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, June 19, I had the pleasure of attending the dedication of a new wing of the Fairport Baptist Home in Fairport, N.Y. After having viewed the outstanding care being given to the residents of the home, I know that my colleagues will also welcome the opportunity to learn of work being done there.

Under the able administration of Director Ernest G. Mount, the home has been able to provide services and personal care to hundreds of our senior citizens. As a home for senior American Baptists, the Fairport Baptist Home provides an ideal environment in which the residents can enjoy and profit from their elder years. Today, the home continues to serve New York State citizens, especially those from the western portions of the State, in the same outstanding fashion as it has done over the years.

In an age of increased concern for our senior citizens, the Fairport Baptist Home offers an example of dedication to the service of others which can be an inspiration for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues will be interested in learning more about the Fairport Baptist Home. Therefore, with your permission, I should like to have included in the RECORD a fact-sheet which has been prepared by the home. I commend this statement to my colleagues because it offers an excellent indication of the many worthy services and activities being undertaken at the Fairport Baptist Home:

INFORMATION ABOUT THE FAIRPORT BAPTIST HOME

The Home, a residence for senior American Baptists, has recently expanded its facilities to serve an increased number of people. The addition includes large, comfortable rooms; a new dining room; a fully equipped modern infirmary; and many other specialized areas designed to meet the needs of older people.

The Home is located on a beautiful 22 acre campus about ten miles southeast of Rochester on the northern edge of suburban Fairport. Public transportation is readily available with Empire State Trailway buses stopping at its front steps. It is only 37 minutes to downtown Rochester by bus; less than 25 minutes by automobile.

Each resident has a private room (except certain infirmary areas) and provides his own furnishings, other than the bed. Familiar objects are a real help in making the adjustment to the new way of life.

ITS ADMISSION POLICY

The Admissions Committee evaluates the applicant's circumstances to see whether the Home can be of service to them. The admission policy requires the applicant be 65 years of age or over, an American Baptist, and able to pay the present monthly charges which vary according to the level of care required by the resident and the type of room desired. Current charges are divided into the three following categories: Level (1) $215 a month/resident and $240 a month/resident (private bathroom), and $460 a month/couple (private bathroom); Level (2) $245 a month/resident (intermediate care); Level (3) $305 a month/resident (infirmary care). The charges include all of the major services offered by the Home. Fees for the services of medical specaillists and dentists are in addition to the monthly charges as are costs of hospitalization, laboratory work, glasses and hearing aids, clothing, personal needs, beautician services, etc.

The Home accepts residents to all levels of care as vacancies permit.

ITS AREA OF SERVICE

Through the years, the Home has served Baptists throughout New York State. Generally, its service area is west of a line drawn from the northern section of the State, passing between Utica and Syracuse, to the Pennsylvania border.

AND ITS PROGRAM

The Home provides a place to live with all the necessary services which give security to the persons becoming residents. In addition to providing housing, food (including special diets), and basic laundry (washer and drier available for personal use), the Home provides general medical and nursing care: podiatry; rehabilitative, social, recreational, occupational, and entertainment services.

The Medical and Nursing staff is available day and night. Medical specialists are available as needed to supplement the Home's staff. Residents requiring special care are either cared for in the Home infirmary or transferred to a Rochester hospital. However, the need for transfer is rare.

Every Sunday afternoon in the Home's Chapel, religious services are conducted by Baptist ministers from the area. Transportation to local Baptist churches is also provided. A Bible class is held each Monday morning and a Chapel Service each Wednesday morning.

Fairport Baptist Home.

FAIRPORT, N.Y., *May, 1966.*

ARE CUBAN SHIPS PASSING THROUGH PANAMA CANAL BEARING MATERIALS OF WAR FOR NORTH VIETNAM?

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD at this point an article written by Mr. Henry J. Taylor for the Los Angeles Times on June 17, 1966.

I have initiated an inquiry with the Defense Department on the allegation that Cuban ships are passing through the Panama Canal bearing materials of war for North Vietnam.

The article follows:

VIETNAM TRADE

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Without exception, Fidel Castro's vessels sailing from Cuba to North Vietnam pass through the Panama Canal. They are sometimes fully, and always partly, loaded with enemy materials for the war. Yet our American authorities usher them through. Why?

As long ago as last January, Capt. Francisco Daltabuit, commanding Castro's Rio Jabacoa, and later Capt. Ceaser Loredo of Camilo Cienfuegos, both of whom left their ships and sought political asylum in Barcelona, Spain, reported all the facts officially to Washington.

They revealed the routines followed in passing through our Panama Canal; voyage times to North Vietnam; payment procedures in Japan; the names of Japanese suppliers in Yokohama, Osaka, etc.; all details of the loading frequencies and the cargoes in Red China and the delivery at Haiphong and Hanoi.

Meanwhile, we support the British in blockading Rhodesia and say in the same breath that we cannot stop even our allies, to say nothing of iron curtain ships, going to Red Cuba or Haiphong.

Defense Secretary McNamara keeps two sets of books on this trade. So long as he so constantly denies everything, I would like to hear him deny this.

Again and again McNamara . . . has given the Senate Armed Services Committee his figures, by months, on free world vessels entering Cuba and North Vietnam. He likewise gives these to the press.

An individual senator on the committee recently discovered that each month, after supplying them, they had been subsequently revised upward inside McNamara's office without McNamara revealing his second set of figures to the committee.

You are reading here the first published statement about two sets of books Mr. McNamara privately employs, admitted to the senator—when challenged—by Mr. McNamara's own executive colonel in charge of them.

In short, to put a better face on the conduct of the Vietnam war, the Senate Armed Services Committee and the American people alike are being steadily misled in this vital subject. And now you can add to it the hush-hush facts about the Panama Canal.

RUIN FOR THE SOUTHWEST?—AN ANSWER TO THE READER'S DIGEST

Mr. UDALL. 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have informed me of mail they have received of late generated by an article appearing in the Reader's Digest. That article, entitled "Ruin for the Grand Canyon?" purported to prove that legislation now pending in this Congress would "desecrate" one of this Nation's "most spectacular national sanctuaries."

Mr. Speaker, this article not only contained many serious errors but it painted a picture of devastation and ruin wholly unsupported by the facts. If what the Digest alleges were true, I certainly would not be working for passage of the Colorado River Basin project. Neither would the 36 other Members who have introduced this legislation.

Because this project is so important to my State and to the six other States of the Colorado River Basin I believe it is important that my colleagues have a responsive reply to the charges made by the Reader's Digest. I have prepared such a reply and it is contained in this address which I am making today.

Forty years ago the Boulder Canyon Project Act was opposed bitterly by the citizens of my State. A few years later when work was about to begin on Parker Dam, we actually assembled a kind of Arizona navy to sail the Colorado River and block the work. In spite of our efforts Hoover and Parker Dams were built, and because they were, southern California has been able to meet the water needs of an enormously expanded population.

But California has nearly 20 million residents today, and its share of the Colorado River—especially since its defeat to Arizona 3 years ago in a celebrated water case before the U.S. Supreme Court—would not continue to meet the needs of its population. New water sources must be found. The Colorado, which has been depleted by a treaty with Mexico and a decline in precipitation, must be made whole. Clearly, another Boulder Canyon-type project is needed. An evidence of the changes that adversity can shape is the common effort now being made by California and Arizona to enact such a project. We call it the Colorado River Basin project, so named because it will help solve the water problems of these two States plus Utah, Nevada, New Mexico, Colorado, and Wyoming.

Just as my State was wrong 40 years ago in opposing Hoover Dam, so I believe the Reader's Digest and many so-called conservationists are wrong today in opposing this regional water project. I think time will show that they were wrong, and I am not talking about 40 years from now. I think the case will be made in 10.

In its April 1966 issue the Readers Digest became a part of the campaign to defeat this project. In an article by Richard C. Bradley entitled "Ruin for the Grand Canyon?"—an article planted originally in the Audubon magazine—the Digest made a sweeping attack on the project, putting considerably more emphasis upon emotion than fact. I might say that this is not the first article of that description I have found in that magazine.

Later the Digest invited a large party of eastern press people and a few Congressmen to a seminar at the south rim of the Grand Canyon. I was among those invited to participate, but when I got there I was told that only opponents of the project would be allowed to speak. Not until I threatened to hold a press conference on the spot did the Digest decide that I might be permitted to present our side of the case to the seminar.

I consider this operation indicative of the kind of balanced, reasonable, fair, and objective evaluation the Digest set out to make of our project.

The article itself meets several tests Arthur Brisbane might have applied in the old days of Sunday-supplement journalism:

First. Suggest dark, mysterious dealings—things being hidden from the public.

Second. Create a villain—someone your readers can hate.

Third. Paint a picture of enormous proportions—great and shocking crimes being committed, wreaking "destruction" and "ruin."

Fourth. Steer clear of any facts that do not fit this picture.

Fifth. In selecting illustrations to go with your article choose those with reader appeal, whether or not they tell a true story.

The Digest article meets these tests in a number of ways. For example:

First. It says that plans for Hualapai Dam and Marble Canyon Dam—projects costing $750 million and widely discussed for years—are "hidden in the central Arizona project, which, in turn, is only a small part of the multibillion-dollar Pacific southwest water plan."

Second. It makes a villain of the Bureau of Reclamation, the agency which has made the United States world leader in hydroelectric power capacity. It says the Bureau has plans to "still the music" of the Colorado River as it courses through Grand Canyon. And to accomplish its evil ends the Bureau "has become more and more adept" at justifying projects lacking "economic feasibility."

Third. The picture the article paints is certainly one of large dimensions. The "huge power dams" would "destroy the river ecology of the area; plants, birds, wildlife would disappear." The "major part of the big-horn sheep habitat" would be "wiped out." All of this would be a "desecration of one of our most spectacular national sanctuaries." And, of course, the title itself poses a question of rather large proportions when it asks whether we are going to "ruin" the Grand Canyon.

Fourth. It steers clear of giving us more than a slap-dash smattering of information about power generation, thereby supporting by omission its thesis that "economic feasibility through hydropower may have been sensible 30 years ago, but not today."

Fifth. Illustrating the article are three pictures, two of which would not be affected in the slightest by the proposed dams or their reservoirs. The third shows a deep, narrow gorge about 10 miles below Grand Canyon National Park; while the implication is that the scene would be flooded, the increased water level would be almost imperceptible from this vantage point.

Thus, we see that the Digest article meets well what we might call the Arthur Brisbane test for reader interest. Unfortunately, this kind of approach weakens materially the case conservationists want to make against this project.

Let me say that I do not oppose the cause of conservation or the work of the conservation organizations we have in this country. Many of these groups and their leaders have been allies of mine in past battles, and we will be allies again, I am certain. What separates us in this instance is not a difference in dedication to conservation but a difference in the extent to which we would go in limiting the development of our natural resources for the use of our expanding population.

I do not favor cutting every tree, mining every ounce of coal, or harnessing every drop of falling water in order to meet the needs of our population growth. I think economies must be made, new and more efficient methods found to feed, clothe, and house our people. And I think with wisdom and foresight we can hold back from the maw of "progress" at least some of our natural environment for the enjoyment of ourselves and future generations. For this reason I fought long and hard for the Wilderness Act, and I might say that all, or nearly all, of the sponsors of the Colorado River Basin project did so too. And we will continue to work for the cause of conservation.

But being for conservation does not mean that one can put his head in the sand and ignore the real problems that face us in the use of our natural resources. Development must occur, and what the true conservationist ought to be doing today is striving, not to block development, but to insure that development interferes as little as possible with the world of nature around us. I believe that philosophy has prevailed in the drafting of the Colorado River Basin project.

In its attack on this project the Digest fabricates a whole that is vastly more than the sum of its parts, and many of the parts are defective.

First, let us consider that phrase, "still the music." The Digest says the dams would have this drastic effect on the waters of the Colorado River. The statement, however colorful and dramatic, is false. It implies that nowhere will the river rush freely through the canyon, as it does now. The contention is that construction of Marble Canyon Dam 12.5 miles upstream of Grand Canyon National Park will cause the river flow to be regulated, thereby stifling its natural "song." The trouble with this argument is that Glen Canyon Dam already exists upstream, and it regulates the flow of the river just as much, or as little, as would Marble Canyon Dam a few miles downstream from it.

Also, the Digest neglects to tell us that from Marble Canyon Dam to the point where the first inch of increased river elevation would occur behind Hualapai Dam there would be 104 miles of free-flowing river—through all of the interior of Grand Canyon National Park. Not until the Colorado reaches the west boundary of the park would there be any change, and that would be merely a slight, gradual increase in depth amounting to only 90 feet at the park boundary.

The vastness of Grand Canyon National Park is totally ignored by the Digest article. I doubt that many of its readers realize that the area left absolutely untouched by these two dams and their reservoirs is substantially greater than the entire State of Rhode Island. And except for this remote 13-mile stretch of river along its western boundary Grand Canyon National Park—the area nearly everyone thinks of as "the Grand Canyon"—would be unchanged in any way.

If these dams were built and a Digest reader went to the park today, he would have no way of observing that they even existed. He could stand on the south rim and look in all directions. He could take the famous mule trek down Bright Angel Trail and watch the waters of the Colorado flowing by. He could go on to the north rim and look in all directions. Nowhere would he see any change at all.

In fact, there is no road, trail or overlook anywhere in the park or out of it where he would be able to see either of the dams or reservoirs. There is one exception. He could take a long, bumpy, dusty and circuitous trip up north into Utah, then come down on the west side of the park and proceed to a point called Toroweap Overlook in Grand Canyon National Monument. To get there he would have to stop his car and open about a dozen gates. And once he was there what he would see would be a beautiful strip of blue water in a narrow canyon—essentially the same scene he would see if he made that trip today.

Thus, when the Digest talks about "stilling the music" of the canyon, a totally false picture is presented.

The Digest article makes much of the destruction of the river's ecology—that is, the interrelationship of plants and animals. Of course any reservoir will affect this relationship, but when the Digest goes on to say that the "major part of the bighorn-sheep habitat in Grand Canyon would be wiped out," it is misleading its readers. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of the Interior says that if bighorn sheep exist in Marble Canyon, the population would be "very limited." And while there are known populations in the vicinity of what would be the Hualapai Dam reservoir, their numbers are little known because of inaccessibility. In any case, officials of the Bureau say that bighorns have no particular affinity to river bottoms except for watering purposes.

The crushing answer to the Digest's argument, however, is to be found in the record already made at Lake Powell above Glen Canyon Dam and Lake Havasu above Parker Dam. Wildlife officials tell us that in the years since impoundment of these waters the bighorn population—far from being "wiped out"—has actually increased. Apparently these animals are benefiting from the increased availability of water.

In Sunday-supplement journalism you always want to raise as many alarms as possible, whether they are valid or not. And this is what the Digest does when it suggests that with construction of Marble Canyon Dam we will "set the stage for the Kanab Diversion Project,

another proposal with gravest consequences for the park."

The Digest tells us that this old plan would divert 90 percent of the flow of the river from Marble Canyon reservoir through a tunnel to the north of the park and then drop it back into the canyon at Kanab Creek, thereby "squeezing out" additional kilowatts of electricity. But what the Digest doesn't tell us is that such a project would rob the turbines at Marble Canyon Dam of 90 percent of their generating capacity. The water cannot go both ways. Construction of a dam at Marble Canyon is the surest way to head off any revival of the Kanab Diversion idea. Once the dam is built this old issue can be put to bed for all time.

Reading the Digest in years past I have a distinct impression that this magazine's editors regard every word of the U.S. Constitution as sacred. No matter how any given word got into that document, no matter what pressures were brought to bear by what States to achieve that precise terminology favorable to them, once the word became part of the Constitution it was as though it had been brought down on stone tablets from Mount Sinai. That's the way the Digest looks at contract language it happens to like.

But how about the language contained in the Grand Canyon Act of 1919? That act, creating Grand Canyon National Park, contains language permitting utilization of areas in the park for a reservoir behind a dam to be built in Bridge Canyon. What is the Digest's opinion of that language? Why, it is a "legal loophole."

By the same principle any of the first 10 amendments to the U.S. Constitution could be called a legal loophole too. Perhaps even the first, covering freedom of the press.

Of course, this clause is no "legal loophole." It is a clause enacted along with the rest of the act by the Congress of the United States and signed by the President. It is just as legal and just as binding as any other part of the act. Without that language there might never have been the support to pass the Grand Canyon Act. It is there, and the Reader's Digest cannot dismiss it by calling it names.

The article also makes the statement that there is nothing in the proclamation establishing Grand Canyon National Monument in 1932 that would permit construction of this reclamation project. What the Digest does not tell us is that reclamation withdrawals for lands involved in the Bridge Canyon reservoir—Hualapai Dam—were made by act of Congress in 1920 and 1933, five powersite reserves and two waterpower designations were made during the period 1914–41, and the proclamation establishing the monument was made subject to all valid existing rights. Thus, it is not true that the monument proclamation made no provision for the dam at Bridge Canyon.

In a recent exchange the author of the Digest article has said that the Federal Power Commission Act of 1935 ruled out all reclamation or power projects from national parks and monuments. This also is in error. That act covered only projects proposed for FPC licensing and had no bearing on Federal reclamation, powersite, and waterpower rights.

Perhaps the most intriguing idea set forth by the Digest article is the thought that plans for Hualapai and Marble Canyon Dams could be hidden in some little old water bill. Remember, these two dams involve $750 million. Both of them have been under discussion for 50 years. One of them, the dam in Bridge Canyon, was approved in legislation passed by the U.S. Senate in 1950 and again in 1951. Both of them have been the subject of project applications before the Federal Power Commission, and a license to build a dam at Marble Canyon would have been issued 2 or 3 years ago if Congress had not passed a moratorium which expires on December 31 of this year.

In addition, I might point out that the dams have taken up a great deal of the public hearings held on this legislation, first in the Senate in April 1964, then in the House in August 1965, and finally in the House again in May 1966. In view of all this publicity I should like to know how the Digest ever got the idea that the dams were being hidden away from public view.

The Digest says the dams are part of a "multibillion-dollar Pacific southwest water plan." Not true. The legislation before Congress is the Colorado River Basin project, and its cost is $1.7 billion. If the Digest wants to include the $3.5 billion in revenues these dams will generate—after paying for themselves—I think this amount belongs in the credit column—not the debit.

Also, I was intrigued by the Digest's use of the adjective "senseless" in speaking of this method of paying for the delivery of water where it is needed. The dams, it says, "will serve no purpose that cannot be served at least as well in a variety of other ways." This "senseless" concept, of course, is the basic principle of reclamation which has guided the policies of this Nation since the days of Theodore Roosevelt.

As in all reclamation projects what is proposed is to use hydroelectric power to pump water to where it must go and then to use any surplus power to create revenues which will pay for aqueducts and other water works. To be sure, there might be a "variety of other ways" to derive such funds. One would be an outright gift from the taxpayers of the Nation, but I do not think this is a likely possibility. Another would be establishment of a chain of federally financed grocery stores; I am afraid a few Members of Congress might not go for this. Or another would be construction of one or more federally financed steam powerplants, perhaps using nuclear reactors for energy. But to suggest that people of these seven States must rewrite Federal reclamation policy—and win the acceptance of our public and private power companies producing the same kind of energy—is to saddle them with a burden they cannot carry. And for what purpose? Denying the use of these dam sites to the Colorado River Basin project will not stop the construction of dams in Bridge and Marble Canyons; it will merely insure their use by State, local, or private applicants.

It may be "senseless" to the Reader's Digest to use federally owned damsites to produce revenues for the delivery of water to the parched fields and cities of the Colorado River Basin, but this idea is neither new nor untested. The argument would apply with about equal force to all reclamation projects now in existence—Grand Coulee, Shasta and Trinity, Theodore Roosevelt and all the rest. And it is this principle that has made possible the growth and development of much of the West.

This brings us to the Digest's fascinating venture into the economics of hydroelectric versus steampower generation. Citing a few quick figures about the cost of producing power here and there, the article poses this dire prospect:

> If the bureau cannot market its power at a profit 30 years hence, it will be unable to pay for the dams or the rest of the central Arizona project. The Nation will have to pick up the tab.

The article tells us that this project is based on selling power from these dams at 6 mills per kilowatt hour, a figure the Digest says will be excessive. In truth, the Bureau of Reclamation proposes to sell the output of these dams for a price of $10 per year per kilowatt and 3 mills per kilowatt hour for energy. This is not 6 mills. Furthermore, it might interest the Digest to know that the State of California Department of Water Resources in its March 1966, report values its hydroelectric peaking power—which these dams will supply—at $17.90 per year per kilowatt and 3 mills per kilowatt hour for energy. And utilities in the area are anxious to make 40- and 50-year contracts for this power, offering substantially more for it than the Bureau's proposed price for Marble and Hualapai Dam power.

A measure of the market for this power—and the soundness of the Bureau's position—will be found in the unanimous support given this legislation by the public and private utilities of the country.

The prospect of hydroelectric dams being unable to market their power is made even more remote in the light of testimony recently from Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, who said that power demands in the years ahead will be so great that, even though we greatly expand our nuclear power capacity, the need for electric power from coal and hydroelectric sources also will be growing, not diminishing.

Leaving the subject of power generation for a moment, the Digest turns its guns on the central Arizona project, the initial water project to be financed by the seven-State basin fund. In fact, there is something interesting about the Digest's tendency to speak only of Arizona and the central Arizona project. It almost would appear that the editors look upon little Arizona, with its three votes in the House of Representatives, as a handy target. The truth, of course, is that this is a regional bill, the heart of which is a basin fund created by revenues from

those two dams. After the central Arizona project has been built and pumping of Arizona water paid for, there will be left in that basin fund about $3 billion to help solve the larger water problems of the seven basin States. The prospect is that these funds ultimately will be used to finance desalting plants, import aqueducts, or other works to supplement the depleted waters of the Colorado River system.

