NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 16 (legislative day of August 15), 1966:

THE JUDICIARY

David W. Dyer, of Florida, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Warren L. Jones, retired.

Wade Hampton McCree, Jr., of Michigan, to be U.S. circuit judge, sixth circuit, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Edward J. Boyle, Sr., of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana, vice Robert A. Ainsworth, Jr., elevated.

Alvin B. Rubin, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Bernard J. Leddy, of Vermont, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Vermont, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

William T. Woodard, Jr., of North Carolina, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1971.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

John S. Patterson, of Illinois, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 5 years expiring August 9, 1971, vice Frank Kowalski.

THE JUDICIARY

Austin L. Fickling, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions for the term of 10 years. (Reappointment.)

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Edward C. Schriber
Hans W. Lindholm

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 16, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord: and he delighteth in his way.—Psalm 37: 23.

Eternal Father of our spirits, who has promised unto the upright in heart a light that shines in the darkness and a strength that never fails, grant unto us such good attitudes and such high purposes that shall lift us above the shadow of doubt and fear and help us to realize the power of Thy presence. Give to us the wings of faith, the lift of love, and the heart of hope as we commit ourselves anew to Thee and to Thy will for our lives.

May we walk the ever-changing roads of our daily life with confidence and courage, knowing that Thou art with us always and all the way. Give to us this day a healthy body, an understanding mind, a happy spirit, a loving heart and with it all a will ready to do good to others where we can do good and to be faithful unto Thee, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 3700. An act to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the independent offices appropriation bill, H.R. 14921, have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

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

There was no objection.

JUDICIAL DICTATORSHIP

Mr. ABERNETHY. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, when the wise Founding Fathers of our Nation molded the basic law of our land, they very wisely created a tripartite system of government—the executive, legislative, and judicial—each coequal with the other. At least, that is what they thought they were doing.

It was the intention of these great men that each branch should stand on its own feet, that each would be a check and balance against the other, and that each would have the courage and pride to stand and defend itself from encroachment or trespass of the other.

The recorded history of our government reveals that those who served in these respective branches, from George Washington's time down through and until several score of years into the 20th century, strongly upheld their rights, prerogatives, and privileges, while respecting such of those who served in the other two branches.

But in recent years, Mr. Speaker, the Congress has allowed itself to sink to a very low ebb. So much of it has subordinated itself to whatever was sent over from the White House. So much of it has allowed itself to yield to pressures from the Chief Executive, under both Democratic and Republican administrations.

This is not all, Mr. Speaker. In recent decades the Congress has been subjected to numerous domineering decisions, indignities and constitutional trespasses by the judiciary. I shall not enumerate them here. They are all too well known.

Action on yesterday of a Federal judge enjoining the Un-American Activities Committee from holding a committee meeting reveals the gluttonous hunger for power growing within the judiciary. And the judge made his act more reprehensible by conducting what amounted to a secret hearing, without service of notice of any kind upon members of the committee.

Where, oh where, Mr. Speaker, did this pipsqueak Federal judge find the authority to tell a committee of the Congress it could not open its doors for a committee meeting?

Next, Mr. Speaker, he and his kind will be telling the Congress when it can or cannot meet. And this is not an absurd suggestion. It is, indeed, the direction in which we are moving and which we will someday encounter if the Congress does not throw off its lethargic robes of inferiority and tell some judges, bureaucrats, and all offices of the executive branch from the President down, that Capitol Hill belongs to the Congress.

A number of us, including the one now addressing you, have long advocated that the Congress take a firm stand in behalf of its rights, duties, and privileges. Many of us have introduced legislation which would require those who preside over our judicial branch to know a little bit of law and to have just a reasonable amount of experience. But year after year these bills get bottled up at the hands of those who consistently and mistakenly defend the power grab of the power-hungry judges.

If the decision of yesterday portends the judiciary of the future, and I think it does, then there can be nothing but judicially inspired chaos.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress had better wake up, assert itself and perform its duties or else this country will soon be in the hands of a judicial dictatorship, if it has not already reached that point.

ENCROACHMENT BY THE JUDICIARY UPON THE LEGISLATIVE

Mr. BOGGS. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in the 25 years on and off that I have had the high privilege and great responsibility of serving in this, the greatest representative body in the world, we have studiously and assiduously refrained from interfering in the affairs of the other branches of the Government. We have a tripartite system—the very essence of our Constitution and our freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, there have been matters presented here during that period of time which would interfere with the constitutional rights and prerogatives of the Executive, the President of the United

States. There have been measures which would have forced him to produce documents which were confidential and executive in nature. Uniformly and invariably, we have rejected such attempts.

Mr. Speaker, by the same token there have been measures here which would impinge upon the sanctity and upon the independence of the judiciary in passing upon the interpretation of the Constitution, the enunciation of the privileges of our citizens and the maintenance of the freedom of our institutions. We have rejected these as well.

So on yesterday it was indeed shocking to see a member of the Federal judiciary usurp, in a fashion that I have never seen, the fundamental prerogatives of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly over the years, we in the exercise of the right to investigate, the right of oversight may have, on occasion, gone too far, just as have the other two branches of our Government on occasions gone too far in exercising their rights. But at no time—at no time—has the right of a duly authorized committee of this Congress ever been questioned outside of this place. Where would such judicial power end? Would a court take unto itself the right to tell the Ways and Means Committee or the Judiciary Committee or any other committee when to meet or who to hear?

Mr. Speaker, I was glad this morning to see a three-judge court set aside the temporary restraining order which was granted on yesterday. It is imperative that the constitutional question be disposed of in favor of Congress because this is indeed a fundamental matter involving the rights of this body to assert its function as the representative of the people.

ENCROACHMENT BY THE JUDICIARY UPON THE LEGISLATIVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in associating myself with the remarks by the distinguished majority whip and of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] concerning this incompetent Federal judge, I do not think that we can overlook the action of this man who is obviously not qualified to hold the job for which he is being paid. I have inquired of some of the old hands around here—I have been here only 26 years—and in no Member's memory has a member of the judiciary ventured as far as this incompetent has gone.

Mr. Speaker, if there was ever grounds for impeachment, this is one of them.

In the case of Halstead Ritter, which I reviewed, one of the grounds on which he was impeached was bringing disgrace to the judiciary.

This man has done that. We cannot permit this act of violence to go unquestioned, unimpeded, and unchecked. It would be well, Mr. Speaker, for someone in this body to draw up articles of impeachment and present them to the Judiciary Committee. I suspect that the House Un-American Activities Committee may do so. Let us see what will happen. If we do nothing now, another one of these incompetents might restrain the great Appropriations Committee or my own committee from performing our responsibility of investigating as the whip has said. The courts can review the actions of the committees after we meet, but to restrain us from meeting is preposterous and must not go unchecked.

Mr. Speaker, without any further investigation, I would be willing to impeach this foul blot on the escutcheon of the fair name of the judiciary of the United States.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IS THE PEOPLE'S INSTITUTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, this House must not sit in fear and trembling before the Supreme Court or any part of the Federal judiciary. This House must not sit in fear and trembling before any Federal judge in the District of Columbia who has rendered this shocking order that would prohibit a committee of the Congress from holding hearings. This House of Representatives must not and cannot become a rubber stamp to the executive or to the judiciary or to the Federal agencies and departments of the Federal Government. This is the road to dictatorship. This is the road to unbridled power by unelected, Federal, appointed officials.

The action yesterday by a Federal judge here in the District of Columbia in attempting to stop the proceedings of a committee of the House is a cold, blatant bid to thwart the wishes of the people in a representative democracy.

Even now, as I speak, Mr. Speaker, there is a demonstration going on, by peaceniks and beatniks, against the Un-American Activities Committee at the Cannon Building. These are the type of individuals who are undermining our war effort in Vietnam and these are the ones the Federal judge here in the District of Columbia is trying to champion at the expense of representative government's freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleagues who have spoken this morning in expressing surprise and shock over the infringement by the judiciary in the prerogatives and the constitutional rights of this, the most representative and deliberative body in the entire world. In the last few years I have gone throughout this Nation defending the Congress, defending the House of Representatives as the people's institution. It was the Continental Congress which brought into being these United States of America. The Continental Congress elected George Washington Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. The Continental Congress prosecuted that war. There was no other body. There was no judiciary. There was no executive.

Mr. Speaker, this body represents directly the people of this country, and if, as my distinguished colleague from South Carolina has said, the judges can stop committees of Congress, if they can enjoin the House Committee on Un-American Activities, they can enjoin the great Committee on Armed Services, the Appropriations Committee, or the Judiciary Committee. They can usurp completely the constitutional obligations, prerogatives, and duties of this great body. The separation of powers among the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary is delicate and subtle. It cannot survive such blatant and far-fetched infringement by the Federal judiciary. I think that it is urgent that we raise a voice of protest here today before it is too late.

The House of Representatives cannot allow one of its committees—meeting in the Cannon Office Building only a few yards from this Chamber—to be intimidated by judicial fiat. The House Un-American Activities Committee must be permitted to go ahead with its perfectly legitimate assigned task of gathering information for the whole Congress, and for the American people. In doing so, the House Un-American Activities Committee acts as the direct agent of the full House, and as such is not liable to the caprices of activist judges. Indeed, every committee of the Congress must be allowed to go about its constitutional duty free from the threat of judicial interference. This Congress must not allow a dangerous precedent to be set that would hold the sword of judicial usurpation over each of the great committees of the Congress. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if a Federal judge can halt a congressional committee meeting then a Federal judge could enjoin and halt a meeting of the entire Congress itself. We can and must stop now this attempt to destroy Congress—the direct elected representatives of the American people.

RESPECT FOR LEGAL ORDER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the remarks of the gentlemen who have preceded me in the well that the decision of a Federal judge in enjoining a House committee from holding hearings was shocking and ridiculous. I yield to no man or woman in this House in my respect for this great institution. I know what I am about to say will not win me any popularity contests in view of the prevailing mood. But I think our colleague who announced in advance planned defiance of this court order was unwise.

At a moment in our history when it is important to encourage respect for law and order, it does not seem fitting to me that a Member of Congress should express open contempt for the legal machinery and the processes of law.

As I have said, the injunction granted by the Federal court judge was ridiculous, but there is adequate machinery for appeal. I understand it has been utilized with the result that the injunction has been set aside with respect to law and order.

How can this Congress expect members of the public to refrain from taking the law into their own hands when we ourselves thumb our nose at law and order?

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

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, surely the gentleman does not regard a simple forthright protest from a Member of Congress as being a violation of the law?

Mr. JOELSON. I am not talking about a violation of the law. I am talking about respect for legal orders. Instead of announcing that we would defy the legal order, we should take advantage of the legal machinery, because any reasonable man should have known that this order could not have been sustained.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not think the comments of Members of the Congress are in defiance of this court—particularly this court, because I really just do not have very much respect for it.