Benefiting from this project will be, not just the 1.7 million people of Arizona, but something like 30 million people in the seven basin States. Knock out Hualapai Dam, which the Digest seems to think is a good idea, and the capacity of that basin fund to help make the Colorado River "whole" will wither away. Knock out Marble Canyon Dam and the whole dream shatters. Yet the Digest says these dams "will serve no purpose."

Throughout its article the Digest plays a semantic game. The American people know what they mean by Grand Canyon—they mean the place they visit on vacation, the south rim and the north rim and all of that vast expanse of fantastic color and spectacle that is Grand Canyon National Park. But the Digest does not mean just that. When it speaks of "Grand Canyon," the Digest apparently means all of that stretch of the Colorado River beginning at Lees Ferry and extending down to Lake Mead. If all of that were in the national park, it would be the size of Rhode Island and Delaware. But this is not the "Grand Canyon," and saying it is will not make it so.

After all, it is a little difficult to say these dams would flood the Grand Canyon if you are speaking of the Grand Canyon everyone knows; the extent of that flooding would be a very slight increase in water elevation along one remote edge of the park. But if you can convince your readers that Grand Canyon includes vast areas upstream and downstream that have never been set aside for Federal protection, then your argument will seem convincing. And that is what the Digest has tried to do in this Sunday supplement attack on a sound and reasonable reclamation project.

Even a glance at this article, without reading it, could give a subscriber to the Digest a false impression. For example, the picture on the title page is labeled "Marble Canyon." I know that readers, seeing that picture, thought this was a scene that would be flooded by the reservoir behind Marble Canyon Dam. However, this is not true. The scene is downriver from Nankoweap Creek, several miles below the proposed dam. It would not be affected at all.

Next is a picture of the Colorado in Grand Canyon National Monument. The river appears here as a continuous body of water, almost exactly as it would appear as part of the Hualapai Dam Reservoir. The only difference would be an increase in water elevation almost imperceptible from this vantage point.

And finally the Digest prints a picture of Upper Deer Creek Falls. It is a beautiful scene but quite irrelevant to the story because it would not be altered whatsoever by either of the dams or reservoirs.

And there you have the parts put together by the Digest to constitute what it calls a "desecration of one of our most spectacular national sanctuaries." If the editors had made their case, I would be on the firing line with them. So would all the other 36 sponsors of this legislation. So would all the basin-State Congressmen and Senators who see this legislation as a great help to the water problems of the West. But they have not made their case, and we shall not be joining them in this never-never approach to the great problems of conservation and resource development.

What readers of the Digest should know is that the West cannot survive without additional water. Here is a sound plan to finance its development and, at the same time, repay the Treasury with interest. It is a plan that pays great respect to the Grand Canyon, that will protect it from the prospect of unwise encroachments in the future. And it is a plan that will open Grand Canyon National Monument to the public, really for the first time, because on the surface of the lake in its inner gorge visitors will be able to look up on sheer cliffs a half-mile and more high. In my judgment Hualapai Dam will make of Grand Canyon National Monument one of the greatest visitors' attractions in the West.

The question, then, is not "Ruin for the Grand Canyon?" As I read and reread this Digest piece, I get the impression that what the editors really have in mind is "ruin for the Southwest." And I don't like it.

AMENDMENT TO CONSOLIDATED FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1961

Mr. MATSUNAGA. 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 Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize loans by the Secretary of Agriculture on leasehold interests in Hawaii. Under existing law, real estate loans available under subtitle A of that act are restricted to farmers who are or will become "owner-operators," thus rendering ineligible farmers who hold less than a fee simple interest in the farmlands involved.

Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has land problems which are quite different from those found in the other States. First of all, there is an acute scarcity of available land, and fee simple land for agricultural use is almost nonexistent. Much of the available land is subject to restraints on alienation and therefore may be obtained for farm purposes only as leaseholds.

The land problems peculiar to Hawaii have virtually made it impossible for Hawaiian farmers to obtain needed financing to carry on their operations. My bill would tend to equalize the status of farmers in the island State with that of farmers in other States by permitting farm improvement loans to be made under subtitle A to "lessee-operators" in Hawaii.

In order to accomplish the purposes for which my bill has been introduced, provisions have been included which would authorize such loans to lessee-operators of farmlands in Hawaii where, first, such lands cannot be acquired in fee simple; second, adequate security is provided for the loan; and third, there is reasonable probability of accomplishing the objectives and repayment of the loan.

This legislation, if enacted in time, would benefit the operators of a large number of family farms which have disappeared as the result of the growing urbanization of the island of Oahu, the principal island of the Hawaiian group. A very desirable farm tract at the easterly fringes of the city of Honolulu has been offered as leaseholds to this group by a private development corporation. The farmers reportedly have been granted a final extension date of September 30, 1966, to come up with their share of the improvement costs, and they are presently unable to make the needed loans to take advantage of the offer. This group of farmers in the past has been able to supply much of the fresh vegetable requirements of the military as well as the civilian population on Oahu.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope that the bill which I have introduced will be considered an emergency measure and be reported out early by the committee to which it is referred, and passed by this House in time to relieve the small farmers of Hawaii.

HORTON BILLS SEEK REFORM OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAWS, STRENGTHEN LAWS AGAINST OBSTRUCTING INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. HORTON. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the incidence of serious crime in the United States has doubled since 1940, and has increased five times faster than our national population since 1958. The prognosis, unfortunately, is that such increases will continue unless significant remedial action is taken promptly.

This alarming development has prompted the President to label crime "a malignant enemy in America's midst," and "a national industry." Such observations justify the further conclusion that the criminal element in our society has declared open and total warfare upon the United States.

The malignant character of the crime rate erodes and corrodes the quality of

our citizens' lives. It does so principally through its generation of an atmosphere of fear among the citizenry—a fear, the manifestations of which compel the citizen to arm himself with tear gas, guns, a proficiency in judo, and the like, if he or she is to enjoy, with a modicum of protection, that simple pleasure of strolling the streets and sidewalks of our cities, towns, and villages at night.

Criminals have declared war on the United States. To successfully conclude this war in victory for our citizens, it is vital that, as in all wars, our law-enforcement officials possess the weapons capable of achieving and assuring this victory.

A responsive arousal of the citizenry to their duty to cooperate with enforcement agencies and officials in the communication of information concerning the commission of crimes with respect to which they have a vital and personal awareness is one approach that will contribute some needed weight to this balancing.

To this end, I respectfully submit the following bills for the consideration of my colleagues:

First. A bill which would stimulate citizen cooperation with law-enforcement agencies and officers by providing stiff punishments for the exercise of any threat, intimidation, harassment, and so forth—the methods often employed by the underworld elements—designed to obstruct criminal investigations by means of delaying, preventing, or obstructing the communication of information concerning crimes to law-enforcement officials and agencies of the Federal Government. The penalty upon conviction for any violation under this bill is a $5,000 fine, imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

Second. I am submitting a bill to establish a National Commission on Reform of the Federal Criminal Laws. In light of the crisis-level increases in serious crimes, and in light of the increasing effects of constitutional considerations on law enforcement procedures, I believe that Congress should have the opportunity to reshape the whole of title 18, United States Code to fit the needs of today's urban criminal patterns. I am not advocating new laws that would challenge recent decisions of the Supreme Court relating to the rights of an accused person. I am, however, concerned that new laws and perhaps more modern procedures be found within constitutional limits, so that law enforcement and judicial branches of government will have the tools with which to bring peace and order to the streets and households of this Nation.

We have gone beyond the point where patchwork changes in our criminal code are adequate to meet the problem we face. Under my bill, the Commission would be required to report its findings and recommendations by the end of 1968.

The first bill I am submitting is one which strengthens the criminal law respecting the obstruction of criminal investigations. It is among the patchwork changes which is urgently needed in a particular area of the law. The second bill, I am confident, will enable the Congress to review the whole scope of Federal criminal statutes, with an eye to weaving a more up to date, and more effective legislative shield against crime.

REFORM OF THE PRESENT DRAFT SYSTEM IS VITAL TO EVERY AMERICAN FAMILY

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reform of the present unfair and inefficient draft system is vital to every American family. In testimony before the House Armed Services Committee tomorrow I will call for ultimate abolition of selective service and creation of a modern, professional, career-oriented military force.

I am opposed to creation of any system of obligated national service or universal military training, and believe a lottery is no great improvement over what we now have.

I have long been a congressional proponent of reform of the draft. Last March 1, I spoke for 30 Republican House Members who urged a congressional investigation of the draft. Since that time we have released six detailed studies pointing out inequities and inefficiencies, and making recommendations for change in Selective Service. The current congressional hearings were secured as a result of general dissatisfaction with the administration of the draft.

Under leave to extend my remarks I ask that the transcript of my testimony, to be delivered to the Armed Services Committee tomorrow, be inserted in the RECORD.

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT ELLSWORTH BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ON SELECTIVE SERVICE REFORM, JUNE 28, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate you and your colleagues on the Armed Services Committee for your decision to examine the draft. And I appreciate this opportunity to present my views.

In the course of the studies which my colleagues and I have undertaken, I have developed my own personal beliefs as to the directions which reform of the draft should take. They are my own and in expressing them I speak for myself.

The present draft system is inefficient and unfair and must be reformed immediately. None of the reforms I will suggest would require new legislation.

But far more important, and more fundamental, Congress owes this nation a new and better system for providing manpower to our Armed Forces. Obligated National Service is not the answer; universal military training will not do the job; a lottery is no great improvement over what we now have.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I urge that Congress abolish the draft, and get on with the establishment of a modern, professional, career-oriented, highly paid volunteer military force.

I believe the present Selective Service System is inefficient and unfair. More important, I do not believe that the present system can be made adequate by minor adjustments or tinkering. What is required is to start at the beginning, determine what is needed, and provide it. I do not believe that the crazy quilt of existing law and regulations can be made fair, efficient or logical merely by the addition of a few new patches.

It will, however, take months of intensive study to produce new legislation based on a new concept. In the meantime the existing system can be made more appropriate by specific changes, none of which would require new legislation:

The Defense Department should set equal acceptability standards for all, rather than discriminating as it presently does between high school graduates and high school dropouts.

In view of the emergency in Vietnam the Defense Department's acceptability standards should be lowered, as was the intent of the provisions in the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

Part-time college and university students, who must work in order to continue their education, should be deferred on the same basis as full-time students.

National Selective Service headquarters should provide local draft boards with a specific set of guidelines on how to apply the various criteria for student deferment, rather than impose on the local boards the responsibility of interpretation, thus encouraging different policies in different boards.

Selective Service should provide local boards with a specific order of priority for the reconsideration of presently deferred groups, if the I–A pool must be expanded.

Simple data-processing equipment should be installed for the storage and maintenance of files to facilitate Selective Service's capacity to measure quickly and accurately the composition of the 32 million registration it now must handle.

Necessary as these reforms are—now—they are nonetheless only the means of making the best of a system which should be scrapped altogether. In my judgment we must start with a totally new concept.

There are four basic alternatives to the current system: Obligated National Service; universal military training; a lottery; and abolition of the draft.

The concept of a national service obligation to replace a military service obligation is repulsive. The military draft has occasionally been necessary in our history in order to secure the national defense. But the drafting of men or women for civilian service, no matter how lauditory the cause, is the exact antithesis of everything this nation stands for. It is surely not what immigrants came to our shores to seek; it is in fact what they came to avoid.

There is no more noble pursuit than service in the Peace Corps. VISTA, the Job Corps, a soundly administered and purposeful War on Poverty are all vital programs through which any young man or woman can make an extraordinary contribution to the welfare of our nation. All Americans owe a debt of gratitude to those who have chosen a career in teaching in the public schools. There is a host of jobs here at home that our nation must tackle to make its democracy, its freedom and its prosperity real for our people—all of our people.

We must encourage our young men and women to seek to make these pursuits their life work. This nation cannot truly be great until these jobs are done. It is vitally important that our nation capture the idealism of its young, and channel their energies in these directions. It is vitally important that we, as a people, make the irrevocable decision to eradicate poverty and ignorance and disease in our own land.

But it is a perverse distortion of the American dream to believe that we should do this

by drafting our young people to serve all the needs of society. The very thing that has made our nation unique is the dedication of its people—the volunteer spirit with which they approach the problems of society. The Peace Corps has been an outstanding success not because young American men and women were drafted into it but because young American men and women volunteered years of their lives to serve the needs of others. The energies and enthusiasm and idealism of America's youth is our nation's most precious asset—not because we can draft them to work for society but because they are ready and willing to commit themselves freely and voluntarily to shape the future to the image of our dreams.

Every one of us who sits in Congress is a public servant—and most of us have chosen this course so that we can make a maximum contribution to the world in which we live. Our society did not force us into public service. We chose this course on our own initiative. We were free to choose, and we chose to serve. If our society ever reaches the stage that its needs cannot be met through the free commitment of its people, then our society is doomed.

On the other hand, if a national service concept means not the drafting of young men for civilian service, but providing an escape hatch from military service through some kind of government job, I am opposed to that, too. I realize full well that some young men may make a greater contribution to their country through two years in the Peace Corps or in VISTA or in teaching than they might make in the Armed Forces. That is more true, however, if their service in the Peace Corps, in VISTA or in teaching is based on a genuine desire to help people than on a desire to avoid military service.

More importantly, civilian alternatives to military service would in no way remove the basic discrimination inherent in the present draft. A man has to meet certain qualifications to join the Peace Corps, to become a teacher, or to participate in almost any of the significant and valuable government programs to meet social needs. More often than not it is the educated man who will get the job—and the result would be that, even more than now, the poor who cannot afford a college education would carry a disproportionate burden of the draft.

Frankly, I am even opposed to an automatic waiver of military service for those in the Peace Corps. No civilians have made a greater sacrifice for the sake of others than do those in the Corps. But the success of the Peace Corps has largely been a product of that sacrifice. They are received abroad as young men and women who have devoted part of their lives, in an extraordinary display of selflessness, to the needs of others. If there were the suspicion abroad that their motives were merely to avoid military service, their reception and their contribution would be significantly less.

The concept of universal military training is abhorrent. The same reason which has encouraged the proponents of the national service concept to make their proposals, demonstrates just how unnecessary universal military training would be at the present time. There are far more men in the draft age population today than ever before—almost twice as many as 15 years ago—and far more men than would be needed in military service except in the case of another world war.

Some, including General Hershey himself, have argued for UMT in order to use the Armed Forces to compel every young man to raise his educational and training level—quite unrelated to the actual manpower needs of the services. I am unalterably opposed to such a program as undemocratic. The draft is justifiable only for military purposes—and only then when absolutely necessary. Furthermore, the concern over the high rejection rate of today's draft results more from extraordinarily high Defense Department acceptability standards than from any deterioration of U.S. educational standards.

Some advocates of universal military training have argued for a very brief period of training for every student leaving high school—graduates and dropouts. This, it is suggested, could be followed by service in a mammoth reserve force. Such a system, they argue, would remove doubt about the draft from the minds of young people as they plan their higher education or employment. I do not think so. The one doubt would merely be replaced by another—doubt over whether their reserve unit would be activated. The question facing government manpower specialists under UMT would not be which untrained man to draft for active service as it is today; it would be which trained man to draft for active service.

I also oppose a lottery system for the draft. A lottery is the politically easy answer, for it offends no one—or it offends everyone equally. But however illogical the current system may be, there is no justification in replacing it with a totally irrational one.

Those who argue for a lottery point out how well it worked in World Wars I and II. In both cases, however, the need for manpower was massive, the supply was limited and the demand was immediate. Today the need for manpower is relatively small, the supply of manpower is enormous, and the demand, while immediate, can at any time be met through the reserves.

Any system of conscription is inevitably inequitable. It is certainly made no less inequitable if a man is drafted by pulling his name out of a hat than if he is drafted on the basis of defined criteria. If the draft is necessary it is incumbent upon society to make some kind of a rational decision as to who shall be drafted. It is silly to suggest that an unemployed man of twenty and a doctor in a one-doctor town should stand an equal chance of being drafted. It is silly to suggest that a single man on whom no one is dependent and a father on whom a family of six is totally dependent should stand an equal chance of being drafted. Any draft must have exceptions, but once exceptions are granted the lottery system would become very similar to what we have today. A lottery would not make the draft any more fair.

It is the capriciousness of the current draft operations which makes a lottery seem attractive. If the draft is necessary, national selective service must establish far more firm rules for local board procedures. At the present time local boards must exercise so much discretion in the interpretation of vague Selective Service regulations that identical cases are treated entirely differently by neighboring boards. Specific and logical criteria for drafting are preferable to a lottery but only if they are uniform and uniformly applied.

The basic concept which the Congress should accept is that the draft should be abolished. I believe that it can be abolished—not immediately but in a very short time. I realize that the military services will dispute this contention. I recognize that they feel they cannot afford to do away with the draft—that they need a system of conscription at least in order to meet crises.

I do not advocate sudden and total abolition of the draft. What I advocate is that the Congress and the Administration adopt that as their objective. We never will get rid of the draft until the government accepts the goal of building a purely volunteer military establishment. This means increased military pay. It means increased career opportunities. It means a radical departure from existing practice of using uniformed personnel in administrative and supply jobs in the United States which could just as easily be filled by civilians. It means attention to the creation of a more adequate volunteer reserve force which can be activated in crisis time. It means a system of bonuses for enlistment by the reserves for active duty in crises. But most of all it means a determination by the Administration and the Congress to make every effort to undertake the necessary reforms to allow the draft to be ended.

Building a purely volunteer service will cost money. But it is testimony to the inattention which the Defense Department has given this subject that Secretary McNamara has estimated the annual cost at $4 billion on one occasion and at $20 billion ten months later. What the costs are is unknown. It is conceivable that it may be expensive, but we will never know until we thoroughly explore the steps which must be taken to permit abolition of the draft. I am confident that the American people would be willing to endure a meaningful dollar sacrifice to end a government policy which drafts the youth of our nation to risk human sacrifice in combat.

I am surely not recommending that we place a priority on abolition of the draft above that of national defense. I do not advocate a smaller army or smaller armed services. Nor do I advocate immediate abolition of the Selective Service System.

Let me be perfectly clear in stating that we are now in an international crisis—and I do not doubt for one moment that the status of our existing military forces requires the military draft.

But at the same time I am convinced that in peace-time we do not need the draft—and that, furthermore, it is possible to construct a military service which can meet international crises of the future—such as those that we confront in Vietnam today—without resort to conscription.

The ten-year period from March, 1955, through March, 1965, was a period of relative calm in the Cold War, although it surely was not a period devoid of tension or crisis. At no time in that entire ten years did the draft call exceed 25,000 men per month. In only three months did it exceed 20,000—September, October, and November of 1961, as a result of the Berlin crisis. Nearly sixty percent of the time during that ten-year period the monthly draft calls were under 10,000, and the average monthly draft call during the ten-year period was only 9,782.

Today we are told that 150,000 new nineteen-year-olds come into the I–A pool of Selective Service each month. That figure will continue to expand. The size of the armed forces in the United States has remained relatively static over the last 15 years. As the population continues to expand, as the benefits of career military service are expanded, as an adequate reserve program is built, and as civilian employment replaces jobs in the United States now held by uniformed personnel, the need for the draft will be increasingly obscure.

What I am calling for is the determination of the government to take those steps necessary to make the draft unnecessary. It should not and cannot happen suddenly, but unless we plan to make it happen it may not happen at all.

Perhaps what I am urging is the exact opposite of an obligatory national service concept. Our goal should not be to draft all men into national service; it should be to draft no one. Our goal should not be to force public service upon our youth but to encourage them to seek in public service the rewards of personal fulfillment. Thus we should try to make of military service—as we would in the Peace Corps, or in education—an opportunity for young men to serve their country with pride, an opportunity to gain the respect of their fellow men and the

gratitude of their country, an opportunity for a satisfying and rewarding career in public service.

All this takes a determination by the Administration and the Congress to make it so. When we are determined to do it, it will be done.

RECONFIRMATION NEEDED FOR FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been deeply disturbed by the lack of confidence a vast majority of the American public seems to have in our Federal court system and especially in its judges. The greatest cause for this erosion of what used to be true confidence in the ability of Federal judges would appear to be the lack of any effective means of holding the appointees accountable once they have been confirmed by the Senate.

I believe that all Federal judges should be subject to reconfirmation by the U.S. Senate every 6 years as a step toward restoring the people's faith in the Federal judiciary. I would not propose that renomination occur, as political considerations could become vital factors. However, I do believe that Federal judges should be held more closely accountable as they serve. Everyone else in public life is accountable to someone, why not those nominated to judgeships?

As one who has spent some time on the bench, I have had the opportunity not available to most men to observe the workings of our judicial system. No man who serves as a judge is perfect. None is infallible. Certainly no man should be put in a position of not being really accountable to any one or any group for his action from the date of his appointment until his ultimate retirement or death. I do not suggest that Federal judges should be elected, nor should they ever have to make political decisions in order to hold their jobs. I do say that they should be responsible to someone, and I believe that the bill I have introduced today is the first step in the right direction.

THEY MARCH TO DIFFERENT DRUMMERS

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there is a considerable number of our young people in this country who are consciously endeavoring to avoid the draft. Everyone must respect the religious sensibilities of individuals who are conscientious objectors. While the country could not remain free if all of us were to be conscientious objectors, nonetheless we are big and tolerant enough that there is a valid position in this Nation for those who think that way.

On the other hand, there is a beatnik fringe which is anti-American, sneer at patriotism, and would do anything to avoid the draft. In some cases we have even heard of courses being given in draft evasion. This is becoming more and more prevalent in many areas and the New York Times has carried an interesting article in its Sunday, June 26 edition. Entitled "They March to Different Drummers," it is very thought-evoking and deserves the study of every Member of this body.

[From the New York Times magazine, June 26, 1966]

THEY MARCH TO DIFFERENT DRUMMERS

(By Walter Goodman)

Paul Carling is 20 years old, a part-time student who lives at the lower end of Manhattan Island. He is a practicing Roman Catholic. Ben Koenig is 24 years old, plays the guitar, teaches music to young children and resides in the upper reaches of the Bronx. He is a nonpracticing Jew. With the exception of a possible chance encounter on a Vietnam protest march, Paul and Ben have never met. They do have something important in common, however. Both have had their applications for exemption from the draft as conscientious objectors turned down by their local Selective Service boards during the past year.

The two young men are now appealing their boards' decision on religious grounds—the only grounds available under the law—but there the similarity of their positions ends. Paul Carling, who attended Catholic schools for most of his life and studied for a year in a Jesuit seminary, bases his claim to exemption on Scripture, on the Apostles' Creed, on the Vatican schema. He told his draft board: "I believe in a personal God and Father of man and His Son Jesus Christ who by becoming man made brothers of all men."

The number of Catholics seeking recognition as C.O.'s, according to Thomas Cornell, co-chairman of the Catholic Peace Fellowship, has "exploded" in recent months. The Peace Fellowship office is now counseling seven to ten objectors a day on the church's teachings regarding the primacy of conscience, and a number of Catholic C.O.'s have won their appeals.

Paul referred his draft board to the New Testament admonitions about turning the other cheek and answering not evil with evil—but the board was not satisfied. Since Paul is not a member of one of the traditional pacifist churches and since the board had evidently never before encountered a Catholic pacifist, they rejected his claim. "If you were a Quaker," a member told him, "you'd get the exemption right away."

Ben Koenig's claim to exemption rests not on any formal religious training or on regular attendance at synagogue or temple, but on his personal decision that he should not fight in any war. "My belief is wholly my own," he informed his board. "It is my credo and my religion. *I will not kill.*"

Many of the young C.O.'s coming before their boards now not only are "unchurched" like Ben, but are severely critical of organized religion, which they view as an especially hypocritical part of the despised Establishment. Given this legal handicap, it is up to them to make a strong case if they hope to persuade their skeptically inclined boards.

Thus, Ben's draft board was predictably unimpressed with his attitude toward Army life. One member made it known that he had a son in the Army who was *really* religious, and he asked Ben, "Do you think he wants to kill?" (The man who put this question happened to be a Lutheran, but an experienced observer of board behavior has concluded that a Jewish C.O. is generally better off before a board that has no Jews on it and a Catholic C.O. is better off appearing before non-Catholics. It seems that the coreligionists of objectors get annoyed at kids in their teens and early twenties telling *them* what their religion is all about.) Ben's hope for a reversal of his board hinges on last year's Supreme Court decision, which widened the acceptable legal definition of religious belief to include, conceivably, even such unfrocked beliefs as his.

Between Ben Koenig, who never thought of himself as a "believer" in the ordinary usage of the word, and Paul Carling, who never thought of himself as anything else, lies the C.O.'s limbo, into which growing numbers of youths are being impelled by the nature of the war in Vietnam and by the ambiguities of the law created to meet their situation.

Neither Ben nor Paul was astonished at being turned down; it seemed to both of them that their cases had been decided in advance of their brief, *pro forma* hearings. Local boards tend to interpret the law very conservatively. References to the works of Mohandas Gandhi cut little ice with them, and they prefer, as a matter of course, to let matters be decided at the state level. Hence, most men have to appeal their initial classifications in order to win C.O. status.

The reaction of the nation's local board when confronted with a C.O. these days ranges from something like sympathy to something like antagonism, with a good measure of bafflement included. On the one hand, draft-card burners who think better of it on the morning after are readily supplied with new cards by most boards despite a law hastily put together last August that provides a fine and imprisonment for their performance. Nor have the courts been harsh on those who do not repent. The first men indicted under the new law were given suspended sentences and gentle lectures.

The members of Paul Carling's board were so distressed at having to turn him down that they recommended he take one more course at Brooklyn College, where he is studying comparative literature, and so qualify for an exemption on educational grounds—a II–S classification. When he explained that he was unable to carry the required 12 credits because he holds a full-time job with the American Committee on Africa, they took note of how thin he was and suggested hopefully that he might manage a IV–F classification as underweight—but at 5 feet 9 inches and 125 pounds, he made the required weight.

On the other hand, some board members are prone to C.O.-baiting. No sooner did Paul enter the hearing room than one man asked him, "What would you do if somebody was going to shoot your mother?"

A C.O. might reply by quoting Sir Norman Angell, winner of the 1933 Nobel Peace Prize, who pointed out that what is wrong with this sort of question is its assumption that one must choose between two absolutes. "If I have a moral objection," Angell asked, "to tearing off a man's face with a piece of hot metal because his government has disagreed with mine as to whether Austrian or Russian influence shall dominate in the Balkans, must I also stand aside when some drunken savage attacks a child?" (The Yiddish poet and critic Eliezer Greenberg tells of an absolutist advocate of nonviolence who, pressed hard on whether, given the chance, he would not kill Hitler, finally succumbed. "All right," he said, "I'd kill him—but under a pseudonym.")

In its popular "Handbook," the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, a Philadelphia-based organization that assists C.O.'s with practical and legal counsel, advises young men to ask themselves the questions they are likely to be asked by their boards and try to decide: "(1) what forms of force you are willing to use, and in what circumstances; (2) how far it is required that you separate yourself from such force as you are not willing to use personally; (3) why you make these distinctions; and (4) what, if any, counterproposals you wish to make in rejecting violence."

Ben Koenig conceded on his application for exemption that even though he is a believer in nonviolence he might use force if it was needed, say, to prevent "an unjust attack on another," and Paul Carling said he would gladly push a man out of the way of a falling object. But their boards did not really seem to care much about the nice points of their philosophies.

"Handbook for Concientious Objectors," more than 60,000 copies of which have been sold since 1952, comforts the objector with the assurance that "he (however unworthy) is with the prophets, and that his inquisitors (however worthy) are speaking for the dead past out of which man is creeping." (The "Handbook" should not be confused with pamphlets like "Brief Notes on the Ways and Means of 'Beating' and Defeating the Draft" that have been circulated of late for the purpose of abetting common draft evasion.)

If, on appeal, either of our young men finally does win C.O. status, two classifications will be open to him. There is I-A-O, which means that if drafted, he will be assigned to noncombat duty in the Army, probably as a medical attendant; about 1,200 I-A-O's are now on active duty, a number of them in Vietnam. (The Medical Corps is jocularly referred to by C.O.'s as the Seventh Day Adventist Corps.) And there is I-O for those, like Paul and Ben, who see no moral distinction between combatant and noncombatant; Ben points out that the authorized role of an Army medic is primarily to get wounded troops back into shape to fight. If a I-O man is drafted, he will be obliged to take a civilian job for two years in a hospital or with an organization like the New York City Welfare Department or the American Friends Service Committee. Slightly more than 20,000 youths out of 31 million now registered with their draft boards are in the I-O category and upwards of 3,000 of them are actually employed at low-paying jobs with nonprofit groups.

Both Paul and Ben would be delighted to serve in some such capacity. "I'm a teacher," says Ben. "There must be some place I'd be useful, some slum neighborhood or ghetto . . ."

The percentage of C.O.'s in our draft population is comparable to that of World War II, but the effects of the heightening of the war in Vietnam are evident in a sharp rise in I-O figures. Whereas about 200 C.O.'s are completing their two-year civilian service each month, twice that number are embarking on it.

The objector who loses his appeal and still declines to enter the armed forces is subject to five years in prison and a fine of $10,000. Fines are almost never levied, however, and the average jail sentence now being handed out by District Courts around the country runs to about 24 months. Despite occasional pummelings of draft-card burners and peace marchers by neighborhood patriots, there has been little disposition in most places to persecute C.O.'s. "I don't sense any vindictiveness," says Arlo Tatum, executive secretary of the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors. "Selective Service wants to send people to the Army, but it doesn't especially want to send people to jail."

Only about 450 C.O.'s not counting Jehovah's Witnesses, have been convicted of Selective Service violations since 1948. Increased call-ups for Vietnam along with rising tempers (Senator JOHN STENNIS of Mississippi, who views opponents of the war as part of the ubiquitous Communist conspiracy, recently called on the Justice Department to "jerk this movement up by the roots and grind it to bits") could raise the figure substantially in coming months.

Conscientious objectors to war have been with us since the beginnings of the nation, but it was not until World War I that a serious effort was made by Congress to discourage draft-dodging, yet permit some leeway to conscience. It was a narrow leeway. The Conscription Act of 1917 limited exemption from the draft to members of "any well-recognized religious sect" whose creed forbade participation in "war in any form. . . ." The war Department handled about 4,000 C.O.'s assigning those, like Mennonites, who fell under the law's provision to noncombat service or farm work. Courts-martial sent 446 men to prison.

Other C.O.'s of that day, like Roger Baldwin of the American Civil Liberties Union, were convicted by civilian authorities for failing to register. In his address to the court shortly before going off to serve a year in prison, Baldwin stood on absolutist principles not only against "this and all other wars" but against "the principle of conscription of life by the state for any purpose whatever, in time of war or peace."

World War I was an unhappy time for civil liberties in America, and the C.O.'s in prison barracks, the great majority of them religious objectors who did not belong to one of the privileged sects, suffered severely from the passions of the hour. They were shackled, starved, hosed, hanged by their wrists and beaten by both warders and patriotic inmates. Their plight and the excessive sentences meted out to them by the Army—142 were given life imprisonment, but were pardoned in due course—became one of the earliest causes of the organization, led by Baldwin, that developed into the A.C.L.U.

In the disillusioning yet ideologically exhilarating aftermath of World War I it seemed that an entire generation of C.O.'s, of a political rather than a religious bent, was growing up throughout the world. In this country in the nineteen-thirties, hundreds of thousands of students set their names to the Oxford Oath, a pledge first taken by undergraduates at Oxford University, never to fight for king or country. But the onrush of Fascism in Europe put their resolution to an impossible test. In 1937, the year that a half-million students took the oath never to support the Government in any war, Norman Thomas, foremost defender of the C.O.'s of 1917, wrote:

"The pacifism which makes mere abstention from war the supreme command will not deliver mankind from new cycles of war and new dark ages of oppression. It is unrealistic and mad to say that it does not matter who wins in Spain if only the guns are stilled. It matters profoundly not only for Spain but for mankind that the Fascist aggression of which Franco is the nominal and brutal leader be defeated."

When America once again resorted to conscription in 1940, only a handful of the signers of the Oxford Oath elected to go to jail. (The loudest protests against the draft ceased abruptly on the day in June, 1941, that the U.S.S.R. was invaded; the American Peace Mobilization became the American People's Mobilization, and overnight many peacemongers turned positively ferocious.)

The 1940 Selective Service and Training Act allowed exemption to anyone who, "by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form," a more generous and considerably vaguer standard than that of World War I—though not vague enough to cover the likes of Roger Baldwin. About 13,000 men were granted a I-O status and permitted, if drafted, to serve their time on the home front.

Most observers agree, in the words of an A.C.L.U. official, that "the treatment of C.O.'s in the nineteen-forties was far more civilized than in 1917." The objectors owed their improved lot mainly to a tolerant public opinion. A poll taken during the war found that fewer than 10 per cent of Americans felt that C.O.'s should be imprisoned. The prevailing judicial attitude was exemplified by the judge who sentenced one C.O. to jail, with this farewell: "This is your conscience, and it is your duty to obey it, even if it brings physical pain or death. . . ." In a single gesture a judge might thus indulge both his punitive inclinations and his libertarian sensibilities.

Jail sentences varied considerably, depending on where the C.O. happened to be tried. In Vermont during 1942–43 the average sentence for all Selective Service violators was 1.1 months; in South Dakota, 55.7 months; the average for the nation was 30.6 months. Robert Lowell, soon to be recognized as one of the nation's outstanding poets, was given a year and a day, and was paroled after 4 months. A devout Catholic, he was the only C.O. in his prison who gave as one reason for refusing to join up the fact that the United States was fighting on the side of the Soviet Union.

Most of the 6,000 men who went to prison for violating the draft law during World War II were Jehovah's Witnesses. (In recent years an understanding between the Witnesses and the Justice Department has kept down the Witness population in the Federal prisons, but a hundred or so may still be found behind bars at any given time; they decline to settle for anything less than complete deferment with a IV–D classification, since by their lights they are all ministers of God.) A number of Black Muslims were jailed for refusing to register.

In some prisons the C.O.'s, being better educated and more intelligent than the run of convicts, were entrusted with office jobs, But the politically oriented, like Jim Peck, who served almost three years in the Federal prison at Danbury, Conn., and who now works for the War Resisters League, complicated the lives of prison wardens by going on periodic sit-down and hunger strikes for a shorter work week, better treatment for C.O.'s, a fairer parole system and an end to prison segregation. On the other hand, some of them, including Peck, volunteered to serve as guinea pigs in medical experiments.

The present military conscription law, passed in 1948 and amended in 1951, carried forward the "religious training and belief" provision from the 1940 law. But Congress, unwilling to let vague enough alone, stated further: "Religous training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially political, sociological or philosophical views of a merely personal code."

The practical effect of this ostensible clarification was at first difficult to discern. Arlo Tatum says: "The fellows the Congress apparently had in mind were the completely apolitical religious fundamentalists; the ones who came before their draft boards and announced, 'God told me not to fight.' But in most places they wouldn't have had any trouble anyway. It was the more sophisticated objectors whose claims were being turned down."

The objectors who have getting most attention in recent months do tend to be more sophisticated than their predecessors in the peace churches. Ralph DiGia of the War Resisters League, which assists mainly unchurched C.O.'s, explains: "Most of them

have had some college. The poorer kids, the less educated, get confused by all the words and regulations. It takes some education for a young man to get clear in his mind what he believes and also to understand what his rights are under the law. Many of the men who come to us have been active on campus in one cause or another—civil rights, Vietnam. They know what's what. Our problem is how to help the kids who haven't had the middle-class privileges."

Lieut. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, director of Selective Service, does not doubt the sincerity of nonreligious objectors; indeed he admits to a certain admiration for them: "They wouldn't be dissenters from the mass if they weren't individualists." But he suspects that some objectors, at least, are responding as much to outside commotion as to inner voices. "It's not always easy to tell whether you're truly following the dictates of your conscience or just being carried away by somebody else's eloquence or the excitement of the times. Youngsters are likely to rush out after every new girl in town."

None of the three young men who recently carried the subtleties of their positions up to the Supreme Court—Daniel A. Seeger and Arno S. Jakobson of New York and Forest B. Peter of California—fit into the traditional religious C.O. niche.

Seeger said he believed in "goodness and virtue for their own sakes" and held "a religious faith in a purely ethical creed." Jakobson also expressed a belief in "goodness," which for him was "the ultimate cause for the being of the universe." Peter based his refusal to serve on "our democratic American culture, with its values derived from the Western religious and philosophical tradition." These declarations did not satisfy their respective draft boards. And all three were convicted in district court of refusing to report for military duty after their C.O. claims had been rejected.

Ruling unanimously in favor of the three in March, 1965, the Supreme Court concluded (to the likely astonishment of the Congressmen who had inserted the "Supreme Being" clause under the impression that they were restricting, not inviting, exemptions) that Congress "was merely clarifying the meaning of religious training and belief so as to embrace all religious and to exclude essentially political, sociological or philosophical views."

Justice Tom Clark, with the assistance of references to Paul Tillich, the Bishop of Woolwich and the schema of the Ecumenical Council, stated for the Court that "the test of belief 'in a relation to a Supreme Being' is whether a given belief that is sincere and meaningful occupies a place in the life of its possessor parallel to that filled by the orthodox belief in God of one who clearly qualifies for the exemption. Where such beliefs have parallel positions in the lives of their respective holders we cannot say that one is 'in a relation to a Supreme Being' and the other is not."

The burden of the decision, then, is that one need not believe in God as He is commonly worshiped in the nation's churches to qualify as a conscientious objector. It was in this light that Ben Koenig felt able to reply "yes" to the question on his C.O. form, "Do you believe in a Supreme Being?" If the Court's decision seems to give the Congressmen a very large benefit of theological breadth, it is because not to have done so would have called into doubt the constitutionality of the Supreme Being clause.

Like surgeons trying to save a dubiously functioning organ, the Justices preferred to tamper with it rather than simply cut it out. Justice Douglas set forth the predicament in his concurring opinion: "If I read the statute differently from the Court I would have difficulties. For then those who embraced one religious faith rather than another would be subject to penalties; and that kind of discrimination . . . would violate the free exercise clause of the First Amendment. It would also result in a denial of equal protection by preferring some religions over others—an invidious discrimination that would run afoul of the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment. . . ."

It is already being predicted that the Supreme Court has not heard the last of conscientious-objector cases. Peter and Jakobson, when asked whether they believed in a Supreme Being, gave answers which, while unorthodox, might have been accepted by a draft board inclined to accept them. But Seeger, born a Catholic and now a regular participant at a Quaker Meeting on Morningside Heights, considers himself "a religious agnostic"; he took his stand, remember, on "goodness and virtue for their own sakes." In upholding his claim to exemption, the U.S. Court of Appeals had ruled that the "Supreme Being" requirement violated his rights of due process—a ruling that the Justice Department automatically appealed and the highest Court managed to sidestep with its spacious definition. But how long will the Court be able to avoid facing up to the issue raised?

A definition of belief in a Supreme Being that can encompass someone like Seeger, who would go no further than state that he did not *disavow* a belief "in a relation to a Supreme Being," doubtless frees the draft law from the charge that it discriminates among religions; even persons who leave the knotty question of God open may now be admitted to judicial grace. But unmitigated secularists and outright atheists are still damned. They insist, like Evan Thomas, brother of Norman, who was sentenced to life imprisonment for his refusal to serve in World War I and was again indicted for refusing to register in World War II, that "religion has no monopoly on conscience, the Selective Service Act to the contrary notwithstanding."

The atheist has not yet had his day in court, but if and when he does, he may claim that in favoring religious objectors over nonreligious objectors, the draft law constitutes an establishment of religion by the state, an act clearly prohibited by the Founding Fathers. He may argue that Congress need not exempt anybody from the draft—but if it decides to honor men's consciences, it must not show partiality toward religious consciences.

Another question still to be finally resolved is whether men who object for conscience's sake to killing in a particular war, like the war in Vietnam, should be forced to choose between an Army uniform and a jail uniform. "It's the nature of this war," says Ralph DiGia of the War Resisters League. "We have people coming in who aren't objectors in the usual sense, not pacifists. But they are opposed to this war, and they're thinking along these lines now."

A 24-year-old soldier from New Orleans who was inducted, trained and sent to Vietnam as a rifleman despite his declarations that he could not take a human life—"especially in reference to the war in Vietnam"—has been sentenced to a year's imprisonment by a military court for his refusal to fight. His mother explains, "He is not a conscientious objector, not a pacifist. He just can't kill those people."

Although spokesmen for some of the traditional peace churches deplore what they see as an organized attempt "to subvert the religious principle of conscientious objection for the purpose of draft-dodging," the concept of a "just war," which places moral limits on a war's ends and means, goes back to St. Augustine. (Members of the "New Left," notes Arlo Tatum, are distressed by any interpretation that finds them to be operating in an orthodox manner of any sort.)

During World War II, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals turned down an objector who refused to fight in that particular conflict; his objection, ruled Judge Augustus Hand, was political rather than religious. But now the A.C.L.U. is able to employ the language of the Supreme Court itself as it reminds us that "there are those who, though not objecting to all wars, refuse to serve in a particular war for reasons which have the same place in their lives as that filled by the pacifist conscience of those who are admittedly eligible for the exemption."

This reasoning might, if extended to the uttermost, apply to those who object to the Vietnam war out of affection for the Vietcong or because they'd rather invade South Africa, as well as to men who are repelled by the idea of supporting military dictatorships by dropping napalm on civilians, destroying crops and torturing prisoners. For the time being, however, specific-war objectors and atheists are still beyond the pale. T. Oscar Smith, chief of the Justice Department's Conscientious Objector Section, says that as the law stands, he would have to recommend that Selective Service deny C.O. status to members of both groups.

The Universal Military Service and Training Act will come up for extension again on July 1, 1967, but in view of the commotion in Congress over the Supreme Court's ruling on school prayer, nothing is to be expected from that quarter which might rescue our unorthodox conscientious objectors from their limbo.

General Hershey, who can usually count on getting a laugh when he remarks that some of his best friends are C.O.'s, takes a practical view of the problem: "If the law permitted men to escape the draft because of any kind of philosophical belief, where would we stop? Personally, I can think of some taxes that I wouldn't pay. It seems to me that we've been progressing very fast toward tolerance in treating C.O.'s, but tolerance can be suicidal for the group. I'd say we have reached a pretty good compromise on the matter."

Meanwhile, Paul Carling, Ben Koenig and thousands of other young men await a decision from above. Untraditional though their beliefs may seem to the Congress, they are as old as the state itself, and have often been paid homage, at least in words, even by those obliged to send the believers to jail. For all their political and logical deficiencies and their pretensions to superior virtue, our C.O.'s serve to remind us, today as ever, that our republic strangely finds strength in the tension between the exigencies of government and the imperatives of belief, between the demands of authority and the refusals of exasperating individuals.

SELECTIVE SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

I-A—Unconditionally available for service.

I-A-O—C.O. available for noncombatant duty only.

I-O—C.O. opposed to both combatant and noncombatant military duty and available for assignment to civilian work.

I-S—High schol or college student deferred to complete school year.

I-Y—Qualified for service only in time of war or national emergency.

II-A—Deferred because of essential civilian employment.

II-C—Deferred because of essential agricultural employment.

II-S—Deferred for study.

I-D—Member of armed forces reserve or student taking military training.

III-A—Deferred because induction would cause extreme hardship for dependents.

IV-A—Completed military duty; sole surviving son.

IV-B—Officials deferred by law.

IV-C—Aliens not on permanent resident status, who have not been in the U.S. for more than one year.

IV-D—Ministers and full-time students preparing for ministry under direction of a recognized church or religious organization.