Mr. JOELSON. The member of the committee said he would stay in jail until hell freezes over, if necessary.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, God bless him.

ENCROACHMENT BY THE JUDICIARY UPON THE LEGISLATIVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, as a nonlawyer, I approach this subject with some trepidation and perhaps from a slightly different angle than some of our Members who are very well versed in the law. I appreciate very much the position which the Speaker has taken and the position expressed particularly by my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. But, Mr. Speaker, I just wonder whether the committee has considered the wisdom of calling this judge before the committee to show cause why he should not be cited for contempt. This would be something that we might be able to do before we undertake impeachment proceedings.

I realize full well, Mr. Speaker, that if this action were taken, it would be useless to have him cited before a Federal judge, but it might not be a bad idea if this body gave consideration to citing this gentleman for contempt, and, if he were so cited, to try him before the bar of this House. This has been done before. Perhaps now is the time to do it again.

CONGRESS MUST ACT TO PREVENT NEW YORK STATE FROM ABUSING THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 19 OF MEDICARE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to my colleagues for switching the subject to something else, but I believe it is something which is equally shocking and equally disturbing; namely, the New York medicare law implementing the provisions of title 19 of the Medicare Act.

We passed medicare last year, a very controversial program, but there was no debate on title 19 of that bill, which was regarded as a rather modest extension of the Kerr-Mills Act. However, the New York Times of last Saturday had a story that says that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare now estimates that the annual cost of this New York program will be $1.4 billion. That means that the Federal share of the New York program will be twice what Congress has estimated would be the annual cost of the entire title 19 program for all 50 States. Yet this Times story says that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare nevertheless intends to approve the New York program as being "reasonable in character."

If this New York implementation of title 19 is approved and if the New York program is then adopted by the other 49 States, I believe we are going to be in serious trouble here in this Congress. Certainly the intent of Congress will be very seriously flouted. I have therefore telegraphed the Secretary and asked him to hold up approval of the New York plan until we in this House can consider the matter more fully.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, our distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means, which has jurisdiction over this matter, has been holding very extensive hearings on the whole subject. I suggest the gentleman might, before he sends all these telegrams, talk with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. STRATTON. I appreciate the comment of our distinguished whip. In fact I took this time this morning to bring to the attention of the House and to the Committee on Ways and Means my bill, H.R. 15917, which, if adopted by the committee, will resolve this problem. I hope the gentleman will support my bill in his committee.

THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND THE JUDICIAL BRANCH ON A COLLISION COURSE

Mr. POFF. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished majority whip has just said, the three-judge court convened this morning dissolved the temporary restraining order. However, I believe it is significant to call attention to the fact that they did so only on the grounds of a technicality. They ruled that the petitioner had failed to show irreparable damage.

I am further advised that the court has convened another session of the three-judge court to sit tomorrow afternoon at 2:30, and that one of the members of that three-judge panel will be the same Judge Corcoran who issued the temporary restraining order.

Mr. Speaker, the legislative branch and the judicial branch of the Federal Government are on a collision course. That course was chosen by the judicial branch. The Congress has not sought to usurp the function of the judiciary. Rather, Judge Corcoran has sought to frustrate the function of the Congress. Ultimately, one branch must yield; the other branch must prevail.

What finally occurs involves the destiny of this Nation. Down one road lies the destination of a continuance of our elective representative democracy operating within the framework of its tripartite form of government. Down the other road lies the destination of an appointive judicial oligarchy where the body of governmental powers is unsubdivided, unseparated and therefore unchecked.

In the present state of things, it is our duty as legislators to resist and defy Judge Corcoran and any judge like him who attempts to trespass upon the domain of the people's elected representatives and emasculate the system of checks and balances which has so long been the security of the people's liberty.

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION HIGH INTEREST RATES SET NEW RECORDS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson high-interest-rate administration each week now is setting new highs in the cost of Government financing.

Two weeks ago, a Treasury refunding issue carried a 5¼-percent coupon for a note due in 1971. Already that note issue is selling at approximately one-half point discount under par to yield 5.34 percent.

That coupon was a 45-year high for Treasury financing.

Last week, FNMA sold 25-month, 5⅞-percent debentures at a discount. The issue was priced at 99$^{30}/_{32}$ to yield 5.91 percent—the highest interest cost ever paid by FNMA.

Yesterday, the Treasury sold 13-week bills at a new high rate of 5.048 percent. The yield on Treasury bills with a 26-week maturity jumped to 5.315 percent; widely exceeding the previous record of 5.099 percent set in January 1960.

Today, the Federal home loan banks are selling a $590 million bond issue bearing a record 5⅞-percent coupon rate. The bonds, due in 1 year, are priced at 99⅞ to afford a return to investors of 6 percent. Only a month before, the banks sold an issue of 5¾-percent bonds to yield the investor 5.80 percent.

Today, conferees on the Independent Offices Appropriations Act hold their first meeting. The Senate has included a provision authorizing FNMA under the Participation Sales Act to sell $3.2 billion of participations against loans to be pooled by various Government agencies. Sale of these participations in the Johnson administration's tight money market would be a tragic mistake as the added pressure on capital markets only can drive interest rates up and up.

I hope the House conferees will be successful in knocking that participation sales authorization from the bill.

A VIOLATION OF SEPARATION OF POWERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have preceded me on the subject of Federal judges, most of them bemoaning what Judge Corcoran did in this instance. I would say it is very definitely a violation of the separation of powers for a Federal judge to try to enjoin a congressional committee. However, we are not talking about some constructive results that can be obtained.

There is legislation pending before this body which would limit or reduce the "lifetime" term of Federal judges; this legislation should be set for hearing. I have introduced legislation which would require the U.S. Supreme Court, in order to hold a decision of this body unconstitutional, to have a majority of at least two-thirds of its members agree rather than having a 5-to-4 decision, as they have time and time again in the last decade.

I also have had legislation pending for a number of years here which would, for the first time, spell out specific qualifications for those persons to be appointed on our Federal benches. It seems to me high time that we should have judges experienced in the law as well as judicial review to make these serious decisions. Our laws are completely inadequate on this subject, and silent on meaningful qualifications.

SEPARATION OF POWERS

Mrs. BOLTON. 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 gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps in all of the years I have been here there has never been a moment in our history that has been so filled with portent, with possibilites of absolute destruction of our way of life as this particular moment. As an American woman I look to this House and to this Congress and, of course, particularly to the House to do something real, something vital, to preserve our Government and our way of life and our whole method of procedure. We have had battles before among the three different parts of our Government but never anything like this. I beg and implore you who are members of the Committee on the Judiciary and you who are the chairmen of these tremendous committees of this House to get together and move into areas that will tell the people of this country and the people of the world that we are still a government of the people. The power was given to the people in the beginning. Very well. We have let all too much of it slip away from us. Let us face the facts as they are and then stand up and get it back.

CONSTITUTIONAL SEPARATION OF THE POWERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with practically everything that has been said today by my colleagues concerning Judge Corcoran's decision, but as I listened to these remarks I could not help but recall some of the other decisions that have been announced by Federal courts since I have been privileged to be a Member of this august body. Decision after decision have invaded the legislative field and overstepped the powers of the courts, so the decision by this Johnson appointee of 18 months was almost inevitable. Time after time this Congress has permitted, since I have been a Member, Federal judges to trespass on the legislative duties of this body without ever doing anything about it. The Supreme Court and other Federal courts have legislated in field after field and have taken duty after duty away from this Congress while this body—with its Democratic leadership—has sat idly by. I have seen members of the Committee on the Judiciary come to this floor after one of these decisions had been announced and actually agree with the takeover when they should have been insisting that the committee report remedial legislation forthwith. Take for example the Supreme Court's decision dealing with the reapportionment of State legislatures. Clearly an area which should be and had been, left to the States. Did the Judiciary bring us any legislation? No, it more or less sanctioned the takeover by its inaction. Why, this inaction has so encouraged these Federal courts that they are now even legislating by drawing district lines not only in the case of State legislation districts but in some States for congressional districts. I could point out other areas where the courts are legislating but time will not permit.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is past time for this Congress to measure up to its legislative responsibilities and to make amends in these areas where the courts have trespassed. We have a constitutional duty to do so. The people expect us to do so as they want us to remain in the legislative branch of the Government. The responsibility for action, Mr. Speaker, rests with you and your party—your party is in the majority.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear our colleagues speak out this morning against this inevitable decision, a judge ruling that the Congress cannot legislate in a given field.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CALM REQUIRED IN WAKE OF JUDICIAL DECISION BEARING UPON LEGISLATIVE PREROGATIVES

Mr. PEPPER. 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. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I share the grave concern of the Members of this House over the judicial decision which has been brought into question here this morning restraining the functioning of a committee of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I think the judge was thoroughly wrong, and I want to do all I can, with my colleagues, to protect and preserve and to assert the proper prerogatives of this House of Representatives and of the Congress of the United States.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think grievous harm can be done to our constitutional system if what has been said here this morning, particularly, by some able Members, might be interpreted by the country as meaning two things: One, that this Congress does not recognize that there are immunities of citizens, even from the power of the Congress, when they are properly presented in a proper manner.

And, secondly, that this House asserts the prerogative of omnipotence. Under the Constitution of the United States we do not have omnipotent power, and as Lord Coke said to the king who wanted to sit on his court, "The king, too, is under the law."

And so, Mr. Speaker, is the House of Representatives, as well as the other body and the President and the courts as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us keep this debate and curb our indignation within our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, this matter of the right of these people to express their opinion about the war in Vietnam or any other matter is one thing that should be preserved and properly protected. This was the wrong way in which to do it that this judge expressed.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us not let what has been said here today in our just indignation, be notice to the American people, that this House does not recognize the power and the right and the duty of the courts in proper cases and in the proper manner to protect the constitutional rights of the citizens, and that we deny that we, as Lord Coke told the King he was, are under the law.

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN RIGHT OF PEOPLE TO EXPRESS AN OPINION AND TREASON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I think there is considerable difference, if I may point out to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] between the right of people to express their opinion and treason—and I call it treason advisedly—which is sending money, supplies and aid and comfort to an enemy of this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, anybody can disagree with what we are doing in Vietnam, verbally; they can visit there if they want to, and they can protest.

But, Mr. Speaker, when they start sending money and supplies, and even blood, to the people who are killing American soldiers, I say that comes under the heading of treason.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps we ought to have a declaration of war, so that the law of treason would apply.

Mr. Speaker, I have always thought that this thing in Vietnam should be kept within bounds, and I have supported the moderation which has been evidenced by our leaders, and I still support it. But I do not believe anyone can get up here and throw a cloak of immunity over some of the actions of some of these people and call it "dissent," because it goes far beyond dissent.

I would just like also to observe that I have read the Constitution and the judicial, the executive, and the legislative branches are equal. I have defended the courts from time to time, but I think this decision by Judge Corcoran was absolutely outrageous. I assume that before I came on the floor someone has pointed out the fact that he could possibly be impeached and that may not be such a bad idea.

ENCROACHMENT BY THE JUDICIARY UPON THE LEGISLATIVE

Mr. HUNGATE. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] who opened a good part of this discussion and the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] in their remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I think we must beware of extremism. I feel that impeachment might be an extreme remedy. Just as I cannot agree with those who would assert that if the jackasses of the world united together and did not elect all the members of the Federal judiciary members for life, they would not get their just desserts—I think that is too extreme.

However, as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio pointed out, we have proceeded along the road that led to decisions in the field of prayer and religion in the schools, with which some disagree. Taking away the right of interrogation of suspects from police officers, with which many disagree. We have observed conduct on the bench of multiple marriages, although in series, with which many disagreed. We have witnessed action at the State legislative level where the State governments patterned their governments after ours and were told that they could not do so.

But now, Mr. Speaker, we have struck a Federal nerve and it may be that we are too late in our protests because as indicated previously, it is not too long a step from permitting judicial legislation to one where the court then says that no one else shall legislate—although, of course, this decision would not reach nearly so far.

I think we might remember that in the beginning of this country there was some dissatisfaction with the form of justice administered in England. This resulted in the fact that in colonial days you did not have to be a lawyer to be a judge and nearly all judges at all levels were elected. Perhaps the wheel is turning around to approximately the same place again.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

PEDRO IRIZARRY GUIDO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2914) for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido.

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

Mr. GROSS and Mr. HALL objected and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ADJUDICATE A CLAIM TO CERTAIN LAND IN MARENGO COUNTY, ALA.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4841) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate a claim to certain land in Marengo County, Ala.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION FOR CANCELLATION OF GRAZING PERMITS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1375) providing a method for determining the amount of compensation to which certain individuals are entitled as reimbursement for damages sustained by them due to the cancellation of their grazing permits by the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FRED E. STARR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1068) for the relief of Fred E. Starr.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. RAISLA STEIN AND HER TWO MINOR CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1945) for the relief of Mrs. Raisla Stein and her two minor children.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ARLINE AND MAURICE LOADER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2016) for the relief of Arline and Maurice Loader.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DEMETRIOS KONSTANTINOS GEORGARAS—ALSO KNOWN AS JAMES K. GEORGARAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2146) for the relief of Demetrios Konstantinos Georgaras—also known as James K. Georgaras.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MELBA B. PERKINS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3275) to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Mrs. Melba B. Perkins against the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ROBERT L. MILLER AND MILDRED M. MILLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4457) for the relief of Robert L. Miller and Mildred M. Miller.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ROBERT A. HARWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6039) for the relief of Robert A. Harwell.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

GILMOUR C. MacDONALD, COLONEL, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7546) for relief Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force, retired.

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

H.R. 7546

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations, lapse of time, or bars of laches, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim, legal or equitable, filed by Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, United States Air Force (retired), Shalimar, Florida, for compensation for the usage by the United States during World War II and the Korean conflict of a tubular caltrop tire-puncturing device allegedly invented by the said Gilmour C. MacDonald, the said Gilmour C. MacDonald having submitted drawings and models of such device to the National Inventors Council, Department of Commerce, in 1940, with the alleged understanding that he would be compensated for his invention if it were used by the United States.

SEC. 2. Suit upon any such claim may be instituted at any time within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. Except as otherwise provided herein, proceedings for the determination of such claim, and review and payment of any judgment thereon shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

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.

JOHN T. KNIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8694) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. HOWARD H. ADELBERGER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8727) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Howard H. Adelberger.

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

H.R. 8727

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $18,810 to Mr. and Mrs. Howard H. Adelberger, 5455 Valley Pike, Dayton, Ohio, in full settlement of their claim against the United States for damages to real estate sustained in July 1958 in connection with certain construction activities at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, by the Corps of Army Engineers. This claim is not cognizable under the tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Western Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of Howard H. Adelberger and Nola A. Adelberger, his wife, against the United States for damages and loss of value with reference to the following described real property:

"Situate on the north side of State Routes 4 and 69 and west of Bath Road in Bath Township, Fairborn School District, section 8, town two, range 8, M.Rs., Greene County, Ohio, and consisting of 32.76 acres, more or less, and is approximately seven miles east of Dayton, Ohio,

due to the lowering of the water table in the above-described property and the lowering of the level of a lake on that property due to the dredging of the Mad River and the lowering of the level of that river north of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. Notwithstanding any principle or rule of law, the court in the exercise of the jurisdiction provided in this Act is authorized to render judgment in behalf of the owners of the property described herein if it shall find that the value of the property has been reduced by reason of the dredging and stream improvement work performed by the United States. The action authorized by the provisions of this Act shall be instituted within one of the effective date of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

EDWARD G. BEAGLE, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13909) for the relief of Edward G. Beagle, Jr.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CHARLES J. ARNOLD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13910) for the relief of Charles J. Arnold.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DELMA S. POZAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 146) for the relief of Delma S. Pozas.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

GEORGES FRAISE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 196) for the relief of Georges Fraise.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION

The Clerk called the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 99) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate concurrent resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DINESH KUMAR PODDAR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2663) for the relief of Dinesh Kumar Poddar.

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

S. 2663

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dinesh Kumar Poddar may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by Mr. and Mrs. Bhagwati P. K. Poddar, a lawfully resident alien and a citizen of the United States, respectively, in behalf of the said Dinesh Kumar Poddar pursuant to section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dinesh Kumar Poddar and Girish Kumar Poddar may be classified as children within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of petitions filed in their behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Bhagwati P. K. Poddar, a lawfully resident alien and a citizen of the United States, respectively, pursuant to section 204 of the Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of private bill S. 2663, for the relief of Dinesh K. Poddar, adopted son of Dr. and Mrs. Bhagwati P. K. Poddar, which has been amended to include the subject of my bill, H.R. 14521, Girish K. Poddar, the second adopted son of Dr. and Mrs. Bhagwati P. K. Poddar. He is 13 years of age and was adopted last December 23, 1965.

The first adopted son, Dinesh, is the beneficiary of S. 2663, which recently passed the Senate and it was my purpose in introducing my bill, H.R. 14521, to classify the second adopted son, Girish, as an eligible orphan in order that his adoptive parents, Dr. and Mrs. Bhagwati P. K. Poddar, can petition to bring him to the United States at the same time they are bringing the older adopted son, Dinesh, to this country with them. The natural parents of Girish in India are extremely poor and have legally released him for adoption by his aunt and uncle, who are permanent residents of the United States and are quite capable in every way of caring for both beneficiaries.

At the present time, Dr. Bhagwati Poddar is studying in India on a research grant and wishes very much to bring both sons back to the United States in August when he and Mrs. Poddar will return to the United States to continue residence here where he will resume teaching at the Illinois State University, Normal, Ill.

Mr. Speaker, my bill has now been made the subject of an amendment to S. 2663 so that both orphan boys are included in this measure now before the House for consideration. The beneficiaries have been medically examined and are medically qualified to receive a visa, and I therefore recommend passage of S. 2663, as amended, in view of the very short time left until the Poddars will be returning to the United States in the hope of bringing both sons back with them for permanent residence.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act for the relief of Dinesh Kumar Poddar and Girish Kumar Poddar."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISS ELISABETH VON OBERNDORFF

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3901) for the relief of Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff.

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

H.R. 3901

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Alien Property Custodian be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to return all funds vested by the Office of Alien Property through order numbered 4115, October 2, 1944, belonging to Elisabeth von Oberndorff: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

USE OF THE VESSEL "JOHN F. DREWS"

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14517) to amend Private Law 86–203 to permit the use of the vessel *John F. Drews* in the coastwise trade while it is owned by a citizen of the United States.

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

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS IN INYO COUNTY, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9520) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Inyo County, Calif., to the personal representative of the estate of Gwilym L. Morris, Dolores G. Morris, George D. Ishmael, and Verna H. Ishmael.

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

H.R. 9520

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue, subject to the provisions of this Act to the persons named below, who have previously filed desert land entries on the lands involved, patents to the following described tracts of land in the county of Inyo, State of California.

(1) Township 27 north, range 4 east, San Bernardino meridian, section 27: west half containing 320 acres to the personal representative of the Estate of Gwilym L. Morris.

(2) Township 27 north, range 4 east, San Bernardino meridian, section 28: east half containing 320 acres to Dolores G. Morris.

(3) Township 27 north, range 4 east, San Bernardino meridian, section 27: east half containing 320 acres to George D. Ishmael.

(4) Township 27 north, range 4 east, San Bernardino meridian, section 26: west half containing 320 acres to Verna H. Ishmael.

SEC. 2. Each patent authorized to be issued by section 1 of this Act may be issued only after payment, by the beneficiary of this Act to the United States, of the sum of (a) the fair market value of the lands as of the effective date of this Act less the value added to the land by the beneficiary, and (b) the administrative costs of making the conveyance, both as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. Any patent issued under this Act shall contain a reservation to the United States of (a) any of the following named minerals for which the land is deemed by the Secretary of the Interior to be valuable or prospectively valuable as of the date of issuance of patent: coal, native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands, from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), oil, gas, oil shale, phosphate, sodium, and potassium, and (b) the right of the United States, its lessees, permittees, or licensees to prospect for, mine, and remove them under applicable provisions of low.

SEC. 4. No conveyance to any beneficiary of this Act shall be made unless application for the conveyance is made to the Secretary of the Interior within one year after the effective date of this Act and payment is made to the Secretary of the Interior within the period allowed therefor by him.

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.

HARRIET C. CHAMBERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2104) for the relief of Harriet C. Chambers.

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

S. 2104

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to quiet title to the following described tract of land situated within the boundaries of the Shoshone National Forests, Wyoming, and held and claimed by Harriet C. Chambers, of Lander, Wyoming, under a chain of title dating from March 29, 1902, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey to the said Harriet C. Chambers by quitclaim deed all right, title, and interest

of the United States in and to such tract of land, more particularly described as follows: The southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 34, township 31 north, range 100 west, sixth principal meridian, Fremont County Wyoming, consisting of forty acres more or less.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by the first section of this Act shall be made by the Secretary of Agriculture without consideration, but the said Harriet C. Chambers shall bear any expenses incident to the preparation of the legal documents necessary or appropriate to carry out the first section of this Act.

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

LAND TRANSFER TO DANVILLE, ILL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16407) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the Danville Junior College, Danville, Ill.

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

H.R. 16407

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to convey, without monetary consideration, to the Danville Junior College, Danville, Illinois, for its use for educational purposes, all right, title and interest of the United States in a tract of approximately seventeen acres of land and to a tract of approximately forty-one acres of land and all buildings thereon, constituting a portion of the reservation of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Danville, Illinois. The exact legal description of the tracts and improvements thereon shall be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and if a survey is required in order to make such determination, Danville Junior College, Danville, Illinois, shall bear the expense thereof.