IV–F—Not qualified for any service.
V–A—Over age.
I–W—C.O.'s in assigned civilian service. Upon satisfactory completion of 24 months of civilian service or upon earlier release, C.O.'s are classified I–W until past the age of liability for the draft, when they are reclassified V–A.
I–C—Member of the armed forces.

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the North American Newspaper Alliance on June 4, 1966, featured an article by former Vice President Richard M. Nixon which warrants serious consideration by anyone concerned with this Nation's problems. Selecting pressing priorities ranging from Vietnam to domestic inflation, Dick Nixon's appraisal of these current issues is based on years of experience in public service, plus a cool and reasoned approach to complex matters. Today, American citizens are looking for specific, workable answers, and in the minds of many, partisan politics is becoming of lesser importance in the face of cruelly realistic issues such as the rising death toll in Vietnam or the declining value of the dollar here at home. It is hoped that more and more citizens will take a tough, show-me position in appraising the various remedies proffered by candidates for public office, and give those of the loyal opposition due attention on the basis of merit only.

With this thought, I offer for insertion in the RECORD the above-mentioned article by Richard Nixon for consideration:

NORTH AMERICAN NEWSPAPER ALLIANCE COLUMN

(By Richard M. Nixon)

Public support for the Johnson Administration has sunk to its lowest point since he took office.

If the present downward trend continues, the presidential coattails that pulled Democratic candidates along to overwhelming victory in 1964 will drag them down to devastating defeat in 1966.

LEADERSHIP GAP

It is the critical leadership gap in Washington which is costing the President support across the country.

He has lost the leadership of the Free World.

He has lost the leadership of his own party.

He has lost the leadership of the economy.

Unless the President can pull an election-year rabbit out of his hat this Fall, he will lose the leadership of the nation in 1968—and the Democratic candidates who clamored to run with him in 1964, will be running away from him in 1966.

The country is reaping the consequences of one-party government—second-rate panaceas for problems that cry out for first-rate solutions.

Unless the leadership gap is closed, we are headed for a major recession in the United States and a major defeat in Southeast Asia.

There is only one way to close the leadership gap.

The deeply divided Democratic Party has demonstrated that it cannot provide the leadership America needs. Only by strengthening the Republican opposition in Congress can the leadership gap be closed.

VIETNAM

In the Vietnam crisis, the President is losing public support, not because the people oppose his policy, but because they simply do not know what that policy is.

The American people are confused about Vietnam, and the indecision in the White House and deep Democratic division in the House and Senate have added to that confusion.

The policy of dissident Democrats is to end the war with appeasement. The Administration's policy is an endless war without appeasement. Both are half wrong and half right. What America needs is a policy which will end the war without appeasement.

The President has not yet learned that you cannot fight a war by consensus. There is no military strategy that will satisfy both those who want to win and those who want to run.

THE ENEMY'S WAR

Today the United States is fighting the kind of war the enemy wants. The enemy wants a land war and a long war; they want to bleed America white.

We must not fall into this trap.

The longer the war goes on, the greater the chances for disintegration in war-weary South Vietnam and the greater the risk of World War III—because of the inevitable growth of China's nuclear capability.

The Johnson Administration has held back from adopting the only strategy which will reduce American casualties and end this war with the least risk of World War III.

We must quarantine the aggressor in North Vietnam, by reducing their war-making capacity through air strikes on all military targets, and by cutting off the flow of supplies from the sea through mining the harbor of Haiphong.

LONELIEST NATION

The crisis in leadership has produced two grim results.

For the first time in history, the President has been unable to unite his own party in time of war. For the first time in history the United States is fighting a war for freedom without the support of our European allies. We are the loneliest nation in the world.

Not only has the Johnson Administration failed to persuade our allies to help us fight the enemy in South Vietnam, it has failed to convince them to stop trading with and aiding the enemy in North Vietnam.

In 1965, the bulk of the cargo to the port of Haiphong was carried in merchant ships of NATO countries.

THE WORLD

Apart from Vietnam, the crisis in American leadership is evident around the world. Respect for the United States is at an all-time low on every continent of the globe.

Item: Eight American fishing vessels have been seized in international waters this year and held for tribute by Panama, Colombia and Peru, and the United States has done nothing.

Item: In January, Cuba declared itself the international clearing house for Communist "wars of liberation" on three continents. America's reaction: silence.

Item: NATO is divided and disintegrating and the Johnson Administration has made no move to rebuild it.

Item: In the five years of this Administration there have been twice as many attacks on U.S. installations and property abroad as occurred in the first 60 years of this century

Hardly a day goes by without news of another American embassy being stoned, a library being burned or another ambassador being humiliated.

THE ECONOMY

While the ship of state drifts toward disaster in Asia—for lack of a firm hand on the tiller—the economy at home wallows in a sea of inflation for the same reason.

Last year, along with other Republicans, I urged the President to declare war on inflation by submitting a responsible budget.

Instead, he submitted an irresponsible one and began waging war on the poor, who must pay for his irresponsibility in higher prices for food, clothing, rent, medical care and other essential items.

The New Economics has become the old economics—war and inflation.

Instead of becoming a pillar of strength in combating the threats to the economy, the Administration had become a troika of confusion—speaking in three voices and pulling in three directions.

The Federal Reserve Board leadership calls for tax hikes and economic restraint; the Treasury sees no need for either, and the White House watches and waits.

RECESSION AHEAD?

The crisis in leadership in Washington has produced a crisis in confidence in the business community. Thus, while prices rise, the stock market flounders; while the economy booms, economists talk of recession.

Unless the Administration assumes a decisive role of leadership and responsibility in economic matters, the dollar will be in deadly jeopardy, and the nation will be headed for a major recession in 1967.

The Administration's economic brinkmanship risks plunging the nation into a War on Prosperity.

POVERTY

The lack of leadership has been evident as well in the massive mismanagement of the poverty program—where we see the ugly spectacle of politicians making a profit out of the poor.

In many communities across the nation, the War on Poverty has become a melancholy mess.

In all these areas of national concern—Vietnam, NATO, Latin America, the economy—Republicans have offered constructive criticism and constructive proposals.

Among the many proposals advanced by Republicans in this session of Congress are:

Proposals to end the war in Vietnam without appeasement.

Proposals to rebuild the NATO alliance.

Proposals to win the war against inflation and halt the war against prosperity.

Proposals to take the politicians out of the poverty program and put the poor into it.

But their criticism has gone unheard and their proposals unheeded because the Republican voice on Capitol Hill is too weak. This weakness is not because of a lack of quality, but because of a lack of quantity—and that voice can be strengthened only by increasing the number of Republicans in the House and Senate.

ONE-PARTY RULE

The country has never been in greater need of great leadership. We need it to stave off disaster in Asia and to stave off recession at home.

But history has shown again that great leadership will never emerge from the stagnation of one-party government.

We need a strong loyal opposition on Capitol Hill to force the White House to act when it would vacillate, to stand firm when it would retreat.

Only a vigorous and loyal opposition, debating the issues and demanding action, can force the President to fill the vacuum of leadership at home and abroad, which has developed during his Administration.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in the early days of our Republic, many leading Americans predicted that the new National Capital would become not only the proud seat of the Federal Government, but also the cultural capital of the United States. As we know too well, this prediction has only been partially fulfilled. Today the District of Columbia, rather than leading the Nation in offering educational enrichment, actually lags behind most States and cities of comparable size.

It is regrettable that, in a decade in which Congress and the executive branch are fully committed to spurring the growth of higher education, the District of Columbia still lacks an adequate public college or university. It is especially regrettable that, while declaring that our Capital City should be a national showcase, Congress continues to deny the citizens of Washington the public higher education available to citizens of so many of the States.

To emphasize my support for the extension of higher education in Washington, I am today introducing a bill—H.R. 15966—to establish a Board of Higher Education to plan, establish, organize, and operate a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia.

This bill is based on the recommendations in the 1964 report of the distinguished Committee on Public Higher Education in the District of Columbia convened by the President. The legislation has the full support of the President, and was first introduced in the House on April 13, 1965, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]. The District Commissioners reported favorably on the bill on June 9, 1965. The recent hearings on similar bills before the Senate District Committee have made clear the breadth and depth of support for this concept among educators, officials, leading citizens, and students of Washington. In short, there is no reason for timidity or delay, and I respectfully request my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], chairman of Subcommittee No. 2 of the House District Committee, to schedule hearings on the subject next month, and to bring a bill before the House this year.

Mr. Speaker, at present all of the 50 States, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands have public institutions of higher education offering baccalaureate degree programs. Washington alone does not. The District's only public college, District of Columbia Teachers College, is woefully inadequate, and has been denied accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education since 1962, largely because upper floors of the college's buildings have been condemned. Rather than building a new teachers college, we should incorporate teacher training into a new 4-year college of the arts and sciences. Such an institution would offer prospective teachers a comprehensive liberal arts education, and would also make available undergraduate instruction in other fields.

A comprehensive public community college, or junior college, is also essential to fill the needs for advanced technical training, preparation for continuing undergraduate education, and adult education and retraining. Each of these needs is growing as the demand for skilled employees continues to increase. In 1970, according to informed estimates, 68 percent of all employment opportunities will require education or vocational training beyond that provided in high schools. We have a clear obligation to provide access to such training, both for high school graduates in the District of Columbia, and for the adults of Washington who seek remedial education, retraining, and special skills.

Above all, we must make higher education accessible to Washington high school graduates at a cost they can afford. Today far too many young men and women of the District of Columbia have no chance for higher education, simply because they cannot afford tuition and fees at the private universities in the District, or at public institutions in various States. One survey showed that about one-third of all District public high school graduates could not pay tuition of $500 per year. Students have testified that even $15 application fees, required by many colleges, are burdensome.

At present, District high school graduates must compete for admission to college either with top students from around the Nation, or with residents of the States whose public universities they seek to enter. There is too little opportunity, under these circumstances, for the average District student to gain admission to college, even if he could afford to pay. The establishment of public institutions in the District would fill this gap and would provide District residents with higher educational opportunities equal to those enjoyed by their counterparts in every State.

Mr. Speaker, the need for public higher education in Washington is incontestable. The President's Committee estimated that a public 4-year college in Washington could expect an annual enrollment of about 600 entering students, while a community college could anticipate 1,400 entering students per year. Such public institutions, cooperating with each other and buttressed by the wealth of talent available in the metropolitan area, would enhance our Capital City and enrich the lives of its citizen. As the President's Committee so wisely declared, "The most urgent educational need in the District of Columbia is hope." By acting now, Congress can and should answer that need.

GRAND CANYON PROPERTY OF WHOLE NATION—MARBLE GORGE DAM POSES NEEDLESS THREAT

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker the pressure for the unwarranted construction of two hydroelectric dams in the Grand Canyon on the Colorado River stems in part from outmoded thinking that remains enamored of big dams without reason.

As the New York Times pointed out in an editorial last January 17:

> Many engineers, remembering Grand Coulee, Hoover, Bonneville, and other monuments to their professional skill, have a romantic attachment to huge dams; but the truth is that it is becoming constantly harder to find sound reasons to build larger hydroelectric dams on new sites in the United States. Most of the good sites have already been used. Thermal plants can in many cases do the job cheaper for the immediate future; nuclear energy and solar energy will do it cheaper in the longer future.

These facts have led me on many occasions to oppose the construction of large Federal hydroelectric dams including the proposed dam at Livermore Falls in the Pemigewasset Valley in my own congressional district and the Dickey-Lincoln School District project on the St. John River in Maine.

I certainly oppose the proposed dams at Marble Gorge and Bridge Canyon on the Colorado River. Not only are better means than these available for the generation of electric power, the construction of these dams would seriously threaten the geology and unique character of the Grand Canyon, a precious national asset.

Bridge Canyon fortunately has been deferred. Marble Gorge has yet to be approved. Both should be shelved permanently.

Opposition from conservationists and newspapers across the country continues to grow. Last February 24, Wes Lawrence, columnist for the Cleveland Plain Dealer, rightly pointed out that the Grand Canyon belongs not merely to the people of Arizona but to the entire Nation and to future generations. This is an excellent column and I offer it for the RECORD in the hope that my colleagues will read it and join the efforts to block construction of the Marble Gorge Dam:

EVERYONE'S GRAND CANYON

(By Wes Lawrence)

In his reply to The Plain Dealer's objections to proposals for building two hydro-electric dams in the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, U.S. Reclamation Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy suggested that "the State of Arizona in which Marble Canyon Dam would be located is in a much better position to evaluate any probable damage to the scenery than is The Plain Dealer, and Arizona has not objected but is indeed pressing the proposal for construction."

Mr. Dominy needs to be reminded that the Grand Canyon does not belong to the people of Arizona alone nor to the Reclamation Bureau; it belongs to all the people of the United States. Moreover—and this is a point usually overlooked when men seek to turn natural beauty and grandeur to immediate economic profits—the Grand Canyon doesn't belong to our generation alone, it belongs to all future generations of Americans for whom we are stewards.

Mr. Dominy asserts that "by no stretch of the imagination would the beauty of the Grand Canyon be ruined," and he points out that there has been no objection to the Marble Canyon site from Secretary of the Interior Udall, "than whom there is no more dedicated conservationist."

I must respectfully point out that a half century ago when it was proposed to convert the beautiful Hetch Hetchy Valley in Yosemite National Park to a reservoir for the use of the city of San Francisco, the same promise was made that it would not harm, but would enhance, the natural beauty of the valley. And President Theodore Roosevelt, than whom there were few more dedicated conservationists at the time, allowed himself to believe this promise and gave his approval to the dam. What that reservoir, with its rising and falling level, has done to the beauty of Hetch Hetchy is outrageous.

Like the Hetch Hetchy dam, the Grand Canyon dams are not necessary to the purpose for which they are proposed. It is true that they are intended to help finance the expensive Lower Colorado Basin Project for getting water—not from these dams but from a reservoir already existing—to parched southwestern cities. The Reclamation Bureau is justly proud of its record of making its projects 90% self-liquidating.

But there are other means of producing power for use and for sale—means that would not waste some 10% of the Colorado's water through evaporation, means that would possibly produce even cheaper power in the end.

I feel certain that if the taxpayers of America were asked to share the cost of the water distribution project to save the Grand Canyon in its age-old condition, the taxpayers would agree by an overwhelming majority.

UNETHICAL OPTOMETRY PRACTICES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, in my home State, Kansas, there is a body of fine professional men operating under the optometry statutes of our State. These optometrists have contributed to the State's program for traffic safety; to improvement of our learning processes; and, to the output of manufacturing plants. These practitioners are ethical upstanding leaders who provide vision care in all Kansas communities both rural and urban.

During discussions with my colleagues in this House, I have learned that their experiences with optometrists in their States are similar to mine. The one jurisdiction where everyone appears to agree that improvement is needed is here in the Nation's Capital. Optometrists everywhere say they are disgraced by the unethical practices of optometry within the District of Columbia. These practices are now allowed because of a hopelessly antiquated optometry law for which Members of Congress are responsible. The law was passed by Congress in 1924, 42 years ago, and has never been amended.

Mr. Speaker, today I wish to do something about the unethical and inadequate practice of optometry in the District of Columbia. I am introducing a bill to amend the city's present regulations governing the practice of optometry. My bill is similar to those introduced by my good friend the Honorable ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota, and Congressman B. F. SISK, of California. Where my bill differs from the Nelsen and Sisk bills the differences are minor; the purpose of all the bills is the same.

The Supreme Court of Kansas, in *State ex rel. Beck* v. *Goldman Jewelry Co.*, 142 Kan. 881, 51 P 2nd 995, 1001, 102 A.L.R. 334, said:

It is our judgment that under our statutes, the Legislature, having in mind that protection of eyesight is just as important as the protection of property rights and advice thereon, as the protection of teeth, as the protection against improper and unauthorized methods of healing, by the enactment of statutes with reference to optometry, recognized it as a profession and accordingly regulated it, and an examination of those statutory regulations conclusively shows that the practice of the profession is limited to individuals, and that corporations cannot be chartered to engage therein. Not only is the holding a necessary consequence of our statutes, but it is in accord with the weight of authority.

Mr. Speaker, the main purpose of this bill is to raise the treatment of human vision within the District of Columbia to a strictly professional level. As I see it, there is a need to free the profession, to as great an extent as possible, from the possibility of being exploited by unqualified lay persons who would make a profit from the license granted to a District optometrist.

The public should be assured that a person in the health professions derives his patronage from his skill, ability, and reputation he creates with his patients. Professional responsibility and the public welfare demand that human vision be held sacred and in no sense an object of routine retail commerce. Vision care should be protected from the rule of the marketplace: "Let the buyer beware." It is not reasonable to expect the District of Columbia, after a scientific and studied examination of an applicant, would issue an individual a license to go out and tamper with the human eye as a commodity in the marketplace. The ophthalmic materials which the optometrist prescribes have no retail value other than to the individual for whom they are prescribed. Any child who has tried grandmother's trifocals will attest to this.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am proposing will eliminate the practice of optometry as the servant of an unlicensed person or retail establishment. It will take the practice of optometry out of the marketplace and put it in its proper professional environment. It will elevate the standards of the quality of optometry as practiced in the District of Columbia and thereby provide both residents and visitors access to better vision care within our Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage the House District Committee to take early, favorable action on my proposal and request that my colleagues in this House join me in passing this bill during this 89th Congress.

Let us accept our responsibility to update the outdated District optometry law.

WHAT PRICE KIDS?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received the following letter from a mother who resides in Yates Center, Kans.

DEAR MR. SKUBITZ: The accompanying article was taken from the June 16 issue of the Yates Center News. It states what we have been feeling for a long time, in so much more effective manner than we could, that we wanted to call your attention to it. It is absolutely ridiculous to allow only a $600 deduction per child. Anyone who has a child in college, or even high school, know $600 is a mere "drop in the bucket" as far as expenses of raising and educating a child in the manner that they must be educated to meet job requirements of today.

We just graduated our third child from Kansas State University and by the time we borrowed money to pay our income tax, we had quite a struggle to find enough money for college expenses. We should be Cuban Refugees!

Please see what influence you can bring to bear on this situation.

Sincerely,

MRS. HENRY H.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Horsch is just as right as she can be. Any family man can tell you that the $600 deduction allowed per child is absolutely inadequate. Is it not about time that we granted some relief to the tax-burdened fathers and mothers who are looked upon to foot the bills so that this administration can go blithly on its way, beautifying the highways, providing every conceivable form of relief to the so-called underdeveloped nations, subsidizing refugees from Cuba, and paying dropouts to attend school. I hope the Ways and Means Committee will give serious consideration and come forward with a legislative proposal increasing the deductions per child from $600 to at least $1,000.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert, as a part of my remarks, a thought-provoking editorial from the Yates Center newspaper—"What Price Kids?"

WHAT PRICE KIDS?

There's no price tags on the kids at our house. We learned long ago that any parent

who thinks he can budget a precise figure for shoes, pants, vacations, doctor bills, church and school activities and the inevitable unforeseen expenses is stark, raving mad, or soon will be. How much food can a teenager consume, for example, in a year?

But Uncle Sam very confidently does set a price tag on our kids. $600. That figure was established by the 1939 Internal Revenue Code. That's what the government allows us for each dependent child, as a deduction on our income tax.

Several million young married couples who were not yet born in 1939 are raising families and paying taxes now under that antiquated $600 deduction per dependent. And while we all struggle, Uncle Sam is establishing new dependency "allowances" everywhere you look.

For example: it costs the government $7,000 a year for each member of its Job Corps. Not $600, mind you, but $7,000.

The cost of maintaining an inmate in a federal prison is $2,300. Social Security pays up to $186 a month to some persons. That is to be compared with the $50 per month deduction we are allowed for each of our kids.

The Aid to Dependent Children program pays more than $800 a year for the upkeep of an illegitimate child. Refugees from Castro's Cuba are allowed a minimum of $1,200 a year by the government with an additional $1,000 a year budgeted for each Cuban child entered in school.

In New York City's Harlem, poverty-war officials have been shoveling out $190 a month to hundreds of teenagers requiring only that the payee stay out of trouble with the police.

In short, when Uncle Sam "adopts" a dependent, that $600 business goes out the window. Believe it or not, last year's budget for the Vista program (Volunteers in Service of America) reflected an expenditure of more than $15,000 per trainee. How would you like to have that much for your college-bound youngster's expenses next year?

That 27-year-old $600 deduction is preposterous by any measuring stick. Making it even more ridiculous is the fact that we have a 42c dollar today as compared with 1939. Realistically the $600 deduction is only $252.00. Help!

BOB PERRY: A FINE WEST VIRGINIAN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe anybody on Capitol Hill has made as many friends for my native West Virginia as Bob Perry, a big, husky mountaineer, who has been serving for these past several years as administrative assistant to Dr. George Calver.

Bob's big smile and cheery disposition, as much a part of Dr. Calver's office as the pills and medicine dispensed there, have been missed around here because of illness.

He first came on the Hill wearing the uniform of the U.S. Navy and the rank of chief pharmacists mate. He became such a vital part of the Capitol Physician's Office that after retiring with 20 years of service in the Navy, Dr. Calver promptly hired him as administrative assistant.

Dr. Calver, who probably knows him as well as anyone, said:

People just love Bob Perry. He's done a wonderful job in public relations. There's never been a more loyal helper or anyone who has given more loyal assistance to the Members of the U.S. Congress than Bob Perry.

The members of my staff join me in wishing a speedy recovery for Bob.

WHEAT POLICY

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, improved Government policies in handling wheat could put millions of extra dollars in the U.S. Treasury, ease our balance-of-payments problem and strengthen wheat prices to farmers.

It now appears that the carryover of wheat in the United States July 1, 1967, will be no more than 250 million bushels. We, of course, have heavy export commitments to India and other friendly nations during the months ahead and these must be honored for humanitarian reasons.

The President's decision to increase 1967 wheat acreage allotments by 15 percent—from 55 million acres to 59.3 million acres—will be most helpful in meeting these urgent needs but some further factors in the current wheat situation should be considered.