SEC. 2. Any deed of conveyance made pursuant to this Act shall—

(a) provide that the property conveyed shall be used in a manner that will not, in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or his designate, interfere with the care and treatment of patients in the Veterans' Administration Facility, Danville, Illinois;

(b) contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, easements, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to protect the interest of the United States;

(c) provide that if Danville Junior College, Danville, Illinois, violates any provision of the deed of conveyance or alienates or attempts to alienate all or any part of the property so conveyed, title thereto shall revert to the United States; and that a determination by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of any such violation or alienation or attempted alienation shall be final and conclusive; and

(d) provide that in the event of such reversion, all improvements made by Danville Junior College, Danville, Illinois, during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

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.

RELIEF OF MULE CREEK OIL CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8699) for the relief of Mule Creek Oil Co., Inc., a Delaware corporation.

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

H.R. 8699

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of section 31 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (30 U.S.C. 188), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to receive, consider, and act upon any petition of the Mule Creek Oil Company, Incorporated, a Delaware corporation, filed within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, for reinstatement of United States oil and gas lease "Wyoming 070268(A)", as if such petition had been filed within the time provided in such section and such section had been applicable thereto.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after "1920", insert ", as amended,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AMEND CHARTER OF SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16608) to amend the charter of Southeastern University of the District of Columbia.

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

H.R. 16608

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act for the relief of the Southeastern University of the Young Men's Christian Association of the District of Columbia", approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 697), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The management of the said corporation shall be vested in a board of trustees consisting of not less than nine nor more than thirty in number, as determined from time to time by said board of trustees, one-third of whom, at all times, shall be graduates of said university, of the qualifications prescribed by said board of trustees, nominated by the alumni of said university in the manner prescribed by said board of trustees, and all of whom shall be elected by said board of trustees. Except as hereinafter provided, each trustee shall be elected for a term of office of three years from the date of expiration of the term for which his predecessor was elected so that the terms of office of not more than one-third of the trustees shall expire annually. A trustee elected to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be elected only for the unexpired term of such predecessor."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The income of the said corporation from all sources whatsoever shall be held in the name of the corporation and applied to the maintenance, endowment, promotion, and advancement of the said university, subject to conforming to the express conditions of the donor of any gift, devise, or bequest accepted by said corporation, with regard to the income therefrom."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall not affect the term of office of any trustee in office on the date of 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.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

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. BOGGS. 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. 222]

Anderson, Ill.	Ford, William D.	Olson, Minn.
Andrews, Glenn	Garmatz	O'Neill, Mass.
Baring	Gilligan	Powell
Barrett	Goodell	Purcell
Blatnik	Grabowski	Quie
Bolling	Gubser	Randall
Bray	Gurney	Rees
Brown, Calif.	Hagan, Ga.	Resnick
Broyhill, Va.	Hansen, Wash.	Rivers, Alaska
Burton, Utah	Hawkins	Rogers, Tex.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hébert	Roncalio
Callaway	Holifield	Rostenkowski
Cameron	Holland	Scott
Celler	Kastenmeier	Senner
Cohelan	King, N.Y.	Sickles
Conyers	Landrum	Skubitz
Corman	Long, La.	Stephens
Cramer	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Martin, Ala.	Todd
Diggs	Martin, Mass.	Toll
Dorn	Matthews	Tunney
Duncan, Oreg.	Mink	Tupper
Edwards, La.	Mize	Tuten
Fallon	Moorhead	Vivian
Farnsley	Morris	Walker, Miss.
Flood	Morrison	White, Idaho
Flynt	Murray	Willis
Fogarty	O'Brien	Wilson, Charles H.
Ford, Gerald R.	Olsen, Mont.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall, 347 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15456) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1852)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15456) "making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 27, 34, 39, and 40.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 36, 37, 38, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52,

And agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 42, 43, 46, 53, and 54.

GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
TOM STEED,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN M. SLACK, Jr.,
JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr.,
GEORGE MAHON,
ODIN LANGEN,
BEN REIFEL,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
E. L. BARTLETT,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
CARL HAYDEN,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15456) making appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Amendments Nos. 1 through 33, under the Senate heading, and Nos. 42 and 43 under the Architect of the Capitol heading, relate solely to expenses of Senate operations and activities. Amendment No. 34 relates to an item for the House of Representatives.

Amendments Nos. 1 through 12; 14 through 26; 28 through 33; and 42 and 43, relating to Senate operations, are reported in technical disagreement. But in accord with the long and well-founded practice, under which each body determines its own housekeeping requirements and the other concurs therein without intervention, the managers on the part of the House will offer motions to recede and concur in these amendments.

Amendment No. 13, in part, would create additional positions on the Senate roll of the Capitol Police force. The rates of base pay specified for the officer positions are the same as those stated in amendment No. 54 which are designed to bring the pay of supervisory positions of the force closer to parity with those provided in H.R. 15857 for their counterparts in the Metropolitan Police force. But since H.R. 15857 has not yet been processed in the Senate, the rates in amendment 54 are in the interim excessive to the objective, and would be scaled back as explained later herein in connection with amendment 54. Consequently, the managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in amendment No. 13 with appropriate conforming changes in the salary rates.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 34 relate to administration of the customary stationery allowances long granted to Members of Congress; No. 27 relates to the Senate and No. 34 to the House of Representatives. Both of course originated in the Senate. In line with the well-founded practice in respect to expenses of the other body, the managers on the part of the House do not object to existing Senate provisions on the subject remaining unchanged. The companion amendment, No. 34, is also omitted.

Joint items

General Expenses, Capitol Police

Amendment No. 35: Reported in disagreement for the purpose of offering a motion to increase the amount by $33,000—to a total of $95,500—to provide clothing and equipment outfitting and first year maintenance costs for the 72 additional police positions authorized June 29, 1966 in House Resolution 796 which covered only salaries.

Capitol Police Board

Amendments Nos. 36–38: Adjust the compensation of two detectives—permanently detailed to the Capitol Police Force—who act as detective sergeants, so as to equalize their pay with that of a fellow detective similarly serving on the House side.

Architect of the Capitol

Office of the Architect

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $647,700 for salaries in the office of the Architect of the Capitol as proposed by the House instead of $635,000 proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Strikes the language inserted by the Senate prohibiting the use of any appropriation in the bill for "administrative or any other expenses in connection with the plans referred to as schemes 1, 2, and 3 for the extension of the west central front of the Capitol." (NOTE.—The three schemes are briefly described in the S. Rept. No. 1409, on this bill.)

There are no funds in the bill for the west front extension project, nor is there any authority to proceed with construction contracts, or even detailed plans and specifications. The work can proceed only if and when the Congress should appropriate the money for the work in a future bill.

$300,000 was, however, appropriated by the Congress last year for preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost, including a model, and incidental expenses looking to extension of the west central front. Most of that fund is already contracted. While the associate architects engaged for this purpose completed the first stage study and plans earlier this year, from which schemes 1, 2, and 3 were developed, and for which a study model (of scheme 2) was made, more time is necessarily required for perfection of plans and drawings and preparation of a full scale model for the scheme (2) selected by the special Extension Commission. At its meeting with the architects in June, the Commission directed the Architects to get the full scale model ready for exhibition to Members of Congress and the public generally.

A full scale model showing the entire Capitol Building—both east and west fronts—should be of great, almost inestimable visual-aid value in helping Members, the press, and the public generally form sound opinions about the appearance of the building if extended and the effect of the particular proposals in Scheme 2 on the architectural features of the present west front. But the conferees understand that the full scale model will not be ready to place on display until about mid-November.

In the circumstances, then, it would be premature, and illogical, to consider any further appropriations for the west front project at this session.

Capitol Grounds

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates $695,400 for care and improvement of the Capitol Grounds as proposed by the Senate instead of $690,000 proposed by the House.

Senate office buildings and garage

Amendments Nos. 42–43: Reported in technical disagreement but, as explained earlier herein in connection with other Senate housekeeping items, motions will be offered to recede and concur in the Senate provisions.

Structural and mechanical care of Library buildings and grounds

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $1,392,000 for this purpose as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,517,000 proposed by the House.

Botanic Garden

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $504,600 for this item as proposed by the Senate instead of $510,000 proposed by the House.

Library of Congress

Amendment No. 46: Reported in technical disagreement. Motion will be made to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, which will provide for the transfer of funds from appropriations of the Office of Education to continue the Monthly Index of Russian Accessions.

Legislative Reference Service

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $2,938,000 for this service as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,852,000 as proposed by the House.

Distribution of catalog cards

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates $4,564,000 as proposed by the Senate for the catalog card and publication service instead of $4,536,000 proposed by the House.

Special foreign currency program

Amendments Nos. 49–51: Appropriates $2,268,000 for this program of acquisition of library materials abroad as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,228,000 proposed by the House, of which $2,088,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,048,000 proposed by the House is to be available only in the form of U.S.-owned foreign currencies determined to be excess to normal U.S. requirements.

The effect is to approve inauguration of a limited program in Ceylon.

Overseas allowances

Amendments Nos. 52–53: Adopt, in modified form, the Senate provision on this subject, under which payments may be authorized with respect to American employees of the Library stationed abroad.

General provisions

(But Relating to Capitol Police Force)

Amendment No. 54: Adopts, in modified form, Senate provision adjusting base pay of officer positions on the Capitol Police force so as to bring them near parity with that of comparable ranks in the Metropolitan Police. But since the rates in the Senate amendment were keyed to the higher rates set for Metropolitan Police in H.R. 15857 which has passed the House but is still in Senate Committee, the rates in the Senate amendment have been scaled down approximately to the present metropolitan rates and a contingency proviso added that will return

the rates to the original figures when and if H.R. 15857 or similar legislation is enacted.

GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
TOM STEED,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN M. SLACK, Jr.,
JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr.,
GEORGE MAHON,
ODIN LANGEN,
BEN REIFEL,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS].

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report is available in leaflet form at the desk. It is brief and uncomplicated. The statement of the managers explains the conference action rather fully. So I shall be brief.

CONFERENCE TOTAL

First, as to the totals: The Conference agreement involves a total of $214,463,913.

The conference total is within the President's budget; it is $285,850 below the President's budget estimates considered in connection with the bill. There was also a budget item of $46,663,000 for a new GPO plant which we did not consider; but that is entirely outside the totals I just gave.

A total of $42,271,880 was in conference. That is the total added by the Senate to the House bill. But $42,243,080, or all but the nominal sum of $28,800, represented insertion of amounts for purely Senate items which by long—and I might add, well founded—practice the House omits from the original bill. And under that practice, we concur without intervention in the purely Senate items as determined by the Senate. They determine their requirements; the House determines its amounts. It is a near perfect system because it works—and works quite well; it is a practice born of long experience.