First. An Associated Press report of June 21, 1966, from Chicago which sets forth details concerning the purchase of some $800 million worth of wheat by the Soviet Union from Canada to be spread over the next 3 years. This news story says:

The Canadian Wheat Board has been steadily boosting the price of wheat for months despite U.S. reluctance to follow suit. Government officials predicted the latest sale would not only boost this country's (Canada) economy but might persuade the United States to demand higher prices for its wheat exports. Canadian authorities have felt for some time that the U.S., in its role as a major exporter, has placed an unnecessary brake on price rises.

Second. With the short wheat crops experienced this year by such major exporters as Australia and Argentina, the reduction in the prospective U.S. wheat harvest because of frost damage and drought, the uncertainty over the size of the Canadian crop, and the apparent shortage of wheat in the Soviet Union, it would appear that the world wheat supply during the year ahead will be tighter than it has been since the immediate post-World War II period.

Third. The United States is the only nation with the reserve wheat acres and the potential capacity to increase wheat production dramatically in 1967. Therefore, I have urged the President to consider a further increase in the domestic wheat allotment so that farmers may prepare now to expand their plantings of winter wheat this fall.

Fourth. As of June 10, 1966, Commodity Credit Corporation had 279 million bushels of wheat in its noncommitted inventory. It has an additional 65 million bushels on farms under reseal program. This constitutes a major part of the world's uncommitted wheat reserves, if one excludes 1966 production which has already been largely programed for export and domestic use both here and in Canada.

Fifth. Immediately following World War II, wheat prices in the United States rose to more than $3 per bushel and some sales by other countries were made at about $5 per bushel. In terms of 1966 dollars, those prices would be much higher. The point I would make is that the U.S. Government is continuing to price its wheat as though this were a buyer's market, rather than the seller's market which clearly exists.

Sixth. Currently Commodity Credit Corporation is paying as much as 65 cents per bushel in the way of an export subsidy to move wheat abroad. I am informed that such export subsidy payments and price differential payments for the crop year beginning last July 1 through March 31 of this year totaled $233 million. Over the last 15 years, the total cost of the wheat export subsidy program has been tremendous. In view of the current worldwide demand for wheat, I am convinced that the export subsidy could be eliminated completely, with no reduction in U.S. exports. It is unimportant whether the wheat which we, in effect, donate to India and other Public Law 480 recipients carries a price tag of $2 or $3 per bushel. It is important, for budgetary considerations, that CCC attempt to recover as much as it possibly can of its huge investment in wheat as its inventory is being liquidated. Moreover, I believe that if CCC were to increase its wheat resale price, American wheatgrowers would receive substantially more for the 1966 crop which they are just beginning to market—perhaps as much as half a billion dollars more. This would, of course, greatly increase net income of wheat producers now—at a time when they are meeting constantly increasing production costs.

In summary, I urge an increase in the domestic wheat allotment for 1967, elimination of the export subsidy on wheat and a more realistic pricing policy for CCC wheat sales which would require commercial buyers in the hard currency countries to pay as much as our domestic users must pay for U.S. wheat.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON] 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15119, the Unemployment Insurance Amendments of 1966. I commend the members of the Ways and Means Committee for reporting a bill which will permit each State to upgrade its unemployment compensation program in a manner which will suit its own needs. It was impossible for me to be here to vote on rollcall No. 150 Wednesday, June 22. Had I been here, I certainly would have supported this legislation.

THE 89TH CONGRESS HAS MET ITS RESPONSIBILITIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the 89th Congress in reporting to their constituents can be proud of their stewardship of the Nation's business. They can go home to their people and tell them that this Congress has met its responsibilities and has met them well. No Congress in modern times has faced up more squarely to the major issues before it.

Ours is a government of the people, and I would hope that Members will tell the people that they have every right to be proud of the contributions of all Americans toward America's progress. We shall face the future with confidence—we will meet the challenges that lie ahead.

It has been our destiny since the time of our own Revolution for freedom steadily to expand our role of leadership among free peoples. Our Nation today stands at an alltime peak of prosperity. It is the most affluent nation in the history of the entire world. We have reached this point by applying the principles of free elections, free speech, freedom of religion, and the other guarantees of civil liberties set forth in our Constitution and the Bill of Rights. We have joined with freedom-loving peoples around the world in the defense of freedom and in mutual pacts to oppose aggression. Our sons fight today in Vietnam because our Nation chooses to fulfill the responsibilities of its leadership and to meet its commitments to the people of other free nations. We fight in order that the aggressor who now threatens one small nation and poses an ultimate threat to all free people, shall not succeed. We recall the Manchurias, the Ethiopias, and the Czechoslovakias of the past, when inaction in the face of aggression whetted our enemy's appetite for conquest and served only to broaden the horizons of his ambition. The cost of World War II to the United States was 292,000 American lives. Russia lost 7.5 million men, China lost 1,325,000, Japan 219,000, the British Commonwealth 245,000, France 210,000, and Italy 78,000.

Today we fight in Vietnam to safeguard the future of our own country as well as to keep our commitments to free nations and to prevent the spread of Communist aggression. Our friends know this; our enemies know this, too. Our involvement in Vietnam is right as the incontrovertible facts will most certainly disclose.

Mr. Speaker, here are the facts.

I. BASIC U.S. POSITION

A COMMITMENT AGAINST AGGRESSION

First. We are assuming the people of South Vietnam for the same reason that we assisted the people of Greece and of South Korea—to support a free people in the face of Communist aggression. Our goal is to preserve the freedom of the South Vietnamese people to determine their future as they see fit. Tens of thousands of armed, trained men including tons of armaments and regular units of the North Vietnamese Army have been sent by Hanoi into South Vietnam to impose Hanoi's will by force. We have learned the lessons of the 1930's—Manchuria, Ethiopia, the Rhineland, Czechoslovakia—that aggression must either be met before it has gathered momentum or it will have to be checked later under more adverse conditions.

Second. Three American Presidents have committed us to assist South Vietnam. Many nations whose future may hinge on American support are anxiously watching our actions in South Vietnam to determine the value of solemn American commitments. Their future conduct, as well as that of hostile nations, will be determined by the conclusions that are drawn from our support of South Vietnam.

COUNTERING "WARS OF NATIONAL LIBERATION"

Third. The Chinese Communists have openly stated that South Vietnam is the model of so-called wars of national liberation. If South Vietnam is conquered, we can expect future conflicts not only in Asian nations such as Thailand, which has already been designated as the next target, but also in Africa and Latin America. On the other hand, successful resistance in South Vietnam should help to preserve peace by showing the Communist powers that cheap victories are no longer possible and that the price of aggression is too costly. In time, the Communist powers will hopefully choose to focus their energies on their own vast internal problems.

THE GOAL OF SELF-DETERMINATION

Fourth. Our goals in South Vietnam include neither military bases, economic domination, nor political alliances. We support the right of the people of South Vietnam to elect their government freely and to decide for themselves without outside force and coercion such questions as reunification and neutrality. The United States does not seek the destruction of North Vietnam or its regime. We have stated our preference for using our resources for the economic reconstruction of southeast Asia and are prepared to contribute over $1 billion for that purpose. But despite our desire for peace we are determined to honor our commitments and to take all necessary measures until we and the more than 30 other nations aiding in the struggle successfully assist the people of South Vietnam in preserving their right to determine their own destiny. We must not forget that despite our assistance it is the South Vietnamese people who are still suffering the bulk of the casualties in what remains their struggle for self-determination.

UNCONDITIONAL DISCUSSIONS

Fifth. Our actions and statements over the past year have clearly shown that we are fully prepared to transfer the struggle for South Vietnam's freedom from the battlefield to the conference table. We continue to be ready to discuss a peaceful solution without preconditions. When, either as a result of the gradual lessening of hostilities or of a formal settlement, the people of South Vietnam are relieved from outside coercion, our forces will be withdrawn.

II. U.S. EFFORTS FOR NEGOTIATIONS

RECENT PEACE EFFORTS

First. In December 1965 and January 1966, the United States halted its bombing of military and communications targets in North Vietnam for 37 days. It pursued this course as part of a continuing effort to uncover any signs of North Vietnamese willingness to respond in some constructive way which might signify an interest in a peaceful solution.

Second. The purpose and sincerity of the U.S. action was conveyed on behalf of the President across the globe by Vice President HUMPHREY, Governor Harriman, Under Secretary Mann, Governor Williams, and Ambassador Goldberg. These emissaries met with Pope Paul and over 30 prominent leaders of Asia, Africa, and Latin America as well as several Communist States. In addition, U.S. Ambassadors abroad brought the intent of the U.S. actions directly to the attention of the leaders of over 100 countries. The U.S. message was conveyed both directly and indirectly to Hanoi.

NO MEANINGFUL RESPONSE

Third. There was no favorable response from Hanoi to this or any other U.S. peace effort. The North Vietnamese continue to insist that their agents, the Vietcong, be accepted in advance of any discussions as "the sole genuine representative" of the South Vietnamese people. Hanoi is adamant that the Vietcong be so accepted without any elections or any other indication of the wishes of the people of South Vietnam. In other words, North Vietnam still insists that it be allowed to conquer and control the South before it will even discuss peace.

THE CONTINUING SEARCH

Fourth. This search for an indication from Hanoi of willingness to seek peace was only part of a long series of U.S. efforts toward this end. During 1965 the United States repeatedly through the public and private statements of its leaders expressed its willingness to seek a peaceful solution to the conflict in Vietnam. The basic facts of the situation in Vietnam together with U.S. views on a framework for a just negotiated settlement are brought together in summary

form in the attached statement, "The Heart of the Matter in Vietnam."

Fifth. Following are some examples of the continuing search for a peaceful settlement by the U.S. Government during 1965:

We warmly endorsed the repeated efforts by the United Kingdom in February, April, June, July, and December to find such a solution through its individual efforts and through the collective efforts of the Commonwealth.

We welcomed the appeal by 17 nonalined nations in April for a settlement through negotiations without preconditions.

In May we suspended our bombing of North Vietnam and sought some indication of a North Vietnamese willingness to respond. At the same time we attempted to transmit a message directly to the Government of North Vietnam but were rebuffed.

We encouraged the attempt by the Canadian representative on the International Control Commission for Vietnam to discuss the possibilities of peace with representatives of the North Vietnamese Government in Hanoi in June.

In July we sent a message to the Security Council expressing the hope that U.N. members would use their influence to bring all governments to the negotiating table to halt aggression and evolve a peaceful solution.

We encouraged initiatives from world leaders such as President Radhakrishnan of India, former President Nkrumah of Ghana, President Tito of Yugoslavia, President Nasser of the United Arab Republic, Foreign Minister Fanfani of Italy, and the Pope, among others, in seeking means of working toward a peaceful settlement.

III. THE POLITICAL SITUATION

GENERAL SITUATION

First. The present Government of South Vietnam, composed of a directorate as the ruling authority over a combined military-civilian cabinet, served almost 1 year without major alteration. However, the Government has been subjected to constant internal pressures since the dismissal of one of the directorate members, General Thi, in mid-March 1966. On June 6, as a result of these pressures, the directorate of 10 generals was enlarged to include 10 civilians. The Government also announced on June 1 its intentions to establish by June 19 an armed forces/civilian council to serve in an advisory capacity to the Government and that was done.

DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

Second. On April 12, 1966 the Government convened a National Political Congress, members of which were broadly representative of all non-Communist civilian political and religious groupings, to discuss steps to be taken for a return to constitutional government. Prior to the congress, the Government had announced on January 15 its intentions to establish a National Advisory Council to draft a constitution which would have been submitted to a national referendum in October and followed by elections in late 1967. However, accepting the consensus of the congress, Chief of State General Thieu issued a decree April 14 providing for elections for a constituent assembly within 3 to 5 months.

Third. After additional consultations with representative groups, the Government on May 5 convoked a 32-man election law drafting committee, consisting again of representatives of Vietnam's major non-Communist groups, to draw up draft laws pertaining to the conduct of constituent assembly elections, the composition and functions of the constituent assembly, and the rejuvenation of political activity. In early June the committee forwarded its recommended draft laws to the Government, which set the elections for September 11. Meanwhile, the Vietnamese Government has approached Secretary General U Thant inviting United Nations observers to witness the elections.

IV. U.S. ECONOMIC AID

First. Since its formation in 1954, the Republic of Vietnam has received about $3 billion in U.S. economic assistance, including Public Law 480. During the current fiscal year—fiscal year 1966—the commercial import program and Public Law 480 imports will total about $470 million and U.S. assistance for economic and social programs about $160 million. AID plans to continue at about this same level in fiscal year 1967.

Second. Many projects have been greatly expanded to meet new and enlarged needs. For example, more than 930,000 South Vietnamese refugees have sought refuge in government-controlled territory since January 1965, of which nearly 450,000 have been resettled, and over 480,000 are in temporary shelters. The United States has provided food, construction materials, blankets, and other supplies in refugee relief. Major efforts are underway and expanding in the field of health. We are assisting the Vietnamese to enlarge teaching facilities in medical and dental education. A surgical or medical team is planned for each of the provinces by the end of fiscal year 1967. An accelerated program of hospital renovation, begun in fiscal year 1965, will continue.

REVOLUTIONARY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Third. Economic and social welfare programs supported by the United States play a crucial role in the overall effort to improve the welfare of the rural population and develop their loyalty to the Government of Vietnam. As was clearly stated in the Honolulu declaration, these programs must be closely tied to military and police actions to protect the villagers and political programs to develop local governmental institutions. They cover a broad range from the training of administrators, teachers, doctors, agriculturalists, and other technical personnel to the provision of classrooms and textbooks, wells, medicines, seeds, and fertilizers. A number of activities are aimed specifically at increasing the participation of rural Vietnamese in local development projects which will give added incentive to village self-defense. These self-help projects include roadbuilding, well digging, and school construction, and combine local labor and materials with AID-financed imports of construction commodities.

Fourth. In furtherance of the revolutionary development program, members of the USAID mission are working with Vietnamese in every one of the country's 43 provinces. American advisers are also assisting the Vietnamese in such important fields as resources control—measures to deny economic resources to the Vietcong—"Open Arms" defector program, and the vital task of training of cadre to carry out the entire rural construction program. Since the success of the entire revolutionary development effort also depends upon the ability of the Government to supply and transport personnel and materials to the areas concerned, the United States is vigorously supporting programs to improve transport and logistics. Also assistance to the Vietnamese is being provided in electrifiction, telecommunications, water and urban development projects, which serve both to identify the Government with the people through the provision of these services and to provide the infrastructure necessary for long-term development under peaceful conditions.

THE PROBLEM OF INFLATION

Fifth. The predominant factor in the current Vietnamese economic situation is the ever-accelerating increase in demand for goods and services, stemming mainly from increased Vietnamese and U.S. Government spending for military requirements and the personal spending by the large new U.S. troop contingents. Local supplies have fallen increasingly behind demand, particularly after mid-1965, as localized shortages of manpower and productive capacity developed and became more generalized, and as transportation and distribution disruptions and bottlenecks developed as a result of military activity. Consequently, heavy dependence on imported resources and sharp localized price rises began roughly in mid-1965.

Sixth. Unemployment in Saigon, a political program in 1964, vanished as the military draft, military construction and a spurt in private spending created labor shortages. The shortages of manpower and production capacity, the Vietcong threat to much of the farming area, and Vietcong interdiction of land transportation routes made it impossible to match rising purchasing power with rising domestic production.

Seventh. To cope with the inflationary threat, the United States and GVN have expanded financing of commercial imports and are developing other financial and fiscal measures; this process has been assisted by the work of an IMF mission which visited Vietnam in April and May 1966. Rice prices were largely stabilized by large Public Law 480 and AID—financed imports; crash programs of port, warehousing, and coastal shipping expansion have been launched. The GVN cut its 1966 budget to the bone, rised customs duties, and instituted a freeze on civilian hirings and wages. The United States and GVN have consulted closely on additional measures to keep inflation within tolerable limits.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

Eighth. The U.S. Government has been making a serious effort during the past year to bring about a removal of free world shipping from the North Vietnam trade through a series of high-level diplomatic approaches to all the nations involved. In carrying out these approaches, we have brought to their attention the recent amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act which provide under certain conditions for a termination of aid to countries whose ships remain in the North Vietnam trade. These efforts have met with considerable success. During the first 5 months of 1966 the average number of calls was down 65 percent from the same period last year, to 10 a month as opposed to 29 a month. Nearly all of the remaining shipping involves small, coastal vessels under charter to Communist countries, most of which are registered in Hong Kong. Their cargoes are nonstrategic. We know of no shipments of arms of free world vessels. Nevertheless, U.S. efforts to achieve a complete cessation of this trade will continue.

V. MILITARY SITUATION

CHRONOLOGICAL REVIEW

First. In late 1961, in response to an appeal by President Diem and following a high-level U.S. study mission which confirmed the serious affects of the Hanoi-directed subversive campaign, President Kennedy agreed to increase significantly the U.S. advisory and logistic effort in South Vietnam. The Hanoi regime had begun in 1959 to infiltrate into South Vietnam former Vietminh cadres who had regrouped in the north after the 1954 Geneva agreements and who had received special training in subversion and sabotage.

Second. By the end of 1962 there was evidence that the GVN had made some military progress against the Vietcong. The Vietcong did achieve a favorable strength increase, considering reported casualties, and there was a noticeable increase in their use of mortars and recoilless rifles.

Third. By the end of 1963 the Vietcong appeared optimistic. They improved their military and political situation throughout the country from the Ap Bac battle in January 1963 to increased terrorism following the overthrow of the Diem regime.

Fourth. Into 1964, the Vietcong objectives appeared to be to destroy or prevent establishment of new life hamlets, to consolidate "liberated" areas, to destroy GVN forces, and to counter efforts to obtain Hoa Hao and Cao Dai support. The Vietcong carried out large-scale operations with relative impunity and achieved some success in their terrorism and propaganda efforts. The continuing infiltration of southern regroupees was augmented by the infiltration of native northerners and, late in the year, of regular troop units of the North Vietnamese Army.

Fifth. During the first half of 1965 the Vietcong continued to maintain initiative and momentum. GVN lines of communication were completely disrupted and the Central Highlands isolated for extended periods. In response to the request of Prime Minister Quat, U.S. ground combat units were sent to Vietnam, beginning in March, to augment the Republic of Vietnam's Armed Forces and thus correct the military imbalance created by the previous introduction of North Vietnamese Army units.

They were later joined by units from Korea, Australia, and New Zealand. Combined GVN/U.S./free world forces blunted this "monsoon offensive." The number of Communist successes declined and there were some important victories over the Vietcong. The tempo of Vietcong activity declined in July; however, in October the number of Vietcong incidents began to increase rapidly through the remainder of the year. In October there were over 3,300 incidents, in November it surpassed 3,600, and in December it reached over 4,000. Each of these was the highest encountered to date in the war. Despite over 40,000 killed or captured and over 9,000 defections, the Vietcong continued to maintain an offensive capability. Their year-end order of battle more than doubled over that at the beginning of 1965.

Sixth. Vietcong/NVA military activity continues in 1966 to follow the familiar pattern of terrorism, harassment, sabotage and small-scale attacks with occasional large-scale operations against isolated Government positions. Recent GVN/U.S./free world forces operations and air strikes in critical areas are believed to have generally discouraged large-scale enemy activity and disrupted their plans. The Vietcong/NVA will probably continue their pattern of terrorism, harassment and sabotage and possibly increase the number of small "hit-and-run" attacks. Whenever they can achieve terms of their own choosing and when and where it suits their purpose, as against the Ashau Special Forces Camp in March, they are likely to attack in force.

ENEMY TACTICS

Seventh. Enemy tactics have not changed since the war began, despite the intensity of their attacks and an increase in terrorism, propaganda and sabotage. Their operations are still essentially "hit-and-run," emphasizing ambushing and destroying friendly reaction forces. An example of this was the Plei Mei battle in November 1965, where there was no real effort to overrun and seize the camp, but rather they attempted to ambush the relief columns. In the subsequent action in the Ia Drang Valley, which resulted from the pursuit of the retreating NVA forces by U.S. forces, the Communists attempted to win a victory. When the battle turned against them, the NVA forces broke contact and withdrew.

ORDER OF BATTLE

Eighth. Current strengths:

(a) Government of South Vietnam—GVN: Despite combat and other losses, the South Vietnamese Armed Forces achieved a modest increase in 1965. Their present strengths are: Approximately 316,000 regulars; 270,000 Regional and Popular Forces.

(b) United States: Approximately 260,000.

(c) Third Nation Forces—major contributions: Korea, 24,500 (will increase to approximately 43,000); Australia, 3,900 (will increase to approximately 4,500); New Zealand, Philippines, and Thailand; see section VI.

(d) Vietcong—VC: Approximately 57,000 Main Force, 110,000 irregulars or guerrillas, 40,000 political cadre, 17,500 support.

(e) North Vietnamese Army—NVA: Approximately 30,900.

INFILTRATION

Ninth. Men and supplies continue to enter South Vietnam over established infiltration routes. Although a firm rate has not been established, current estimates give the Communists the capability of several thousand men per month with enough supplies to sustain them until the Vietcong system can provide for them or until integrated into the Vietcong units. From 1958 to 1964 over 40,000 were infiltrated from North to South Vietnam. During 1965, the estimate exceeded 19,000. It is estimated that the 1966 infiltration exceeded 21,000 by the end of May.

CASUALTIES

Ten. Combat deaths since 1961, as of June 4, 1966, with U.S. military deaths until 1965 sustained by advisors only and third nations forces deaths from 1965 only: Vietcong, over 126,000; GVN military, over 36,000; U.S. military, 3,662; Third Nations Forces, Australia/New Zealand, 33; Korea, 247.