So, Mr. Speaker, there was very little in the way of money differences in conference. I will insert a table showing the usual comparative amounts. I might just say that the table will show the conference bill some $16,488,606 above fiscal 1966 appropriations. It is pertinent to also say that nearly all of that increase—$15 million of it—is a nonexpenditure addition to the reimbursable working capital fund of the GPO.

STATIONERY ALLOWANCE

Mr. Speaker, as I say, the system of comity under which each House determines its own housekeeping is a good system—but not quite perfect. The Senate, by floor amendments, undertook to make some decided changes in provisions of existing law with respect to administration of official stationery allowances of Senators. But they did not stop there—they put in an amendment making essentially identical changes in the long-standing provisions with respect to such allowances for Members of the House.

No one on this side—so far as I know—had felt the need or saw any justification for any such changes. No one over here—so far as I know—had made any study of the matter. And in any event, it was an intrusion not harmonious with the well-founded practice long followed in connection with this annual appropriation bill. May I just repeat what the statement of the managers says; namely, that in line with the well-founded practice in respect to expenses of the other body, the managers on the part of the House do not object to existing Senate provisions on the subject remaining unchanged—which they would do under this conference report. The companion amendment relating to the House, therefore, also is omitted.

WEST CENTRAL FRONT OF CAPITOL

Mr. Speaker, probably the most celebrated—certainly the most controverted subject dealt with in this bill has to do with the proposal to extend the badly deteriorated west central front of the Capitol Building. And, Mr. Speaker, we have—by my own estimation at least—accomplished a remarkable settlement insofar as this bill is concerned.

Every conferee agreed.

Every member of the conference on both sides signed the report without noting any reservation.

And if I interpreted this morning's news correctly, those on all sides of the question who were reported in the paper are agreeable to the solution agreed upon.

We have removed from the bill the rather sweeping Senate language that would have prohibited the use of any appropriation in the bill for "administrative or any other expenses in connection with the plans referred to as schemes 1, 2, and 3 for the extension of the west central front of the Capitol."

Actually, Mr. Speaker, there were no funds; there are no funds in the bill for the west front extension project, nor is there any authority to proceed with construction contracts, or even detailed plans and specifications. The work can proceed only if and when the Congress should appropriate the money for the work in a future bill.

But what we have said, Mr. Speaker, and what we indicate by this action—and I want to emphasize this—is that, in the present circumstances, it would be premature, and illogical, to consider any further appropriation for the west front project at this session of Congress. It can be taken up at a future time, but we are all agreed that now is not the propitious time.

Everyone who knows anything at all about the matter agrees that something must be done to the west central front of this magnificent building. Congress, rightly or wrongly depending on one's point of view, last year took a first step—in the direction of plans for extension of the front.

A fund of $300,000 was appropriated for preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost, including a model. Most of that fund is already contracted. More time is necessarily required for perfection of those plans and drawings and preparation of a full scale model for the scheme—No. 2—selected by the special Extension Commission.

A full-scale model showing the entire Capitol Building—both east and west fronts—should be of great, almost inestimable visual aid value in helping Members, the press, and the public generally in forming sound opinions about the appearance of the building if extended and the effect of the particular proposals in scheme 2 on the architectural features of the present west front. But the conferees understand that the full-scale model will not be ready to place on display until about mid-November.

The Senate amendment would probably have stopped the already approved work right in its tracks. The conference agreement lets the work continue. A model should certainly be a big help to many Members and people at the proper time. And I repeat, that everyone, of every opinion on this much controverted subject, ought to have, and I believe will have, an opportunity to express himself at the proper time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that touches the main questions presented in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the customary comparative summary of the bill:

Legislative branch appropriation bill, 1967

Item	Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	House	Senate
Senate	$37,586,790	$38,368,285	[1]	$39,655,180	$39,655,180	+$2,068,390	+$1,286,895	+$39,655,180	
House of Representatives	71,352,050	72,797,545	$77,676,145	77,676,145	77,676,145	+6,324,095	+4,878,600		
Joint items	8,892,267	9,771,433	9,671,488	9,683,988	9,716,988	+824,721	−54,445	+45,500	+$33,000
Architect of the Capitol	26,980,600	14,472,600	11,812,700	14,268,300	14,281,000	−12,699,600	−191,600	+2,468,300	+12,700
Botanic Garden	473,000	538,000	510,000	504,600	504,600	+31,600	−33,400	−5,400	
Library of Congress	26,351,600	31,146,000	29,820,100	29,974,100	29,974,100	+3,622,500	−1,171,900	+154,000	
Government Printing Office	26,329,000	[2] 47,655,900	42,655,900	42,655,900	42,655,900	+16,326,900	−5,000,000		
James Madison Memorial Commission	10,000					−10,000			
Total	197,975,307	[2] 214,749,763	172,146,333	214,418,213	214,463,913	+16,488,606	−285,850	+42,317,880	+45,700

[1] In accord with custom, items relating solely to the Senate are omitted from the original House bill.

[2] Excludes $46,663,000 for new GPO plant not considered.

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

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. Is the $2,468,300 additional, in excess of what the House originally passed, to be used for the proposed west front? Is that in this?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman repeat the question, please?

Mr. BROCK. As I understand it, the conference is recommending an increase of $2,468,300 for the Architect of the Capitol in excess of that passed by the House. For what purpose are these added funds? Does that relate to the west front?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. No, there is no moneys in this bill with reference to the west front extension project.

Mr. BROCK. What is the purpose of the money?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. I do not have the details with me here in the well of the House, but the largest item would be for operation of the Senate office buildings.

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

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROCK. Is there no specific purpose for the $2.5 million additional in funds?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mostly for the Senate operations—in this instance, an item for the Senate but under administration of the Architect. The House never initiates appropriations for Senate activities. The Senate adds those to the House bill, and we concur.

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

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, a member of the committee.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, on page 4 and on page 5, there are items for the Senate under the Architect's heading. This is what accounts for most of the $2,468,300. They all relate to building repairs, mantenance, and expenditures as proposed by the Senate. Originally, the House does not consider those. That is the reason they show up now, as an increase. It is the prerogative of the Senate to provide for those items, much the same as we do for whatever repairs are needed on the House side.

I think the figure of $2,468,300 is a net figure, composed of the two items I just referred to, offset partly by a reduction of $125,000 cut by the Senate from the House bill relating to an elevator for the Library Annex Building. We agreed with that cut.

Mr. BROCK. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House are often accused of getting free haircuts and free bottled or spring water. Is there any money in this bill for either free haircuts or spring water for Members of the House?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. I can assure the gentleman categorically that there is no money in this bill for free haircuts or mineral water or any such items as that for Members of this House.

Mr. GROSS. One other question. Is there any money in this bill for the manning of the automatic elevators in the Rayburn Building?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. There is money, but it is not being used.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if we can depend that it will not be used.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Let us hope so.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. I shall not use the 5 minutes.

I believe the chairman has adequately, explicitly, and plainly set before the House the items which were in conference and the manner in which they were settled. The conference committee proceeded with diligence and without great difficulty. I believe it has arrived at a conference solution which serves the best interests of this legislative body and the Congress as a whole.

I highly recommend the conference report to the House.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Legislative Branch [Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS], and to the distinguished chairman of the Full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and to the other conferees on the part of the House for the decision which they have taken in this bill with regard to the controversial west front extension of the Capitol.

As I am sure Members are aware, I have opposed this extension rather vigorously since the decision of the Commission on the Extension of the Capitol was announced in June.

I urged the conferees only yesterday, when the conferees were selected, to accept a Senate amendment to this bill which would have deferred all action on a west front extension until a study of the cost of repairing the west front instead of extending it could be made.

I wish to say I believe the compromise agreement which the gentleman from Alabama has outlined, and as incorporated in the conference report, is certainly a very acceptable substitute to the Senate amendment. It does delay this matter for a full year. In addition, it insures that when an extension of the west front does come before the House it will come up in the normal course as a part of the legislative appropriation bill rather than in the closing hours of the session in a supplemental bill.

I would certainly feel that this is a major victory for those who have opposed the extension and who have said that anything as important as a drastic architectural change made in the original portion of the great United States Capitol—certainly the number one historical shrine in our country and the number one tourist attraction in Washington, D.C.—should be made only after full debate and consideration by all Members of the House and of the Senate. Other Members may not agree with my view, but at least we ought to have an opportunity to discuss the subject fully before we act.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, regret that the Senate language—to prohibit the use of any appropriation "for administrative or any other expenses" in connection with plans for the extension of the west front of the Capitol—has been dropped in this conference report. However, it is a matter of encouragement that it is explicit in this bill "that no part of any appropriation contained in this act" can be used "in connection with the plans referred to as schemes 1, 2, or 3 of the west central front of the Capitol."

I hope, along with the gentleman from New York, that it will be possible during this delay for a bill to be passed establishing a Commission to thoroughly look into the needs for restoration of the west front, and that we will bring in the best architects—including representatives of the American Institute of Architects—and other experts in the United States so to do.

Last month I introduced legislation which would establish a Commission on Architecture and Planning for the Capitol within the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

The Commission's approval would be necessary for any "construction, alteration, or repair of any public building on, or landscaping of, real property comprising the U.S. Capitol grounds," thus insuring that the architecture of the Capitol will be treated consistent with its historical heritage and artistic tradition. In addition, my bill would require that construction projects on the Capitol Grounds "meet a standard which exemplifies and reflects excellence in architecture and land use, good taste and judgment, and which demonstrates a proper regard for the historic and symbolic importance of our National Capitol."

Mr. STRATTON. I certainly agree with the gentleman. I have joined in introducing that legislation. I was fearful, however, that if this matter was going to be decided in the supplemental appropriations bill we would not have an opportunity to consider the legislation he has referred to. The agreement that has now been made certainly makes it possible for us to discuss that legislation and possibly to pass it. It also makes it

possible for us to try to find out what the sentiment is back home on this issue.

Many national magazines have been concerned with the possible alteration of the west front. Perhaps by next year we will have a little better indication of what the people at home think and whether they agree with some of us that we ought not to change this historic building just to put on additional restaurants and briefing rooms and offices we do not really need, since there is already plenty of space in the Rayburn Building and in the remodeled Cannon and Longworth Buildings.

Mr. REID of New York. I think the gentleman will agree that in a very real sense the people of New York and Westchester County desire to restore the west front and not destroy or change it.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, in view of some of the things which have been said, I should state that the conferees did not agree that funds for the improvement of the west front of the Capitol Building would come before the House for consideration through the regular legislative appropriation bill. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS], stated that these funds can be considered at a later time—at a more propitious time, I believe he stated. But I am sure Mr. ANDREWS would say, and certainly I will say, that funds for the improvement of the west central front of the Capitol should be considered in great depth, after lengthy and exhaustive debate, and that the House should, of course, work its will on this matter.

Nothing precipitous should be done. Certainly, it is not the intent of the Committee on Appropriations in this session of Congress to give any consideration whatsoever to any further funds for the extension of the west front. Nobody, insofar as I know, has made a request of the Committee on Appropriations for funds in this or any other bill in this session of Congress for the extension of the west front.

Now, it has been stated by the gentleman from New York that we ought to consider the wishes of the people back home in respect to what we do about the west front of this building. I agree. But, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the people who elect us to office, while they are aware that we do not possess all wisdom on all subjects, would be willing to leave to us in the House of Representatives a decision as to whether or not the west front should be repaired and in what manner. I believe they feel we would be better advised in these matters and would trust each Member's judgment for a decision of this type.

Now, as to the proposition that the action of the conferees in striking the prohibitory language of the Senate somehow represents a great victory for the opponents of the extension of the west front, I would say such a statement is clearly wide of the mark. Why do I say that? Because there was no issue as to providing funds in this bill for the extension of the west front at this time.

I happen to believe that a great majority of the Members of Congress would favor an improvement and probably an extension of the west front. We can make that determination later. This Capitol is supposed to be the place where the national legislative business of the people is done. If by expanding the facilities of this great Capitol and strengthening it we can make it a better place to do the job that the people sent us here to do, that would seem to me to be what we would probably ultimately do when the times are more propitious than they are now.

So, Mr. Speaker, I for one certainly do not consider the fact that there is no money in the bill for the west front as a victory for the opponents of the west front improvement. Nor do I consider the conference action as a repudiation or a slap in the face toward the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the special commission of which he and others are members.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. I certainly do not want to debate the question as to whether it is or is not a victory. As far as I am concerned, my position is not intended to be any slap in the face of the Speaker, for whom I have great respect. I have simply felt that this is a matter that should be debated fully by the Members of the House and those of us who felt differently ought to have a chance to be heard. I would like to say from that point of view the conference committee has come up with an agreement which makes it possible, as the gentleman says, for this matter to be considered and debated in depth. And to that extent it is a finality for those who wanted some consideration.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would say further that there was no sentiment—that I know of—on the part of any member of the Committee on Appropriations to deny the House an opportunity to consider fully this entire matter. No one about whom I know had contemplated trying to slip in the back door, so to speak, and put in funds to do a job of which the Members of the House are not in favor.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it was my understanding that the hearings before the Legislative Subcommittee in the other body had elicited testimony from Mr. Stewart that there was not going to be any request from the Legislative Subcommittee, but that there would be a request before the supplemental committee for the supplemental bill, and it was that testimony that led the other body to put in the restricting amendment, which the conferees eliminated, but which it replaced with this bill to which the gentleman from Texas refers.

Mr. Speaker, that testimony does concern me, and may I——

Mr. MAHON. I would like to say that while this is not a matter that would be considered this session in the closing supplemental, the mere fact that an appropriation is considered in a supplemental bill does not mean that it is not given the same consideration that it would be given in any other appropriation bill.

Mr. STRATTON. Except that by the time it comes to the floor of the House for consideration many Members are already campaigning for reelection. I recall once when we were called back by the leadership at 4 o'clock in the morning in order to pass the supplemental bill, on the 13th of October 1962, I believe it was. Therefore it does not give us the kind of depth of discussion to which the gentleman referred, but I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his assurance, if I understood the gentleman correctly, that there will not be any request in the supplemental bill this year.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from New York indicates that the House of Representatives, this great legislative body about which we have heard considerable today, would not give as thorough consideration in the closing hours as in the opening hours to any important appropriation legislation. Of course, if the gentleman feels that such consideration is not given at the end of the session, I assume, then, that the Members would shout any extension proposition down, thus achieving the gentleman's objective.

But, Mr. Speaker, I harbor no doubt that the Committee on Appropriations, and indeed the House of Representatives acts responsibly throughout the session, and I do not want to see the body of which I am a Member act irresponsibly at any time during the session.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that many of the amendments reported in technical disagreement relate solely to housekeeping operations of the Senate—which by long and well-founded practice we concur in without debate—and in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 1 through 12, inclusive; 14 through 26 inclusive; 28 through 33 inclusive; and 42 and 43, be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of these amendments be dispensed with, and that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendments, as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 1, insert the following:

"SENATE

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 2, line 2, insert the following:

"COMPENSATION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND SENATORS, MILEAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND SENATORS, AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCES OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND LEADERS OF THE SENATE"

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 6, insert the following:

"COMPENSATION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND SENATORS

"For compensation of the Vice President and Senators of the United States, $3,296,735."

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 2, line 10, insert the following:

"MILEAGE OF PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND OF SENATORS

"For mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, $58,370."

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 2, line 14, insert the following:

"EXPENSE ALLOWANCES OF THE VICE PRESIDENT, AND MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

"For expense allowance of the Vice President, $10,000; Majority Leader of the Senate, $3,000; and Minority Leader of the Senate, $3,000; in all, $1,000."

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 2, line 10, insert the following:

"SALARIES, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES

"For compensation of officers, employees, clerks to Senators, and others as authorized by law, including agency contributions and longevity compensation as authorized, which shall be paid from this appropriation without regard to the below limitations, as follows:".

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 3, line 1, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

"For clerical assistance to the Vice President, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in basic multiples of $5 per month, $203,515."

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 3, line 5, insert the following:

"CHAPLAIN

"Chaplain of the Senate, $15,540."

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 3, line 7, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"For office of the Secretary, $1,369,630, including $150,220 required for the purposes specified and authorized by section 74b of Title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That the reporters of debates in the office of the Secretary are hereby designated the official reporters of debates of the Senate."

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 3, line 14, insert the following:

"COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

"For professional and clerical assistance to standing committees and the Select Committee on Small Business, $3,367,430."

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 3, line 18, insert the following:

"CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $99,435.

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Minority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $99,435."

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 4, line 1, insert the following:

"ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

"For administrative and clerical assistants and messenger service for Senators, $17,171,215."

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 4, line 19, insert the following:

"OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND THE MINORITY

"For the offices of the Secretary for the Majority and the Secretary for the Minority, $166,675."

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 4, line 23, insert the following:

"OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY WHIPS

"For four clerical assistants, two for the Majority Whip and two for the Minority Whip, at rates of compensation to be fixed in basic multiples of $60 per annum by the respective Whips, $18,460 each; in all, $36,920."

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 5, line 3, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF THE SENATE

"For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, $317,895."

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 5, line 7, insert the following.:

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE"

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 5, line 8, insert the following:

"SENATE POLICY COMMITTEES

"For salaries and expenses of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, $204,150 for each such committee; in all, $408,300."

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 5, line 12, insert the following:

"AUTOMOBILES AND MAINTENANCE

"For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of four automobiles, one for the Vice President, one for the President Pro Tempore, one for the Majority Leader, and one for the Minority Leader, $43,660."

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 5, line 17, insert the following:

"FURNITURE

"For service and materials in cleaning and and repairing furniture, and for the purchase of furniture, $31,190: *Provided*, That the furniture purchased is not available from other agencies of the Government."

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 5, line 22, insert the following:

"INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

"For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, or conducted pursuant to section 134(a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, including $396,615 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution Numbered 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, $5,420,000."

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 6, line 5, insert the following:

"FOLDING DOCUMENTS

"For the employment of personnel for folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate of not exceeding $2.32 per hour per person, $40,715."

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 6, line 9, insert the following:

"MAIL TRANSPORTATION

"For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, $16,560."

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 6, line 13, insert the following:

"MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

"For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, $3,743,160, including $275,000 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87–82, approved July 6, 1961."

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 6, line 18, insert the following:

"POSTAGE STAMPS

"For postage stamps for the offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority, $140; and for air-mail and special delivery stamps for office of the Secretary, $160; office of the Sergeant at Arms, $125; Senators and the President of the Senate, as authorized by law, $90,400; in all, $90,825."

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 7, line 1, insert the following:

"STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

"For stationery for Senators and the President of the Senate, $249,600: *Provided*, That effective with the fiscal year 1967 and thereafter the allowance for stationery for each Senator from States having a population of ten million or more inhabitants shall be at the rate of $3,000 per annum; and for stationery for committees and officers of the Senate, $13,200; in all, $262,800, to remain available until expended".

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 8, line 6, insert:

"COMMUNICATIONS

"For an amount for communications which may be expended interchangeably for payment, in accordance with such limitations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, of charges on official telegrams and long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of Senators or the President of the Senate, such telephone calls to be in addition to those authorized by the provisions of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 392; 2 U.S.C. 46c, 46d, 46e), as amended, and the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949 (63 Stat. 77; 2 U.S.C. 46d–1), $15,150."

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 8, line 18, insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 8, line 19, insert:

"Effective July 1, 1966, the paragraph relating to official long-distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, under the heading 'Contingent Expenses of the Senate' in Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended (2 U.S.C. 46c), is amended to read as follows:

" 'There shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, toll charges on not to exceed three thousand strictly official long-distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, aggregating not more than fifteen thousand minutes each fiscal year for each Senator and the Vice President of the United States: *Provided*, That not more than fifteen hundred calls aggregating not more than seventy-five hundred minutes made in the first six months of each fiscal year shall be paid for under this sentence. The toll charges on an additional fifteen hundred such calls aggregating not more than seventy-five hundred minutes each fiscal year for each Senator from any State having a population of ten million or more inhabitants shall also be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate: *Provided*, That not more than seven hundred and fifty calls aggregating not more than three thousand seven hundred and fifty minutes made

in the first six months of each fiscal year shall be paid for under this sentence.'"

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 9, line 21, insert:

"Effective the first day of the first month following date of enactment the table contained in section 4(f) of the Federal Employees' Salary Increase Act of 1955 (Public Law 94, Eighty-fourth Congress, approved June 28, 1955), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"States having a population of—	*Amount of increase*
Less than 3,000,000	$12,780
3,000,000 but less than 4,000,000	17,760
4,000,000 but less than 5,000,000	20,760
5,000,000 but less than 7,000,000	23,760
7,000,000 but less than 9,000,000	26,760
9,000,000 but less than 10,000,000	29,760
9,000,000 but less than 10,000,000	25,740
10,000,000 but less than 11,000,000	34,740
11,000,000 but less than 12,000,000	37,740
12,000,000 but less than 13,000,000	40,740
13,000,000 but less than 15,000,000	43,740
15,000,000 but less than 17,000,000	46,740
17,000,000 or more	49,740"

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 10, line 4, insert:

"Effective the first day of the first month following date of enactment the paragraph relating to rates of compensation of employees of committees of the Senate, contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a–1a), is amended by striking out so much of the second sentence thereof as follows the words 'First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947,' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'the basic compensation of any employee of a standing or select committee of the Senate (including the majority and minority policy committees and the majority conference of the Senate and minority conference of the Senate but excluding the Committee on Appropriations), or a joint committee of the two Houses the expenses of which are paid from the contingent fund of the Senate whose basic compensation may be fixed under such provisions at a rate of $8,000 per annum, may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $8,040 per annum, except that the basic compensation of one such employee may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $8,880 per annum, and the basic compensation of two such employees may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $8,460 per annum. The basic compensation of any employee of the Committee on Appropriations whose basic compensation may be fixed at a rate of $8,000 per annum under such provisions may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $8,040 per annum, except that the basic compensation of one such employee may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $8,880 per annum, and the basic compensation of seventeen such employees may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $8,460 per annum.'"