B–52 OPERATIONS IN SVN

Eleven. Since June 1965, when they were first initiated, over 300 B–52 strikes have been conducted against VC and NVA bases in South Vietnam. These strikes have provided continual disruption and harassment to the enemy forces located in areas hitherto impregnable to attack. According to prisoner-of-war interviews, the B–52 operations have been a significant factor in lowering Vietcong and North Vietnamese Army morale.

AIR STRIKES AGAINST NORTH VIETNAM

Twelve. Bombing of the North began in February 1965, with a strike on the Dong Hoi Barracks and has gradually expanded, with the targets being military ones associated with infiltration. A pause in the bombing occurred during the period May 13–17, and a second pause, of 37 days, began December 24. The purpose of our air strikes has been to make it as difficult and as costly as possible for North Vietnam to continue effective direction and support of the Vietcong; to convince the North Vietnamese Government that its control, direction, and support of the Communist insurgency in South Vietnam is not worthwhile; and to bolster morale in South Vietnam.

VI. FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO SOUTH VIETNAM

First. The main burden of outside support for the Government of South Vietnam has been and will continue to be borne by the United States in the foreseeable future. Substantial contributions of military and civilian assistance are provided by a large number of other

countries, however. In response to appeals made on July 15, 1964, by the Government of Vietnam for more international support, free world assistance to South Vietnam increased greatly through additional pledges and new contributions. Prior to the July appeal only 10 nations, including the United States, were providing aid. At the present time, 34 free world countries are providing—and several more have agreed to provide—assistance to South Vietnam. Negotiations are underway between the Government of Vietnam and many of these nations for additional aid.

Second. Significant contributions of armed forces have been made in the past year. A Korean combat division has been in Vietnam since last fall, and a second division is now being deployed. The Australian Government is increasing its military forces in Vietnam from its present 3,900 men to 4,500, and New Zealand has raised its artillery battery from four to six howitzers. The Philippine Congress has approved President Marcos' request for a 2,000-man engineering force with supporting security personnel to be sent to Vietnam, and the Thai Government has announced that it will furnish a landing ship, patrol vessel and two transport aircraft with crews, thereby adding to a previous small military contribution.

In proportion to the population of these countries and that of the United States, these contributions are the equivalent of the following number of American troops:

(a) Korea: 327,000.
(b) Australia: 90,000.
(c) Philippines: 13,000.

Third. Free world personnel, other than American, in Vietnam under governmental arrangements now number over 30,000, the large majority of which are military personnel. However, some of these military personnel are engaged in civic action programs, such as rural reconstruction and medical care. Among these are personnel from Korea, the Philippines, New Zealand, and Australia.

Fourth. Significant economic contributions have been made by the United Kingdom, Japan, West Germany, France, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand in the form of loans, grants, and commercial credits. For example, Germany has made available in loans and grants about $27 million. Australia has provided technical and economic assistance totaling nearly $8 million. Assistance since 1955 from France has totaled more than $111 million, while Japan has provided about $55 million chiefly in the form of reparations.

Fifth. Many nations are giving social and humanitarian assistance to South Vietnam. More than 10 nations are sending medical teams which provide for the medical needs of entire provinces. Others have contributed medicines and supplies for the half million refugees in South Vietnam. Educators and engineers from friendly nations are assisting Vietnam to rebuild.

Sixth. The countries now contributing help to South Vietnam are: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Laos, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela.

THE HEART OF THE MATTER IN VIETNAM

I. THE FACT OF AGGRESSION

The simple fact is that tens of thousands of trained and armed men, including units of the North Vietnamese regular army, have been sent by Hanoi into South Vietnam for the purpose of imposing Hanoi's will on South Vietnam by force. It is this external aggression which is responsible for the presence of U.S. combat forces. Indeed, it was not until the early summer of 1965 that the number of U.S. military personnel in South Vietnam reached the number of those which have been infiltrated by Hanoi. If this aggression from the outside were removed, U.S. combat forces would not be needed.

II. THE U.S. COMMITMENT

The United States has a clear and direct commitment to the security of South Vietnam against external attack. This commitment is based upon bilateral agreements between the United States and South Vietnam, upon the SEATO Treaty—whose obligations are both joint and several—upon annual actions by the Congress in providing aid to South Vietnam, upon the policy expressed in such congressional action as the August 1964 resolution, and upon the solemn declarations of three U.S. Presidents. At stake is not just South Vietnam, nor even southeast Asia: there is also at stake the integrity of a U.S. commitment and the importance of that commitment to the peace right around the globe.

III. INITIATIVES FOR PEACE

A. We are not aware of any initiative which has been taken by Hanoi during the past 5 years to seek peace in southeast Asia. Reports of "peace feelers" have to do with initiatives by third parties. Hanoi has denied that it has ever made any "peace feelers." We, ourselves know of none. During 1965 Hanoi has consistently insisted that its four points must be accepted as the sole basis for peace in Vietnam. The third of these four points as interpreted by Hanoi would require that the Vietcong be accepted as "the sole genuine representative" of the people of South Vietnam, whether the South Vietnamese want it or not.

Second. We would welcome a conference on southeast Asia or on any part thereof;

Third. We would welcome "negotiations without preconditions" as the 17 nations put it;

Fourth. We would welcome unconditional discussions as President Johnson put it;

Fifth. A cessation of hostilities could be the first order of business at a conference or could be the subject of preliminary discussions;

Sixth. Hanoi's four points could be discussed along with other points which others might wish to propose;

Seventh. We want no U.S. base in southeast Asia;

Eighth. We do not desire to retain U.S. troops in South Vietnam after peace is assured;

Ninth. We support free elections in South Vietnam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice;

Tenth. The question of reunification of Vietnam should be determined by the Vietnamese through their own free decision;

Eleventh. The countries of southeast Asia can be nonalined or neutral if that be their option;

Twelfth. We would much prefer to use our resources for the economic reconstruction of southeast Asia than in war. If there is peace, North Vietnam could participate in a regional effort to which we would be prepared to contribute at least $1 billion;

Thirteenth. The President has said:

The Vietcong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that would be an unsurmountable problem.

B. The initiatives for peace undertaken by our side, and by many other governments, would be hard to count. They began with President Kennedy's talk with Premier Khrushchev in Vienna in June 1961 and have not ceased. The publicly known initiatives have been multiplied many times by private initiatives not yet disclosed. On the public record, however, are the following instances:

First. Kennedy-Khrushchev talks in June 1961;

Second. Geneva Conference on Laos;

Third. U.S. reference of Gulf of Tonkin matter to the U.N. Security Council in August 1964;

Fourth. The Polish proposal to convene the two cochairmen and the three members of the ICC—India, Canada, and Poland—to take up the question of Laos;

Fifth. The call of 17 nonalined nations for negotiations without preconditions;

Sixth. Attempts by U Thant to visit Hanoi and Peiping;

Seventh. President Johnson's call for unconditional discussions;

Eighth. The British Commonwealth Committee on Vietnam;

Ninth. Attempted or actual visits by Patrick Gordon Walker, Mr. Davies—M.P.—and Guinean Delegation.

IV. U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS FOR PEACE

The following statements are on the public record about elements which the United States believes can go into peace in southeast Asia:

1. The Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962 are an adequate basis for peace in southeast Asia;

14. We have said publicly and privately that we could stop the bombing of North Vietnam as a step toward peace although there has not been the slightest hint or suggestion from the other side as to what they would do if the bombing stopped.

In other words, we have put everything into a program for peace except the surrender of South Vietnam.

ECONOMIC STRENGTH

This Nation has been capable of vast effort in Vietnam and in assisting other

nations of the world because it has demonstrated a tremendous capacity to move forward in expanding its national economy. Since 1961 there has been unprecedented growth in all economic sectors and increased prosperity for virtually all our citizens.

THE STAR PERFORMANCE OF THE ECONOMY

First. The United States has made tremendous economic gains in this decade. Today, we are reaping the benefits of 5 years of continuous economic expansion and of more complete use of our great productive potential. We are earning more. Farm income is higher, and business earnings have risen astronomically. This tremendous prosperity has affected every part of the country.

Average spendable earnings of a factory worker with three dependents in May were $19.62 higher than in January 1961. This is an increase of 25 percent. Translated into dollars of constant purchasing power it is a real gain of 15 percent.

Real income per farm rose by a third between 1960 and 1965.

Corporate profits, after taxes, almost doubled between the first quarter of 1961 and the first quarter of this year. The rate of return on shareholders' equity, in manufacturing, in the first quarter of this year was the highest for any first quarter since 1951.

Data that became available in April show that per capita personal income reached a record high in every State in the Nation last year.

In three States—Massachusetts, Maryland, and Michigan—it crossed the $3,000 mark for the first time, joining Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Illinois, Nevada, and Alaska.

For the Nation as a whole and for six States—Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Colorado, and Oregon—it topped $2,700 for the first time.

The disadvantaged have also shared in the advance. The proportion of the population in poverty fell from 22 percent in 1960 to 18 percent in 1964. Data to be released this summer will surely show a further decline last year.

Second. The advance in earnings has resulted from gains in employment that have put more people on payrolls and have resulted in steadier work for others. Since January 1961:

Total civilian employment—seasonally corrected—has risen by 6¾ million workers, or 10 percent;

Total unemployment—seasonally corrected—has fallen from 4.8 million to 3 million persons—a decline of more than one-third;

The unemployment rate has fallen from 6.7 percent to 4 percent;

Average weekly hours of work in manufacturing industries—seasonally corrected—has risen from 39.2 to 41.4;

The number of layoffs per 1,000 persons employed in manufacturing—seasonally corrected—has dropped from an average of 27 persons to 10 persons per month.

The latest report on area trends in employment show that 55 of the Nation's 150 major employment areas had unemployment rates below 3 percent in March. This is the largest number since the classification system began in mid-1955. It compares with no areas under 3 percent in March 1961. Five areas—Chicago; Detroit; Gary-Hammond, Lorain-Elyria, Ohio; and Wichita—had just joined this honor list in March.

Third. Record incomes for business, for farmers, and for labor have been possible because total output has soared. Not only are we using more of our resources but we are using them more productively.

Total real output of goods and services for the Nation—gross national product in constant prices—as a whole has risen by almost one-third since the first quarter of 1961.

Industrial production—seasonally corrected—in May was 49-percent higher than at the beginning of 1961.

Fourth. Effective Government policies, together with the skill and initiative of business and labor, have made it possible to achieve these gains.

In 1962, 1964, and 1965 taxes were reduced to boost private purchasing power when the growth in spending was lagging behind the Nation's capacity to produce.

Since the middle of last year, the step-up in military spending necessary to meet our commitments in Vietnam has been providing a fiscal stimulus to the economy. Thus, early this year, Congress responded promptly to the President's request for some offsetting tax measures to prevent the economy from overheating. Excise taxes for automobiles and telephone service were reimposed and payments of individual and corporate income taxes were speeded up, and payroll taxes went up as scheduled. Monetary policy is also more restrictive.

These measures will make it possible to maintain a sound expansion with reasonably stable prices. They siphon off funds that would have been evaporated by higher prices rather than cutting into real purchasing power. Despite Vietnam, households' income and consumption will rise to a new record high this year.

After surging ahead in the first quarter, the pace of advance in production and spending has slowed down recently. This is not cause for alarm.

Spending for most consumer goods other than automobiles is still well above a year ago.

Business capital spending plans call for a continued strong advance.

The Government is armed with measures to assure that monetary restraint does not clamp down too hard on housing.

The economic advance is easing to a more healthy and sustainable pace.

Fifth. The strong expansion has not jeopardized other economic objectives.

From 1961 to 1964, the U.S. price record was a grade A performance. Wholesale prices were almost unchanged and consumer prices edged up by only 1.2 percent per year—no faster than in previous periods of economic slack. The record has been blemished since then. But a large part of the rise reflects higher food prices now. Wholesale food prices have declined since February and food prices at the retail level fell in May.

Progress has also been made toward curing the balance of payments problem. The deficit—liquidity basis—was cut in half last year. And despite some overall deterioration in the first quarter of this year, the programs to reduce capital exports are obviously going well and we still had a very large $6 billion surplus—seasonally adjusted annual rate—on goods and services account for the first quarter.

The United States has had a measure of inflation in the past 5 years but the following figures comparing consumer price indexes of this Nation and other major world powers unquestionably shows the relative stability of the U.S. economy. Our prices have gone up less than all other major nations and much less than most.

Consumer price index

	1960	*1966, 1st quarter*
United States	100	108.2
United Kingdom	100	121.4
France	100	122.2
Italy	100	129.4
Germany	100	117.6
Japan	100	139.6
Canada	100	110.9

MOST SIGNIFICANT EFFORT

Perhaps the most significant long-range undertaking of this Nation and this Congress is the war on poverty—the attempt to rescue from despair and degradation the deprived citizens who struggle in the midst of general prosperity.

The war on poverty, after a little more than a year and a half, is one of the most exciting and successful—as well as one of the most controversial—aspects of the President's Great Society program. It is my belief that the remarkable achievements of the war on poverty have received far less attention than they deserve, and are often overlooked in favor of much repeated charges against the program which have generally proven to be unfair, inaccurate, and occasionally irresponsible. Let me try to set the record straight.

In 20 short months, the war on poverty has been transformed from a blueprint into a great national purpose and has been carried from the drawing board into urban and rural slums from coast to coast. Under the direction of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the war against poverty has:

Reached more than 3 million impoverished Americans directly, with jobs, job training, educational programs, and an amazing variety of other services;

Contributed vitally to the emergence of 2.2 million Americans from poverty in 1965;

Created over three quarters of a million part-time and full-time jobs filled exclusively by poor people;

Enrolled 720,000 preschool children in Headstart projects, with an additional 580,000 to participate this summer, resulting in an average IQ increase of from 8 to 10 points and an average boost of 14 months in intellectual capacity, as well as vastly improved health and remarkable personality development among these youngsters;

Provided useful jobs and earnings for more than half a million disadvantaged

teenagers through the Neighborhood Youth Corps;

Approved over 5,680 grants under the community action program to over 950 local antipoverty agencies in all 50 States, and in well over a third of all counties in the United States;

Established over 100 Job Corps centers, where 27,500 of our most terribly disadvantaged teenagers are currently receiving remedial education, job training, counseling, and preparation for useful and productive lives;

Approved 285 VISTA, or Domestic Peace Corps projects in 47 States, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia, in which 2,000 VISTA volunteers from 18 to 80 are serving, with more in training;

Won the involvement of approximately 8,000 residents of impoverished neighborhoods on the governing boards of community action agencies across the country.

Brought forth an absolutely unprecedented outpouring of volunteer effort, including 250,000 Headstart volunteers, approximately 30,000 members of community action boards, 10,000 members of women in community service, and countless doctors, dentists, lawyers, businessmen, religious leaders, and local government officials who are freely and enthusiastically devoting their efforts and skills to the success of the war on poverty.

All across the Nation, exciting and imaginative new programs to help impoverished Americans help themselves have taken hold and are already bearing fruit: This summer, 20,000 promising but economically disadvantaged high school students are participating in Project Upward Bound on the campuses of 200 colleges and universities, beginning a full year of intensive tutoring and special counseling that will enable them to break the cycle of poverty by qualifying for college; 33 foster grandparents projects, which serve the economic needs of low-income elderly persons together with the emotional and psychological needs of the most unfortunate little children in public and private institutions, have won wide acclaim; 105 legal services projects are, for the first time, bringing the majesty of the law into battle on the side of the poor; 63 antipoverty projects for migrant agricultural workers are providing the first avenues of opportunity from the migratory labor streams to the mainstream of American life; and 100 American Indian tribes are vigorously conducting their own wars on poverty as a result of the special attention OEO has given to their problems. In appreciation of this effort, the chairman of the Navajo Tribal Council has called Sargent Shriver "the best friend the Indian has ever had."

In addition, illiterate adults in 45 States are participating in adult basic education programs; work-experience projects are bringing jobs and income to over 100,000 family heads previously on relief; nearly 16,500 antipoverty loans have gone to combat poverty in rural areas; and small business development centers in 46 urban and rural communities have approved approximately $15,650,000 in economic incentive loans to struggling small businesses in poverty neighborhoods.

All this and more has been accomplished in a little over a year and a half under a program that accounts for about 1 cent in each tax dollar, and which is directed by an OEO staff approximating in numbers that which is required by the Air Force to keep a single squadron of B–52's in the air. Our critical friends have spoken of "chaotic administration" in the war on poverty, but I feel that these facts constitute, instead, a tremendous tribute to Sargent Shriver and his staff.

What are some of the other charges opponents of the war on poverty have leveled against it? Let me review the main ones, and comment briefly on each.

JOB CORPS COSTS

The Job Corps has often been attacked as an extravagantly expensive program. Indeed, it is not cheap, but who believes that the ravages of poverty can be cheaply overcome, or that terribly disadvantaged and socially alienated young lives can be transformed at nominal cost? For the fiscal year beginning July 1, it is estimated that 9 months of Job Corps training will cost approximately $5,800 per corpsman, and that 45,000 corpsmen will be enrolled at capacity, including 10,000 young women. The "start-up" costs for many of the Job Corps centers have, during the initial year of operation, been substantially higher than those estimated for the next fiscal year—just as the start-up costs of a college are much higher than in later years. But it is important to keep what we are talking about in perspective. The young men and women in the Job Corps come from the bottom of the barrel, and have had virtually no prior financial investment in their lives. It is estimated that it costs society $100,000 to support an individual on welfare for a lifetime, and $2,000 to $3,000 per year to keep a convicted felon in prison. On the other hand, the value of a high school education may be estimated at $150,000 over a lifetime: If the value of Job Corps education and training is conservatively estimated at $100,000 for a lifetime, the contrast with the price society would eventually have to pay for not investing in the Job Corps comes sharply into focus. Indeed, the average Job Corps graduate, who holds a constructive, permanent job in private industry, can be expected to repay the cost of his training in Federal taxes within a few years of graduation.

JOB CORPS SCREENING AND DISCIPLINE

As might be expected when the most socially alienated and frustrated young people are brought together in a residential program, the Job Corps has experienced a certain degree of anti-social behavior by a minority of corpsmen, and occasionally, serious criminal acts. However, the proportions of most such incidents have been vastly exaggerated or distorted by many critics and certain quarters of the press. The Job Corps is not a finishing school—rather it is a beginning school, for youths who have never before had a fair chance. The remarkable fact is that instances of serious misbehavior have been so few. Job Corps youth fall significantly below national FBI figures for infractions of the law among the 16–21 age group. Statistically, according to the FBI, corpsmen should have had 906 arrests over an 11-month period, but instead had 834; FBI figures warrant the expectation that 80 percent of such offenses would be in serious categories such as assault, larceny, and auto theft, but the Job Corps figure was 50 percent. However you measure it, corpsmen respond better to discipline and public order than many of their more fortunate contemporaries. Most incidents involving corpsmen would get little or no attention if college students or servicemen were involved instead.

But the Job Corps is not taking a lax attitude or slighting its reponsibilities to local peace and order. A great effort is made to maintain discipline—which is often effectively enforced by the corpsmen themselves. The screening of Job Corps enrollees is generally done by local offices of the U. S. Employment Service, and while not every incorrigible youth is weeded out, a very commendable job is being done of selecting young people who can be helped, and who will respond to the opportunity for self-betterment. With every month that passes, this process becomes increasingly effective.

I might say that the faith which American industry obviously has in the Job Corps—as demonstrated by the low-profit Job Corps contracts at major training centers held by such industrial giants as General Electric, IBM, ITT, Westinghouse, and Litton—or their subsidiaries—is a particularly gratifying aspect of the program. These and other great corporations—and their Republican officers and directors—believe the Job Corps to be a success.

PROBLEMS IN THE COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

Critics of the war on poverty often refer to alleged political abuses and scandals in the community action program, but their concerns are largely mythical. In fact, out of more than 950 local antipoverty agencies, most of which have only come into existence since the outset of the war on poverty, only a bare handful have ever been accused of improper use of Federal funds, and less than one-half of 1 percent of antipoverty funds have even come under question, despite the promptest and most thorough system of auditing by OEO in the entire Federal Government. In only one program—that of HARYOU-Act in Harlem—has the misuse of a substantial amount of CAP funds been documented, and that case came to light as a result of an investigation conducted by OEO itself. HARYOU-Act funding was promptly frozen, and will not be restored unless and until OEO is completely satisfied that the conditions which permitted administrative chaos in last summer's crash program have been entirely removed.

As for political abuses, I fear that our Republican friends object to so many Democrats holding local municipal offices more than anything else. For the Economic Opportunity Act makes it clear that whole "communities"—obvi-

ously including local community leadership—are to mobilize their resources for local attacks on poverty. Under normal circumstances, participation by elected local officials is indispensable to an effective antipoverty effort, and indeed the Republican Party has long championed the role of local government. The community action program provides a more crucial role for local initiative, responsibility and leadership than any Federal program I can think or, and the local leadership of Congressman FORD's hometown of Grand Rapids has taken advantage of this to help develop and direct one of the most outstanding and promising antipoverty efforts in the entire State of Michigan.

But OEO has been scrupulous in guarding against local political abuses in CAP, and in fact not one single case of improper political interference with or manipulation of this program has been documented in any form to this date. And while Republicans may be quick to cast innuendoes upon Chicago's war on poverty because of Mayor Daley's energetic role there, they remain silent about the vigorous role the Republican mayor of New York now seeks to play in his city. The truth is that both Mayor Daley and Mayor Lindsay are entirely correct in commiting themselves and their administrations to the success of the war on poverty, and I personally wish Mayor Lindsay as much success as Mayor Daley has had.

WAR ON POVERTY SALARIES

Among the most misleading and specious charges leveled at OEO is the one that antipoverty officials are paid exorbitant salaries, and that little money "trickles down" to the poor. The facts are these:

In fiscal year 1967, an average of 2,275 persons will be employed by OEO, including Washington headquarters and seven regional offices. An average of 4,600 persons will be employed by the programs delegated by OEO to other Federal departments, such as the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, which administer 82 Job Corps conservation centers; Labor, which directs the Neighborhood Youth Corps; and HEW, which administers the work-experience and adult basic education programs. These 6,875 Federal, antipoverty employees will earn an average of $8,192 a year. The OEO personnel, comprising the top directorate of a vast, billion dollar national effort, will earn an average of $9,878. These figures, which represent pay scales established by Congress and budget estimates approved by the Bureau of the Budget, are fully in line with comparable figures for other Federal agencies, and seem quite modest in light of the tremendous responsibilities with which OEO and the delegated programs are charged.