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 11, line 17, insert: "The third paragraph under the heading 'Administrative Provisions' in the appropriation for the Senate in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, as amended (2 U.S.C. 43b), is amended by inserting after the words 'six round trips' the following: '(or the equivalent thereof in one-way trips)'."

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 27, line 12, insert:

"SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

"For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel, and for personal and other services; including eight attendants at $1,800 each; for the care and operation of the Senate Office Buildings; including the subway and subway transportation systems connecting the Senate Office Buildings with the Capitol; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, $2,530,000."

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 28, line 1, insert:

"SENATE GARAGE

"For maintenance, repairs, alterations, personal and other services, and all other necessary expenses, $57,900."

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 through 12, inclusive; 14 through 26, inclusive; 28 through 38, inclusive; and 42 and 43, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 4, line 5, insert:

"OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

"For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, $3,364,025: *Provided*, That effective on the first day of the first month following date of enactment, the basic per annum compensation of one offset press operator, Service Department shall be $2,700 in lieu of $2,340, that the Sergeant at Arms may employ a telecommunications adviser at $5,520 basic per annum, an additional Sergeant, Capitol Police force at $2,940 basic per annum, an additional Lieutenant, Capitol Police force at $3,600 basic per annum, and twenty-five additional Privates, Capitol Police force at $2,160 basic per annum each: *Provided further*, That appointees to the Capitol Police force positions authorized herein shall have the equivalent of at least one year's police experience."

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount of "$2,940" named in said amendment, insert "$2,880"; and in lieu of the amount of "$3,600" named in said amendment, insert "$3,480".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 21, line 15, strike out "$50,000" and insert "$62,500".

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$95,500".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 46: Page 31, line 5, insert: ", together with $478,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriations made for the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 34, line 23, insert: "Funds available to the Library of Congress may be expended to reimburse the Department of State for medical services rendered to employees of the Library of Congress stationed abroad; and for purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles. Further, payments shall be authorized of allowances and other benefits to employees stationed abroad to the same extent as authorized from time to time for members of the Foreign Service of the United States of comparable grade, subject to such rules and regulations as may be issued by the Librarian of Congress."

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Funds available to the Library of Congress may be expended to reimburse the Department of State for medical services rendered to employees of the Library of Congress stationed abroad; for purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles; and for payment of travel, storage and transportation of household goods, and transportation and per diem expenses for families en route (not to exceed twenty-four), subject to such rules and regulations as may be issued by the Librarian of Congress."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 38, line 8, insert:

"SEC. 105. Effective on the first day of the first month following date of enactment, the basic per annum compensation of the captain, Capitol Police force shall be $4,320; the basic per annum compensation of lieutenants and special officers, Capitol Police force shall be $3,600 each; and the basic per annum compensation of sergeants, Capitol Police force shall be $2,940 each."

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 105. Effective on the first day of the first month following date of enactment, the

basic per annum compensation of the captain, Capitol Police force shall be $4,260; the basic per annum compensation of lieutenants and special officers, Capitol Police force shall be $3,480 each; and the basic per annum compensation of sergeants, Capitol Police force shall be $2,880 each. Effective on the first day of the first month following enactment of H.R. 15857, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation, amending the District of Columbia Police and Fireman's Salary Act of 1958, the basic per annum compensation of the captain, Capitol Police force shall be $4,320; the basic per annum compensation of lieutenants and special officers, Capitol Police force shall be $3,600 each; and the basic per annum compensation of sergeants, Capitol Police force shall be $2,940 each."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote on the conference report and the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables at the conclusion of the debate.

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

There was no objection.

HANDLING OF DOGS AND CATS FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 13881) 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, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1848)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13881) 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That in order to protect the owners of dogs and cats from theft of such pets, to prevent the sale or use of dogs and cats which have been stolen, and to insure that certain animals intended for use in research facilities are provided humane care and treatment, it is essential to regulate the transportation, purchase, sale, housing, care, handling, and treatment of such animals by persons or organizations engaged in using them for research or experimental purposes or in transporting, buying, or selling them for such use.

"SEC. 2. When used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes any individual, partnership, firm, joint stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or other legal entity;

"(b) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Agriculture;

"(c) The term 'commerce' means commerce between any State, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State, territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, but through any place outside thereof; or within any territory, possession, or the District of Columbia;

"(d) The term 'dog' means any live dog (Canis familiaris);

"(e) The term 'cat' means any live cat (Felis catus);

"(f) The term 'research facility' means any school, institution, organization, or person that uses or intends to use dogs or cats in research, tests, or experiments, and that (1) purchases or transports dogs or cats in commerce, or (2) receives funds under a grant, award, loan, or contract from a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States for the purpose of carrying out research, tests, or experiments;

"(g) The term 'dealer' means any person who for compensation or profit delivers for transportation, or transports, except as a common carrier, buys, or sells dogs or cats in commerce for research purposes;

"(h) The term 'animal' means live dogs, cats, monkeys (nonhuman primate mammals), guinea pigs, hamsters, and rabbits.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary shall issue licenses to dealers upon application therefor in such form and manner as he may prescribe and upon payment of such fee established pursuant to section 23 of this Act: *Provided*, That no such license shall be issued until the dealer shall have demonstrated that his facilities comply with the standards promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to section 13 of this Act: *Provided, however*, That any person who derives less than a substantial portion of his income (as determined by the Secretary) from the breeding and raising of dogs or cats on his own premises and sells any such dog or cat to a dealer or research facility shall not be required to obtain a license as a dealer under this Act. The Secretary is further authorized to license, as dealers, persons who do not qualify as dealers within the meaning of this Act upon such persons' complying with the requirements specified above and agreeing, in writing, to comply with all the requirements of this Act and the regulations promulgated by the Secretary hereunder.

"SEC. 4. No dealer shall sell or offer to sell or transport or offer for transportation to any research facility any dog or cat, or buy, sell, offer to buy or sell, transport or offer for transportation in commerce to or from another dealer under this Act any dog or cat, unless and until such dealer shall have obtained a license from the Secretary and such license shall not have been suspended or revoked.

"SEC. 5. No dealer shall sell or otherwise dispose of any dog or cat within a period of five business days after the acquisition of such animal or within such other period as may be specified by the Secretary.

"SEC. 6. Every research facility shall register with the Secretary in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

"SEC. 7. It shall be unlawful for any research facility to purchase any dog or cat from any person except a person holding a valid license as a dealer issued by the Secretary pursuant to this Act unless such person is exempted from obtaining such license under section 3 of this Act.

"SEC. 8. No department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States which uses animals for research or experimentation shall purchase or otherwise acquire any dog or cat for such purposes from any person except a person holding a valid license as a dealer issued by the Secretary pursuant to this Act unless such person is exempted from obtaining such license under section 3 of this Act.

"SEC. 9. When construing or enforcing the provisions of this Act, the act, omission, or failure of any individual acting for or employed by a research facility or a dealer, or a person licensed as a dealer pursuant to the second sentence of section 3, within the scope of his employment or office, shall be deemed the act, omission, or failure of such research facility, dealer, or other person as well as of such individual.

"SEC. 10. Research facilities and dealers shall make, and retain for such reasonable period of time as the Secretary may prescribe, such records with respect to the purchase, sale, transportation, identification, and previous ownership of dogs and cats but not monkeys, guinea pigs, hamsters, or rabbits as the Secretary may prescribe, upon forms supplied by the Secretary. Such records shall be made available at all reasonable times for inspection by the Secretary, by any Federal officer or employee designated by the Secretary.

"SEC. 11. All dogs and cats delivered for transportation, transported, purchased, or sold in commerce by any dealer shall be marked or identified at such time and in such humane manner as the Secretary may prescribe.

"SEC. 12. The Secretary is authorized to promulgate humane standards and record-keeping requirements governing the purchase, handling, or sale of dogs or cats by dealers or research facilities at auction sales.

"SEC. 13. The Secretary shall establish and promulgate standards to govern the humane handling, care, treatment, and transportation of animals by dealers and research facilities. Such standards shall include minimum requirements with respect to the housing, feeding, watering, sanitation, ventilation, shelter from extremes of weather and temperature, separation by species, and adequate veterinary care. The foregoing shall not be construed as authorizing the Secretary to prescribe standards for the handling, care, or treatment of animals during actual research or experimentation by a research facility as determined by such research facility.

"SEC. 14. Any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States having laboratory animal facilities shall comply with the standards promulgated by the Secretary for a research facility under section 13.

"SEC. 15. (a) The Secretary shall consult and cooperate with other Federal departments, agencies, or instrumentalities concerned with the welfare of animals used for research or experimentation when establishing standards pursuant to section 13 and in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the officials of the various States or political subdivisions thereof in effectuating the purposes of this Act and of any State, local, or municipal legislation or ordinance on the same subject.

"SEC. 16. The Secretary shall make such investigations or inspections as he deems necessary to determine whether any dealer or research facility has violated or is violating any provision of this Act or any regulation issued thereunder. The Secretary shall promulgate such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to permit inspectors to confiscate or destroy in a humane manner any

animals found to be suffering as a result of a failure to comply with any provision of this Act or any regulation issued thereunder if (1) such animals are held by a dealer, or (2) such animals are held by a research facility and are no longer required by such research facility to carry out the research, test, or experiment for which such animals have been utilized.

"SEC. 17. The Secretary shall issue rules and regulations requiring licensed dealers and research facilities to permit inspection of their animals and records at reasonable hours upon request by legally constituted law enforcement agencies in search of lost animals.

"SEC. 18. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary to promulgate rules, regulations, or orders for the handling, care, treatment, or inspection of animals during actual research or experimentation by a research facility as determined by such research facility.

"SEC. 19. (a) If the Secretary has reason to believe that any person licensed as a dealer has violated or is violating any provision of this Act or any of the rules or regulations promulgated by the Secretary hereunder, the Secretary may suspend such person's license temporarily, but not to exceed twenty-one days, and, after notice and opportunity for hearing, may suspend for such additional period as he may specify or revoke such license, if such violation is determined to have occurred and may make an order that such person shall cease and desist from continuing such violation.