It has been said that many OEO staffers make more than the "base pay" of an Army colonel, and that 25 top OEO officials make more than the "base pay" of General Westmoreland. These statements are both true and meaningless. Military base pay is only a portion of total remuneration, and has no counterpart under the civil service system. An Army colonel who is not a combat officer actually earns over $15,000; about 22 percent of Mr. Shriver's OEO staff will earn $14,600 or over. If the colonel is a combat officer in South Vietnam, he will earn about $17,800. As for General Westmoreland, his total pay comes to $32,775, as a four-star general in a combat area. This is substantially more than any OEO official, including Mr. Shriver, earns, and only Mr. Shriver as the Director of a Federal Agency earns more than a non-combatant general's base pay plus allowances. It should be added, of course, that both civilian and military salaries are established by the Congress. Of the total requested appropriation for fiscal year 1967, 3.2 percent would go for salaries of Federal antipoverty officials: the figure for OEO salaries would be 1.2 percent of the total budget.

As for salaries paid in local antipoverty agencies, about 2.7 percent of all community action agency staff earn in excess of $10,000 and about one-half of 1 percent earn in excess of $15,000.

Maximum salaries approved for any CAA over $10,000 are based on a staff ratio of 1 to 20; salaries for professional staff earning over $15,000 are justified only on a ratio of 1 to 100. This is so despite the fact that the most talented and dedicated leadership is required for an effective local program—which may involve the administration of millions of dollars and hundreds of professional and nonprofessional personnel. Local CAP salaries generally average $3,000 less than comparable private community service posts and substantially less than comparable public offices. About 5 percent of obligated CAP funds go to pay the salaries of local CAA staffs, whereas 24 percent of such funds go directly to pay the salaries of poor people who have been employed in nonprofessional antipoverty jobs.

INVOLVEMENT OF THE POOR

Some critics have made the incredible charge that the poor are not being truly "involved" in the war on poverty, as the act directs. This charge flies in the face of the fact that 25 percent of all positions on the governing boards of antipoverty agencies are filled by the poor—about 8,000 of about 30,000 positions—and that these individuals are making enthusiastic and vital contributions to the growing success of local attacks on poverty. Twenty-eight of the most effective local representatives of the poor serve as members of an active national advisory council to OEO. And tens of thousands of the poor are deeply involved in the lower echelons, such as advisory boards and neighborhood councils. The fact is that the poor are genuinely and profoundly involved in the war on poverty, and deeply committed to its success.

HEADSTART BUREAUCRACY

Despite the overwhelming and amazing success of the Headstart program—which will have immensely benefited an estimated 1,300,000 disadvantaged preschool children—and their parents—by the end of this summer—some critics have been heard to bewail Headstart "bureaucracy" and "red tape." This is a peculiar way to comment upon a program which in a half-year went from nothing to become one of the most popular and successful Federal efforts in history. While a few unfortunate cases of delay and frustration have inevitably occurred among the thousands and thousands of headstart applications filed since the program's inception, it is noteworthy that local school systems, educators, and child psychologists—as well as politicians—predominate among Headstart enthusiasts. And economically and culturally deprived parents of Headstart youngsters are the greatest boosters of all. One of the most striking facts about criticism of the war on poverty has been its obsession with myth and fantasy. Consider the following oft-repeated charges, and how foolish they seem in light of the truth:

First. The charge that antipoverty funds had been awarded to such wealthy communities as Beverly Hills, Calif., and Garden City, N.Y. In fact, OEO has never even considered awarding funds to these communities.

Second. The charge that OEO awarded funds to a Minnesota community for a swimming pool. In fact, OEO promptly rejected, and never considered approving, an application for such a project.

Third. The charge that OEO funds were used to rent tuxedos for poor high school boys in Dos Palos, Calif. In fact, not one dime of OEO funds has ever been used or considered for such a project.

Fourth. The charge that OEO money was paying for ballet lessons for youngsters in a midwestern community. In fact, OEO rejected a request for such funds when it turned up as a small component in an application for a local antipoverty program.

Fifth. The charge that OEO had flown 40 job corpsmen from Hawaii to California so that they could help harvest asparagus. This also was totally false.

Sixth. The charge, just recently made, that OEO had increased its personnel by 10 percent in April and May. In fact, 116 of 205 new employees were hired on a temporary basis to assist in handling the tremendous flood of Headstart applications for this summer's massive program, and all 116 were employed in regional offices rather than OEO headquarters. Not one was hired on a permanent basis. The other 89 new employees were hired to replace former employees or to fill positions approved long ago by the Bureau of the Budget.

Seventh. The charge that nearly 70 percent of an OEO grant to Gum Springs, Va., went for salaries and the rest to the poor. In fact, the vast preponderance of that 70 percent went for salaries to poor residents of Gum Springs who were employed—often for the first time—as nonprofessional staff under that program.

All of these false and frivolous charges and others like them have received great attention—sometimes to the point of sensation—from less responsible press sources and many of our Republican friends, who breathlessly revealed these war on poverty vignettes as shocking scandals.

SPEECH BY HON. ROBERT T. MURPHY TO AMERICAN SOCIETY OF TRAVEL AGENTS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by the Honorable Robert T. Murphy, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, at a luncheon of the American Society of Travel Agents, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., June 23, 1966:

It is a distinct pleasure and privilege to join you, the members of the Board of Directors of the American Society of Travel Agents, and your other distinguished guests in paying tribute to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, the noted Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, for his outstanding leadership in encouraging the development of travel and tourism and promoting the welfare of the travel agency industry. Certainly, there is no person in the Congress or in the Country more deserving of this award.

As some of you know, I had the good fortune to work closely with Senator MAGNUSON for some years as a member of the staff of the Senate Commerce Committee prior to my service on the Civil Aeronautics Board. Consequently, I have firsthand knowledge of his constant and ardent support of the development of air transportation as well as some of the many specific contributions which he has made to the establishment and maintenance of a sound national transportation system in all its facets and all its modes, including water, rail and surface, as well as air. One impressive example of his personal achievement in the field of your special interest is the creation of the United States Travel Service which is directly and wholly attributable to Senator MAGNUSON's legislative leadership. Clearly, as a man of vision, he was years ahead of all of us in his insistence upon the beginning of some sound Federal interest in the promotion of travel to the United States with proper emphasis upon the monetary benefits which would result from such an organized promotional effort.

Aviation and the air transport industry in particular, is greatly indebted to him not only for his active aid and assistance on legislative matters lodged in the Senate Commerce Committee, but also for his invaluable help and assiduous support in the Senate Appropriations Committee where the funding of aviation programs must be authorized in order to be effectively implemented.

The scope of the jurisdiction of the Senate Commerce Committee is of such magnitude and the volume of its business so great as to impose a very heavy burden of responsibility upon its Chairman—a responsibility which has been discharged with fidelity to the public interest and with courtesy to all who come before it. As many of you know, the Committee is responsible for the legislative review, not only of the work of all of the transportation agencies and commissions, but also for the functioning of almost all of the Federal regulatory agencies, including the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission, among others. Certainly, no other man in the Country has a more intimate knowledge of this whole wide spectrum of Federal administrative law, including all aspects of transportation law, than your distinguished guest of honor today. Yet, he has always found the time to devote his energies to important work on other committees, including the Appropriations Committee and the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, without compromising his effective leadership in all matters of prime concern and importance to the many subcommittees of the Senate Commerce Committee. In him we have not only a supervisor, but a friend and loyal supporter as well. I am very happy, indeed, to say that our distinguished Chairman, Charles S. Murphy, and my colleagues, Joe Minetti, Whitney Gillilland and John Adams have asked me to especially convey their very warm and affectionate regards to him as well as our congratulations to the ASTA Board of Directors for their perspicacity in selecting him for this special citation of merit.

I have no intention of indulging in any lengthy speech which might otherwise mar what has been a very pleasant occasion. But I know that some remarks are expected and I assume I would be derelict in accepting your hospitality were I not to make some few brief comments.

It is particularly gratifying for those of us in Government to note that one of the chief purposes of your present meetings here in Washington is in connection with the promotion of the "Visit U.S.A." and "Discover America" programs—programs which are clearly in keeping with the President's desire to alleviate the balance of payments deficiency in the field of travel and tourism. During a period of relatively high disposable income those of us interested in air transportation should devote every effort to making available to more of our foreign friends, as well as our own citizens, the special attractions of natural beauty, culture and climate which are found in such wide variety within the United States. At the present time an appropriately priced and appropriately packaged air transportation product can be sold to an increasing percentage of the tourist market. Stimulating this vacation travel market is particularly within your competence and ability and, clearly, you have a unique role to play with respect to it. All of us commend your efforts in this promotional endeavor and trust that your further concentration on this subject at the forthcoming Annual Meeting in Seattle will be highly productive.

Of course, we are aware of some special problems, the resolution of which would most likely facilitate your promotional efforts in selling America to more and more of your clients. Recently, our able Chairman, Charles Murphy, gave some very direct and interesting comments on these problems during the course of his testimony before the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives in which he noted the special desire and interest of the Board in assisting in the resolution of them. I am sure that most of you are familiar with the views he expressed regarding the level of commissions in domestic and international travel and the feasibility of working out an accepable system for the allocation of free or reduced rate transportation so that the incentives for travel agency activity in the sale of domestic transportation can be at least as favorable as those which exist for the sale of international transportation. Hopefully, your recently launched and jointly financed study of the role of the travel agent in the merchandising of air travel will provide us with a better understanding and appreciation of how some of these matters can be resolved in the overall public and national interest.

In this connection, let me say that all of us are pleased with the continuing dialogue between the carriers and yourselves and the better rapport which has been achieved during the past few years through these mutual exchanges of views. If the carriers and the agents can achieve a satisfactory ordering of their respective interests, such a result would be preferable to requiring the Board to impose its own judgment in these matters. Naturally, we are ready and willing to exercise the responsibility delegated to us by the Congress in passing upon the Air Traffic Conference and International Air Transport Association agency resolutions, but we are also desirous that you seek to achieve mutually satisfactory agreements with the carriers in the first instance.

As Senator MAGNUSON would say in guiding a bill through Committee, "This may require a little giving as well as taking."

I think it is fair to say that the Board is quite desirous to solicit the good will and the support of this Society and that of the carriers in coordinating every effort to alleviate the balance of payments deficiency in the area our tourism and, thus, implement the President's program along these lines. You may be assured that every consideration will be given to reasoned positions of the travel agents in resolving this important public issue.

Finally, let me say that, in my judgment, this Society has served a very useful function in bringing to bear on carrier-agent problems a degree of statesman-like leadership so that there has been a steady improvement in the past few years in that relationship which is so important to the whole air transportation industry. This has been particularly gratifying to the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Society, also, has intervened in a number of important cases at the Board and we have come to value its views and to accord great weight to its evidence in the record. While we know that there are some pending problems of rather major and intricate proportions, I venture the hope that with your continued good sense and good will these will be resolved without acrimony and in the overall national interest.

I compliment you for your achievements and thank you most sincerely for your kind invitation to participate in this special luncheon honoring Senator MAGNUSON today.

MEETING THE MEDICARE CHALLENGE IN AMERICAN HOSPITALS

Mr. PATTEN. 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Emergency Hospital Assistance Act of 1966 to meet the grave challenge facing American hospitals as medicare goes into effect next month.

Hospitals across the Nation are bracing for a surge of patients as senior citizens take advantage of the new Federal provisions to obtain needed medical care and treatment. Many institutions have asked doctors to postpone low-priority admissions for non-emergency treatment; others are crowding additional beds into already overburdened facilities to prepare for the demand.

However, a number of communities throughout the United States are already grappling with a grave crisis due to the lack of adequate hospital bed space and related facilities. For these hospitals, July 1 and medicare threaten disaster and there are no remedies at hand.

The Division of Medical Care Administration of the Public Health Service recently conducted a survey of public and nonprofit private hospitals in the United States. This survey, which I am submitting for the record, reveals that 143 hospitals serving 97 communities in 29 States and Puerto Rico are in the critical category and their situation cannot be remedied by existing State or Federal aid programs.

This is the situation on the eve of medicare:

First. Of the 97 communities facing a critical shortage of hospital facilities, 39 are served by hospitals now maintaining an average annual occupancy rate in excess of 95 percent—of these, 19 average 100-percent occupancy or more. It should be noted that, in order to maintain an annual average of 95 percent, a hospital must have long periods during the year in which occupancy exceeds 100 percent. In fact, one hospital reporting an average annual occupancy rate of 92 percent also notes a number of months when the occupancy rate rose above 120 percent.

Second. There are 58 communities served by 101 hospitals with an average annual occupancy rate of between 90 and 95 percent.

By contrast, the American Hospital Association reports that the national average hospital occupancy rate runs about 76 percent.

The Bureau of Hospital Insurance, which administers the medicare program for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, estimates that some 3,820,000 people over age 65 will require hospital care in the first year of the program. This figure does not include an estimated 580,000 additional patients who will be using various outpatient and clinical facilities. As a matter of fact, 160,000 people are already scheduled for hospitalization under medicare and the program is not even in effect yet. In many cases, the greatest demand will occur in the very areas where hospital facilities are already dangerously overcrowded.

The Public Health Service survey indicates that an emergency program of expansion to add approximately 3,000 new beds to the existing facilities of these 143 critical hospitals would permit the treatment of more than 150,000 new patients and would alleviate the immediate threat. Such a program would not provide a long-range answer to the Nation's hospital problem, but it would enable these hospitals to rise above the critical level and offer adequate service to their respective communities.

Existing programs of Federal aid are not geared to meet this kind of emergency situation. Even if Federal funds were available, few of the 143 critical hospitals could use them since they lack the financial resources to raise the required non-Federal portion of the construction costs. Many of the communities have already exhausted their resources in earlier Hill-Burton-assisted hospital construction projects for which they are still paying.

An emergency program of Federal assistance is needed to bring the hospitals above the critical level. To be effective such a program should be direct, in order to reach the threatened hospitals quickly, and flexible, to meet the complex financial problems of the needy communities.

The Emergency Hospital Assistance Act of 1966 would meet this challenge by offering a balanced program of direct grants and loans, administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The bill would authorize the Secretary to make grants of up to 66⅔ percent of the cost of expansion or renovation to provide new bed space and related facilities. This grant program is patterned after the successful Hill-Burton formula except that aid would be given directly to the hospital by the Federal Government, instead of being distributed by the States. Also, certain types of renovation projects not covered by Hill-Burton would be permitted. The intent of the legislation is expressly not to supplant the Hill-Burton program, but to correct an emergency situation with a single short-term infusion of Federal assistance and without embarking on a massive continuing new Federal spending program during this time of severe inflationary pressures. A total of $40 million is authorized to be appropriated for grants.

To meet the needs of those hospitals serving communities without adequate financial resources to put up the remaining 33⅓ percent non-Federal portion, the act authorizes the Secretary to make long-term, low-interest loans of up to 90 percent of the non-Federal share of the construction cost. Interest on these loans shall be charged at 2.5 percent and the hospital would have up to 50 years to repay. A total of $18 million is authorized for this part of the program.

These authorizations are adequate for the emergency situation we face today.

The Public Health Service reports that it costs between $10,000 and $30,000 per bed to construct additions to existing hospitals, depending upon the location and the adequacy of supporting facilities such as laboratories, kitchens, operating rooms, and the like. The survey of the needs of the critical hospitals indicates that an average expenditure of $20,000 per bed would meet the immediate need.

Under this combined grant and loan program, a hospital need only raise $667 in order to start construction on a $20,000 project to add one bed. The cost to the community of repaying the $6,000 loan over a 50-year period at 2.5-percent interest is minimal.

It is important to note that the cost of constructing complete new hospitals is substantially greater than the proposed program of expansion and renovation of existing facilities.

The Emergency Hospital Assistance Act will make it possible to avoid disaster but it is not intended to provide a solution to our growing medical facilities crisis.

CRITICAL HOSPITALS IN THE UNITED STATES

A survey of public and nonprofit private hospitals in the United States, prepared by the Division of Medical Care Administration of the Public Health Service showing that 143 hospitals serving 97 communities in 30 States cannot meet the expected demand for hospital beds by medicare recipients, follows:

State and county	Number of hospitals	Number of beds	Average daily census	Percent occupancy	Percent [1] medicare recipients	Rank
Alabama: Shelby	1	55	55	100.00	8.5	18
Arkansas: Ouachita	1	156	156	100.00	9.4	16
Florida:						
Okeechobee	1	25	25	100.00	6.4	15
Washington	1	52	52	100.00	11.0	19
Georgia:						
Bulloch	1	94	93	98.94	8.0	88
Camden	1	25	24	96.00	5.3	46
Cobb	1	280	266	95.00	4.8	59
Gwinnett	3	86	86	100.00	7.1	10
Houston	1	53	53	100.00	3.2	11
Laurens	1	100	97	97.00	8.4	34
Wayne	1	74	73	98.65	5.8	32
Iowa:						
Clarke	1	32	31	96.88	16.8	25
Dallas	1	16	16	100.00	14.6	9
Palo Alto	1	45	43	95.56	11.5	36
Kansas:						
Allen	1	42	42	100.00	17.5	6
Grant	1	37	36	97.30	4.4	82
Marshall	1	36	36	100.00	17.1	12
Kentucky:						
Allen	1	46	45	97.83	14.1	22
Caldwell	1	39	42	107.69	14.8	1
Laurel	1	28	31	110.71	9.8	3
Louisiana:						
Sabine	1	32	31	96.88	11.8	20
St. Tammany	2	104	108	103.85	8.2	2
Terrebonne	1	100	103	103.00	4.9	4
Maryland: Calvert	1	67	64	95.52	7.9	56
Minnesota: Carlton	1	22	22	100.00	10.5	7
Missouri: Dade	1	26	25	96.15	18.2	26
North Dakota: Towner	1	26	25	96.15	9.3	50
Ohio: Adams	1	54	54	100.00	14.3	5
South Carolina: Bamburg	1	55	53	96.36	8.3	40
South Dakota: Bon Homme	1	21	20	95.24	13.5	27
Tennessee:						
Cumberland	1	75	75	100.00	9.2	8
Monroe	1	40	40	100.00	9.2	14
Rutherford	1	111	109	98.20	7.7	21
Sequatchie	1	30	29	96.67	8.7	49
Williamson	1	50	48	96.00	9.5	28
Wilson	1	74	71	95.95	11.5	30
West Virginia:						
Mineral	1	63	63	100.00	9.5	13
Wyoming	1	60	59	98.33	4.7	23
Wisconsin: Pepin	1	35	35	100.00	13.3	17
Alabama:						
Franklin	1	74	67	90.54	10.2	69
Russell	1	128	119	92.97	6.7	66
Tuscaloosa	1	363	327	90.08	7.9	79
California: Siskiyou	2	148	137	92.57	9.4	72
Florida:						
Columbia	2	103	93	90.29	8.7	37
Santa Rosa	1	81	75	92.59	5.5	70
Georgia:						
Glynn	1	162	151	93.21	5.9	84
Muscogee	2	436	395	90.60	4.7	89

See footnotes at end of table.

State and county	Number of hospitals	Number of beds	Average daily census	Percent occupancy	Percent [1] medicare recipients	Rank
Georgia—Continued						
Peach	1	46	42	91.30	7.6	77
Rabun	1	32	29	90.63	9.7	78
Illinois:						
Montgomery	1	68	62	91.18	16.0	35
Rock Island	3	713	660	92.57	10.1	73
Woodford	1	31	29	93.55	11.4	92
Indiana:						
Clark	1	173	157	90.75	7.2	75
Hendricks	1	70	65	92.86	7.9	41
Jefferson	1	70	64	91.43	12.6	52
Monroe	1	120	111	92.50	7.2	53
Orange	1	36	34	94.44	13.2	29
Porter	1	230	207	90.00	7.2	90
Starke	1	31	29	93.55	12.0	31
Tipton	1	79	74	93.67	11.9	65
Iowa: Davis	1	74	68	91.89	14.8	85
Kentucky: Letcher	2	118	107	90.68	6.7	91
Michigan:						
Oakland	3	712	672	94.38	5.5	33
Ogemaw	1	50	46	92.00	13.3	67
Ontonagon	1	37	34	91.89	10.7	63
Mississippi:						
Jasper	1	30	27	90.00	10.0	44
Pontotoc	1	60	56	93.33	12.1	51
Missouri:						
Grundy	1	52	49	94.23	20.2	37
St. Charles	1	175	161	92.00	7.3	76
New Jersey: Ocean	3	371	338	91.11	11.8	60
New York:						
Jefferson	3	444	414	93.24	12.4	64
Putnam	1	51	47	92.16	9.9	38
North Carolina:						
Avery	2	135	122	90.37	8.8	94
Davie	1	35	33	94.29	9.0	39
Ohio:						
Fayette	1	68	63	92.65	12.2	42
Hancock	1	170	155	91.18	11.0	62
Jefferson	3	413	392	94.92	9.3	57
Lucas	8	2,212	2,021	91.37	9.8	81
Summit	4	1,610	1,463	90.87	8.2	74
Trumbull	2	479	442	92.28	7.9	55
Oklahoma:						
Cleveland	1	100	90	90.00	8.6	58
Garvin	1	26	24	92.31	10.9	29
Puerto Rico: [2]						
Ponce	4	796	718	90.20	5.6	
San Juan	8	1,482	1,375	92.78	5.0	
Tennessee:						
Bradley	1	152	140	92.11	7.3	80
Gibson	3	139	129	92.81	12.4	43
Texas:						
Hopkin	1	65	59	90.77	16.1	48
Webb	1	150	142	94.67	6.5	45
Virginia:						
Fairfax	1	282	258	91.49	2.8	68
Prince George	1	80	72	90.00	2.9	95
Princess Anne	1	50	45	90.00	3.4	47
Roanoke	5	969	919	94.84	7.5	93
Washington: Jefferson	1	57	52	91.23	11.1	86
West Virginia:						
Hancock	1	175	163	93.14	7.1	83
Summers	1	85	79	92.94	11.7	71
Taylor	1	52	47	90.38	13.6	61
Wisconsin: Monroe	2	94	85	90.43	12.5	54

[1] Communities ranked in order of expected difficulty in meeting increased demands for hospital bed space and related facilities based upon the ratio of available beds and the percentage of medicare recipients in the community. All hospitals reported average daily occupancy rates of 90 percent or higher over the past year. Lowest rank—greatest difficulty in meeting increased demand.

[2] Not ranked but listed as critical.

ANOTHER SUCCESSFUL LAUNCH IN THE FAMILY OF ORBITING GEOPHYSICAL OBSERVATORIES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the period recently past has been a time of high adventure in space for the United States. We have been witness to another successful launch in the family of orbiting geophysical observatories—this one carrying 21 experiments out as far as 76,000 miles from earth to investigate portions of the earth's environment never before studied. We followed the flight of Gemini 9, shared the astronauts' frustrations and their triumphs.

I am sure you were as elated as I with the amazing success of the Titan III launch of our Department of Defense communications satellite system—eight relay stations in space from the power of one rocket—and of the first Surveyor flight. The specialists working on the Surveyor project are reported to have estimated the odds against accomplishing a soft landing on the first attempt at better than 100 to 1. Yet it was achieved and Surveyor's camera has sent back more than 10,000 photos of the moon's surface. The detail of these pictures show objects as small as a twentieth of an inch can be seen. Remarkable as these pictures are, it is perhaps more important that Surveyor has validated the concept that is under development for a manned lunar landing and ends doubt about the adequacy of the bearing strength of the lunar surface for the manned mission.

These dramatic successes confirm me in my belief that the exploration of space is one of the most rewarding and exciting programs ever undertaken by the United States. It has challenged our imagination, developed our resources in manpower and material, and reaped rewards not only to our citizens but to people the world over. It has strengthened our defense and contributed to the peace of the world. And we are still very early in the growing stage. The future is unlimited.

Our space program is certainly one of the most successful of the wide-ranging and constructive undertakings in our history. We cannot jeopardize its future or allow it to falter.

Satellites provide instantaneous communication over vast portions of the globe, promote our defense, and further the cause of understanding between nations. Weather satellites photograph cloud cover all over the world and make the meteorological information available to all nations. Scientific satellites return information about the universe that man has sought throughout history and enlarge our knowledge not only of the sun and stars and planets, but of our own earth and immediate environment. Man himself, in our manned space program, has at last ventured away from his gravity-bound existence.

The space program has provided work for 400,000 men and women working in 20,000 plants across the country.

In my own State of Louisiana, the development of the Saturn facilities at Michoud has proved of the greatest importance to the economy of the State. The plant there that had built boats and other war items during World War II and tank engines during the Korean conflict had largely been idle since 1954. It was acquired for NASA at no cost to the Government, and using it represented great savings in taxpayers' dollars. Today Michoud is a vital part of our program to reach out in space as far as the moon. Not only has it provided work for nearly 10,000 people, but it has attracted the kind of employees that today's economy, oriented to science and technology, requires. It has created thousands of other jobs for all of the service personnel required by this employment—for homebuilders, storekeepers, and schoolteachers. Space agency contracts amounted to more than $355 million in Louisiana in 1965.

All of the Deep South has benefited from the space program—indeed, the area stretching from Houston, Tex., to Cape Kennedy, Fla., has come to be known as the Space Crescent.

Our conquest of space is a tribute to the economic and political system of the United States and the American way of life.

We responded to the challenge of sputnik with Explorer I. We countered Gagarin with Glenn, Leonov with White, and Luna IX with Surveyor.

We have an edge on the Soviet Union in many regards. We have chalked up more man-hours in space. We have had a high degree of success with our planetary probes and scientific satellites. But we have no reason for complacency. Our position as leader of the free world demands that we forge ahead at a pace consistent with our needs and our resources.

President Johnson prepared an austere budget for the space agency. He pared it down from an already tight request prepared at NASA after much painful scrutiny.

The request for funds for fiscal 1967 was $5.012 billion—down $163 million from the $5.175 billion of fiscal 1966.

NASA under this request is being asked to do as much or more than in the past, with less money. Less funds put strong pressures on the core of NASA's effectiveness, its dedicated personnel that man the centers and laboratories and facilities that make our participation in the space age possible.

The program as presented allows no margin for insurance, and no room for error. Surely no businessman would invest tens of thousands of dollars in a locomotive and then allow it to rust in the yards for lack of a $5 part. Neither can we invest tens of billions in a space program and leave it to falter for the lack of funds.

We cannot put important elements of our capability into mothballs. We must use it or see it rust. Retrenchment puts us in the danger of seeing the Soviet program surge past us again as it did in 1957. If we cut back we may not be able to develop the scientific information and advanced technology required for the needs of U.S. industry and Government. Critical reduction in funds will not allow us to continue to energize large segments of the scientific community or bring our resources to bear on the critical problems of the modern world.

It is likely that any major setbacks at this point, or any cut below the present frugal level of funding, would require an assessment of all of our target dates, not only for the lunar mission in manned flight, but for a host of other highly important unmanned projects.

Weather information from space can be increased until it will be possible to program the earth's entire atmosphere on a computer and to make long-range weather forecasts for the entire world.

Some inkling of the importance of weather forecasting can be gathered if you consider that it has been estimated that the construction industry in the United States could save up to $1 billion a year by using the weather information now available. Consider how much more can be saved as our weather-forecasting tools improve.

Multipurpose communications stations can provide TV and radio broadcasting to the entire world. Satellites can serve as control towers in space to handle the increasing speed and volume of traffic on the world's airways. Satellites show promise in such various areas as oceanography, studying water resources, and detecting diseased areas of forests.

I do not believe that anyone can predict or even imagine the uses to which our space program can be put to improve the lot of mankind.

We can move ahead with our space program toward these goals only if we make a prudent investment. And President Johnson's request for funds for 1967 is indeed prudent. The Congress would be shortsighted in the extreme if it failed to meet these minimum needs to carry our space program forward.

FREE ELECTIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution identical to that sponsored by my very able colleague, Congressman ROBERT E. SWEENEY, to express the sense of the House of Representatives in support of free elections in South Vietnam and to urge the sponsorship of these elections under an impartial international body.

A critical look at the current situation in Vietnam can only relay to us a feeling of caution regarding the meaningfulness of the election in September. In any nation when leaders are chosen by the electoral process, there needs to be a basic stability, a culture which supports the ideals and mechanisms of representative government. In a time of internal turmoil, in a nation which has a previous history of subverted elections, it is naive to expect an election to be a fair reflection of the desires of the people.

International supervision of the elections in South Vietnam is of utmost import, therefore, as at least a partial balance to other factors jeopardizing this effort to create a more popularly based civilian government. A serious obstacle is evident in the events of recent weeks in Hue, Danang, and Saigon. The suppression and arrests of Buddhist leaders by the Ky government forecasts little likelihood that the dissent which exists will be allowed and expressed. Difficulties exist as well in the South Vietnamese election law. Candidates are denied the right to campaign as an organized slate. In some situations, the same representation would be given districts with 25,000 people as districts with 125,000 people.

Neither is Vietnam's past experience with the electoral process encouraging. Eleven previous time, the people of Vietnam have participated in elections which have been corrupted and manipulated to insure a particular result. To call for elections means nothing if what follows is a hollow mockery of the entire process. The inevitable consequence is a cynical distrust and confusion and, moreover, an understandable refusal to accept the results.

The opportunity lies ahead. Under the circumstances which I have discussed, there is no guarantee that the election will be a fair reflection of Vietnamese thinking. There is no guarantee that it will not. However, the probability of fair elections is enhanced with supervision by an international body such as the United Nations and I urge that we take action to support as a collective body this course of action.

ON THE PASSING OF EDWARD J. REARDON

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to inform my colleagues that last week Edward J. Reardon passed away. Ed Reardon was for many years a respected member of the House press corps and was a beloved figure in the Capitol. He possessed unusual integrity and was a newspaperman's newspaperman.

The core of Ed Reardon's work was fairness and honesty. He never broke a confidence and he never wielded a poison pen.

Ed reported the news in such a way that the public could always depend on the truth of his reports and on the decency of his motives.

He served the Herald News, which is published in the congressional district which I represent, faithfully, and I am sure that he will be missed by his many friends on the staff of that fine newspaper.

I personally have lost a dear friend whom I shall never forget, and whose memory I will always revere.

INDEPENDENCE DAY—MALAGASY REPUBLIC

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the Malagasy Republic celebrates its sixth anniversary today as an independent nation. This day is indeed a proud and an important one in the colorful history of this island country. The people of the United States are proud to join with the many friends of the Malagasy Republic in paying tribute to the Malagasy people and government on the joyous and memorable occasion. To His Excellency, President Philibert Tsirana and His Excellency, Mr. Louis Rakotamalala, Ambassador to the United States, I wish to extend warm congratulations and best wishes for continued progress.

The Malagasy Republic, formerly Madagascar, is not a new country to the people of the United States. Trading first took place between the two countries during the last years of the 18th century when an American buccaneer ship brought the first Malagasy rice to the State of North Carolina. Some 30 years later, our first American "ambassador", Trader Marks conducted a lively trade in Malagasy goods. His small trading operation was to herald the increased commerce between the two countries. In 1881, Malagasy and the United States signed a treaty of commerce and friendship. Today, the United States continues a close trade association with Malagasy. As Malagasy's second best customer, the United States purchases almost 18 percent of her exports.

However, the interest of the United States in the Malagasy Republic is not limited to the area of trade. Although, American investment is not large, substantial amounts of U.S. technical and economic aid demonstrates the strong American concern for this developing country. In agreement with the Malagasy Government, a strategic tracking and data gathering station, part of the American space program, has been built by the United States on Madagascar island.

The island of Madagascar, fourth largest island in the world and four other small islands comprise the Malagasy Republic. They are located in the Indian Ocean 250 miles across the Mozambique Channel from the southeast coast of Africa. More than 6 million people make up the 18 different ethnic groups. The Merina closely resemble the first non-African inhabitants of the island and are thought to have come from the southwest Pacific area several centures after the birth of Christ. They hold leadership positions in the Government and professions. President Tsirana belongs to the Côtiers, a coastal people who are an admixture of Arab and Negroid blood. In addition, the large number of Indians, Chinese and Indonesians who have settled in Malagasy make this island nation truly "Afro-Asian." The language spoken throughout the republic is of Malayo-Polynesian origin.

The economy of Malagasy is heavily agricultural with such principal crops as sugar, manioc, coffee, tobacco, and vanilla. Several disadvantages such as shortage of skilled technicians and low world market prices for Malagasy have restricted the expansion of the economy. To meet this crucial problem, the Government has initiated a new 5-year plan that emphasizes commercialization of agricultural production in livestock, sugar and coffee, and so forth. The United States in accordance with these goals will provide aid for agricultural expansion, police communications, maintenance of roadbuilding, and ground water development.

The United States is very proud of its long tradition of friendship with the people of Malagasy and we look forward to the continuing growth of friendly relations between our two countries. We are also proud of the steady, deliberate progress that is taking place in Malagasy and again wish the people and leaders of Malagasy continued success and prosperity as they celebrate this historic occasion.

EQUALIZATION OF MILITARY RETIREMENT PAY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining a number of my colleagues in introducing legislation to correct a gross inequity in the pay of men and women who served this country bravely and well and have now retired from the military service. My bill would amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of all members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service.

Under present legislation, Mr. Speaker, military personnel who retired prior to 1962 are being deprived of the benefits of three pay raises which have been given to the military since 1962. Certainly the cost-of-living increases which brought about this increase in pay scales have had the same effect upon retired military people as upon those who remained in service, or those who retired later, with higher retirement pay.

The legislation which I have introduced would recompute the pay of military personnel who retired without the benefit of these recent increases. Even though their service may have been as long, and their rank as high, they are now paid considerably less than those who have retired under higher pay scales. Many of the military personnal who will benefit from this legislation are veterans of both World War II and Korea.

Many of them have chosen my west Texas district as the place of their retirement, and I would like to join in urging the approval by this Congress of legislation which will show our appreciation in a most practical manner.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the Members of the House that tomorrow the continuing appropriations resolution will be called up, and also the four bills previously announced from the Committee on Armed Services: H.R. 5256, H.R. 14741, H.R. 15005, and H.R. 12615.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DE LA GARZA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the remainder of the week, on account of death in the family.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for June 28 through June 30, on account of official business.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Georgia), effective today, on account of advice of Capitol physician.

Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of illness in his family.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. MAILLIARD, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. HICKS (at the request of Mr. ADAMS), for June 27 and 28, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on account of legal business in Erie, Pa.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROUSH, for 60 minutes, May 28, 1966.

Mr. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, May 28, 1966; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALBERT, for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SWEENEY (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 30 minutes, on June 29, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 30 minutes, on June 28, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURPHY of New York (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 60 minutes, on July 12, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McGRATH (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 60 minutes, on July 12, 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:

Mr. WHITENER to revise and extend his remarks on H.R. 15858 and to include a letter from the National Capital Planning Commission.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM to include extraneous material in remarks made during debate on H.R. 14904.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOLE.

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. CAHILL.

(The following Members and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CRALEY.

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. DYAL.

Mr. ULLMAN in two instances.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER.

Mr. TENZER.

Mr. LOVE.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were

taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3005. An act to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce accidents involving motor vehicles and to reduce the deaths and injuries occurring in such accidents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3484. An act to amend the act of June 3, 1966 (Public Law 89-441, 80 Stat. 192), relating to the Great Salt Lake relicted lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol"; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3368. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve Banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury.

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. 136. An act to amend sections 1, 17a, 64a(5), 67(b), 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13431. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; and

H.R. 13822. An act to provide for an additional Assistant Postmaster General to further the research and development and construction engineering programs of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1582. An act to remove a restriction on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of California;

H.R. 3438. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy;

H.R. 7371. An act to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956;

H.R. 10721. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to improve its benefits, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12270. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the 12th Boy Scouts World Jamboree and 21st Boy Scouts World Conference to be held in the United States of America in 1967, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 28, 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:

2514. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting reports of violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679(1)(2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2515. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to except real property owned by the Government of New Zealand from the provisions of certain laws regulating the locations of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2516. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the fourth semiannual report on the problem of air pollution caused by motor vehicles, and measures taken toward its alleviation, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-272; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2517. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 12, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Rockport Harbor, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 16, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

2518. Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting the 14th report to Congress on U.S. contributions to international organizations, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 81-806 (H. Doc. No. 455); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2519. Chairman, National Commission on Food Marketing, transmitting a report on the structure and performance of the Nation's food marketing system, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-354; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2520. Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on a proposed Presidential archival depository to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, pursuant to the provisions of section 507(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2521. Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to cancel certain unpaid interest accrued after September 30, 1931, on loans made to World War I veterans upon the security of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 23, 1966, the following bills were reported on June 24, 1966:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 15941. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 8337. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 10823. A bill relating to credit life insurance and credit health and accident insurance with respect to student loans; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia: H.R. 12119. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to reconstruct the substructure and to replace the superstructure of the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 15857. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1656). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 15858. A bill to amend section 6 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, to authorize early land acquisition for the purpose of acquiring a site for a replacement of Shaw Junior High School; without amendment (Rept. No. 1657). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 15860. A bill to establish the District of Columbia Bail Agency, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 1178. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 93d annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, D.C., in July 1967, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1967, Inc., on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 5426. A bill to provide that common-law marriages may not be contracted in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 1660). Referred to the House Calendar.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 23, 1966, the following bill was reported on June 25, 1966:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2934. An act to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts approved by the Secretary of Agriculture; with amendments (Rept. No. 1661). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted June 27, 1966*]

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. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.J. Res. 1180. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1967, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1662). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report entitled "Coast Guard Examination of Foreign Passenger Vessels," 33d report; without amendment (Rept. No. 1663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report entitled "Federal Research and Development Programs: the Decisionmaking Process," 34th report; without amendment (Rept. No. 1664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FOLEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2623. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Pig War National Historical Park in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1665). 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. 14875. A bill to amend section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, and other laws, to authorize members of the uniformed services who are on duty outside the United States or its possessions to deposit their savings with a uniformed service, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1666). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 895. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5256, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 1667). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 896. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12615, a bill to amend sections 404(d) and 408 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize members of the uniformed services to be reimbursed under certain circumstances for the actual cost of parking fees, ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls; without amendment (Rept. No. 1668). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 897. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14741, a bill to authorize an increase in the number of Marine Corps officers who may serve in the combined grades of brigadier general and major general; without amendment (Rept. No. 1669). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 898. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 15005, to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove inequities in the active duty promotion opportunities of certain officers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1670). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13125. A bill to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1671). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 23, 1966, the following bill was introduced on June 24, 1966:

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 15941. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

[*Submitted June 27, 1966*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 15942. A bill to impose a tax on unrelated debt-financed income of tax exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 15943. A bill to impose a tax on unrelated debt-financed income of tax exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 15944. A bill to amend section 8 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to increase the special revenue bond borrowing authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 15945. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Martime Board-Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 15946. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 15947. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 15948. 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. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 15949. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 15950. A bill to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 15951. A bill to amend the consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize loans by the Secretary of Agriculture on leasehold interests on Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 15952. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the position of Chief Veterinary Officer of the Service and provide for the rank of Assistant Surgeon General for said position; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 15953. A bill to amend section 8 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to increase the special revenue bond borrowing authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 15954. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15955. 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. SPRINGER:

H.R. 15956. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Lincoln Homestead National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 15957. A bill to provide for a refund of excise taxes levied on automobiles purchased by certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 15958. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 15959. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to eliminate certain requirements with respect to effectuating marketing orders for cherries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 15960. A bill to provide a temporary program for dairy farmers under which production adjustment payment shall be made to such farmers who voluntarily adjust their marketings of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 15961. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr CORMAN:

H.R. 15962. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that the interest on certain obligations shall not be tax exempt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 15963. A bill to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 15964. A bill to amend chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15965. A bill to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 15966. A bill to establish a Board of Higher Education to plan, establish, organize, and operate a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 15967. A bill to amend section 336(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to authorize any petitioner for naturalization to take the oath of allegiance at a final hearing held upon his petition within 30, rather than 60, days preceding a general election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15968. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that pensions paid to retired law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 15969. A bill to establish an emergency program of direct Federal assistance in the form of grants and loans to certain hospitals in critical need of new beds and related facilities in order to meet the demands for service resulting from new and expanded Federal programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 15970. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 15971. A bill to provide for the issuance by the Secretary of Agriculture of a 25-cent-per-bushel export marketing certificate on wheat for the 1967, 1968, and 1969 crops of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 15972. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Lincoln Homestead National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 15973. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 7-percent increase in all annuities and pensions payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 15974. A bill to include all periods of military service as creditable service for severance pay purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 15975. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to increase the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to obtain funds for use in its secondary market operations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 15976. A bill to authorize the granting of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbon substances, and all rights in connection therewith and pertaining thereto, to certain homestead patentees who were wrongfully deprived of such property and rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 15977. A bill to amend chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15978. A bill to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15979. A bill to outlaw the Mafia and other organized crime syndicates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15980. A bill to prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law-enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 15981. A bill to provide that the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland shall hold court at Hyattsville; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 15982. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 15983. A bill to provide for the temporary suspension of duty on stoppers of cork suitable for wine bottles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 1180. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.J. Res. 1181. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.J. Res. 1182. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring that Federal judges be reconfirmed by the Senate every 6 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.J. Res. 1183. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Commission on National Defense Policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.J. Res. 1184. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Commission on National Defense Policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.J. Res. 1185. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Commission on National Defense Policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 1186. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Commission on National Defense Policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H. Con. Res. 799. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on National Service and the Draft; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. Con. Res. 800. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the prompt and full settlement of the indebtedness of France and other nations to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 801. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the holding of elections in South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H. Con. Res. 802. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the holding of elections in South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 899. Resolution providing for consideration of House Joint Resolution 1148, a joint resolution providing an emergency limitation on interest rates paid by insured banks; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 900. Resolution authorizing the transfer of funds from the contingent fund to meet committee employee payroll for June 1966; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 901. Resolution relating to telephone, telegraph, and radiotelegraph allowances of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

491. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, relative to equalizing the territorial boundaries of all States bordering on an ocean or the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

492. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, relative to ratification of the proposed amendment relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency, and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of the office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 15984. A bill to authorize the interment of Mrs. Mary L. Campbell in the Long Island National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 15985. A bill for the relief of Sofia Cascarano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER (by request):

H.R. 15986. A bill for the relief of Yau Mei Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 15987. A bill for the relief of Natale Grippe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15988. A bill for the relief of Clara Ordentlich and Julius Ordentlich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 15989. A bill for the relief of Irene Mercedes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 15990. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Daughters of the American Revolution in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 15991. A bill for the relief of Mr. Henry Schierembergg and Mrs. Maria Lucretia Schierembergg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15992. A bill for the relief of Manuel Furtado Gabriel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15993. A bill for the relief of Monica G. Anvoner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 15994. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Merrill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 15995. A bill for the relief of John E. Coplin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

403. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to Satchel Paige Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

404. Also petition of City Council, Chicago, Ill., relative to proposed increase in toll charges for use of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

405. Also, petition of Charleston Freedom Forum, Inc., Charleston, S.C., relative to American servicemen captured by Communist governments; to the Committee on Rules.