"(b) Any dealer aggrieved by a final order of the Secretary issued pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may, within sixty days after entry of such an order, seek review of such order in the manner provided in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1009).

"(c) Any dealer who violates any provision of this Act shall, on conviction thereof, be subject to imprisonment for not more than one year or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both.

"SEC. 20. (a) If the Secretary has reason to believe that any research facility has violated or is violating any provision of this Act or any of the rules or regulations promulgated by the Secretary hereunder and if, after notice and opportunity for hearing, he finds a violation, he may make an order that such research facility shall cease and desist from continuing such violation. Such cease and desist order shall become effective fifteen days after issuance of the order. Any research facility which knowingly fails to obey a cease-and-desist order made by the Secretary under this section shall be subject to a civil penalty of $500 for each offense, and each day during which such failure continues shall be deemed a separate offense.

"(b) Any research facility aggrieved by a final order of the Secretary issued pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may, within sixty days after entry of such order, seek review of such order in the district court for the district in which such research facility is located in the manner provided in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1009).

"SEC. 21. The Secretary is authorized to promulgate such rules, regulations, and orders as he may deem necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"SEC. 22. If any provision of this Act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of any such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 23. The Secretary shall charge, assess, and cause to be collected reasonable fees for licenses issued. Such fees shall be adjusted on an equitable basis taking into consideration the type and nature of the operations to be licensed and shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as Congress may from time to time provide.

"SEC. 24. The regulations referred to in section 10 and section 13 shall be prescribed by the Secretary as soon as reasonable but not later than six months from the date of enactment of this Act. Additions and amendments thereto may be prescribed from time to time as may be necessary or advisable. Compliance by dealers with the provisions of this Act and such regulations shall commence ninety days after the promulgation of such regulations. Compliance by research facilities with the provisions of this Act and such regulations shall commence six months after the promulgation of such regulations, except that the Secretary may grant extensions of time to research facilities which do not comply with the standards prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to section 13 of this Act provided that the Secretary determines that there is evidence that the research facilities will meet such standards within a reasonable time."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and certain other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
JOSEPH RESNICK,
ALBERT QUIE,
CATHERINE MAY,
BOB DOLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN MAGNUSON,
A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
MAURINE NEUBERGER,
DANIEL BREWSTER,
NORRIS COTTON,
HUGH SCOTT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13881) 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, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The amendment of the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substituted language which generally followed the structure of the House bill but was different in numerous substantial respects.

We have diligently tried to bring back to the House an effective bill which will codify the noblest and most compassionate concern that the human heart holds for those small animals whose very existence is dedicated to the advancement of medical skill and knowledge while at the same time still preserving for the medical and research professions an unfettered opportunity to carry forward their vital work in behalf of all mankind.

The House bill and the Senate amendment were similar in objective yet different in detail. The conferees have attempted to select the best and most practicable provisions of each version and have combined and modified them in an effort to produce workable and meaningful legislation.

The conferees are aware of course that this bill, which was originated and developed by this Congress, creates a new responsibility for the Department of Agriculture.

In anticipation of future questions and problems about the new program, the conferees herewith submit an explanation and interpretation of this legislation which is designed to foresee some of these questions and problems. Yet the conferees recognize that no one possesses completely accurate forward vision and in that spirit we will continue to seek the advice and counsel of all those who share an interest in this program. This includes not only the medical and research professions, the various animal welfare groups, and the Department of Agriculture, but also the many thousands of Americans throughout the nation whose conscience and concern have led to the enactment of this legislation.

BRIEF SUMMARY

The Conference substitute contains the following major provisions:

(1) The Secretary of Agriculture would issue licenses to dealers who bought or sold dogs or cats in commerce. These license fees would be set at a reasonable amount and the cost would be adjusted on an equitable basis with the Secretary considering the type and nature of the dealer operation to be licensed.

(2) Research facilities, as defined by the bill, would be required to register with the Secretary of Agriculture, but would not be required to be licensed.

(3) Dealers and research facilities would keep and retain for reasonable periods records of their purchase, sale, transportation, identification, and previous ownership of dogs and cats only. Although monkeys, guinea pigs, hamsters, and rabbits would be included under humane standards provisions obligatory to both dealers and research facilities, records would not be required to be kept on these animals.

(4) The Secretary would specify the time and humane method of identification of dogs and cats.

(5) The Secretary would establish standards to govern the humane handling, care, treatment, and transportation of animals (as defined in this legislation) by both dealers and research facilities. These standards would include minimum requirements with respect to the housing, feeding, watering, sanitation, ventilation, shelter from extremes of weather and temperature, separation by species, and adequate veterinary care. However, these standards would not be construed to apply to research facilities during actual research or experimentation as determined by the research facility itself.

(6) Departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States which have laboratory animal facilities would be required to comply with the provisions of this legislation.

(7) The Secretary would consult and cooperate with other Federal departments, agencies, or instrumentalities concerned with animal welfare in research or experimentation when establishing humane standards for the handling of such animals by dealers and research facilities.

(8) The Secretary would make necessary investigations to see that dealers and research facilities are not violating any provisions of this legislation or any regulations established thereunder. The Secretary would establish necessary regulations to permit inspectors to confiscate or destroy in a humane manner any animal found to be suffering as a result of a violation of this legislation or any regulations established thereunder if animals are held by a dealer, or if animals are held by a research facility and are no longer required to carry out the research, test, or experiment for which they were utilized.

(9) The Secretary would issue rules and regulations requiring dealers and research facilities to permit inspection of their animals and records at reasonable hours upon request by legally constituted law enforcement agencies in search of lost animals. However, these regulations would not be construed to authorize any interference with research or experimentation by a research facility.

(10) As a general rule, research facilities would be required to purchase dogs or cats only from persons holding valid licenses as dealers. The same general rule would apply to departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States. However, research facilities and U.S. Government facilities could obtain dogs and cats from certain exempted sources, such as, for example, municipal pounds and farmers.

(11) Whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that any person licensed as a dealer has violated or is violating any provision of this legislation or any regulation established thereunder he may: (1) suspend that person's license for up to 21 days, (2) after notice and opportunity for hearing he may suspend it for an additional period or revoke it if a violation is determined to have occurred, and (3) he may issue a cease and desist order to prevent a continuing of the violation. Any dealer who is convicted for a violation of any provision of this legislation would be subject to imprisonment for not more than one year or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both.

(12) If the Secretary has reason to believe that any research facility has violated or is violating any provision of this legislation or any regulations established thereunder and if, after notice and opportunity for hearing, he finds a violation (1) he may issue a cease and desist order, and (2) if the research facility knowingly fails to obey this cease and desist order, it shall be subject to a civil penalty of $500 for each offense, and each day such failure continues shall be deemed a separate offense.

(13) Any dealer or research facility aggrieved by a final order of the Secretary may within 60 days after entry of such order seek review in the manner provided in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

ARRANGEMENT OF SUBJECT MATTER

The conference substitute rearranges the order of most of the sections as they originally appeared in the House bill and the Senate amendment in order to establish an orderly and uniform coverage of the subject matter in conference. The 24 sections of the bill and the subject matter covered by each section are as follows:

Section 1. Statement of policy.
Section 2. Definitions.
Section 3. Licensing of dealers.
Section 4. Valid license for dealers required.
Section 5. Time period for disposal of dogs or cats by dealers.
Section 6. Registration for research facilities.
Section 7. Prohibition against research facilities purchasing dogs or cats except from dealers or exempted persons.
Section 8. Prohibition against U.S. Government facilities acquiring dogs or cats except from dealers or exempted persons.
Section 9. Principal-agent relationship established for dealers and research facilities.
Section 10. Recordkeeping by dealers and research facilities.
Section 11. Marking and identification of dogs and cats.
Section 12. Humane standards and recordkeeping for dogs and cats at auction sales.
Section 13. Humane standards for animals by dealers and research facilities.
Section 14. Humane standards for animals by U.S. Government facilities.
Section 15. Consultation and cooperation with Federal, State, and local governmental bodies by Secretary of Agriculture.
Section 16. Investigations or inspections by Secretary of Agriculture.
Section 17. Inspection by legally constituted law enforcement officers.
Section 18. Exemption applicable to animals during actual research or experimentation.
Section 19. Dealer penalties and enforcement.
Section 20. Research facility penalties and enforcement.
Section 21. Regulations.
Section 22. Constitutional invalidity clause.
Section 23. Fees and appropriations.
Section 24. Effective date.

SECTION BY SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. This section sets forth the objectives of the bill which are (a) to protect owners of dogs and cats from the theft of such pets; (b) to regulate the transportation, purchase, sale, handling, and treatment of dogs, cats, and certain other animals destined for use in research or experimentation; and (c) to regulate the handling, care, and treatment of dogs, cats, and certain other animals in research facilities. Section 1 is identical to section 1 of the Senate amendment and is comparable to section 1 of the House bill.

Section 2. This section contains definitions of eight terms used in the bill.

(a) The term "person" is limited to various private forms of business organizations. It is, however, intended to include nonprofit or charitable institutions which handle dogs and cats. It is not intended to include public agencies or political subdivisions of State or municipal governments or their duly authorized agents. It is the intent of the conferees that local or municipal dog pounds or animal shelters shall not be required to obtain a license since these public agencies are not a "person" within the meaning of section 2(a). Accordingly, research facilities would not (under section 3) be prohibited from purchasing or acquiring dogs and cats from city dog pounds or similar institutions or their duly authorized agents because these institutions are not "persons" within the meaning of section 2 (a). Section 2(a) is identical to section 2 (a) of the House bill which is broader in scope than the comparable provision in section 2(a) of the Senate amendment.

(b) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture. This provision was identical in both section 2(b) of the House bill and section 2(b) of the Senate amendment.

(c) The term "commerce" is defined as interstate commerce (1) between the several States, territories, possessions, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or (2) between points within the same State, territory, possession, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, but through any point outside of there, or (3) within any territory or possession or the District of Columbia. Section 2(c) is identical to section 2(c) of the Senate amendment which was substantially the same as section 2(c) of the House bill.

(d) The term "cat" is limited to a live cat of the species Felis catus. Section 2(d) is identical to section 2(e) of the Senate amendment.

(e) The term "dog" is limited to a live dog of the species Canis familiaris. Section 2(e) is identical to section 2(d) of the Senate amendment. The conference substitute includes the Senate definitions of "dog" and "cat" which are broader than the House bill which was confined to dogs or cats used or intended for use in research or experimentation.

(f) The term "research facility" means any school, institution, organization, or person (as defined in section 2(a)) that uses or intends to use dogs or cats for research or experimental purposes *and* that (1) purchases or transports dogs or cats in commerce (as defined in section 2(c)), or (2) receives any funds from a U.S. Government department, agency, or instrumentality for the purposes of carrying out research, tests, or experiments.

By adopting the definition of research facility in section 2(f), the conferees' intention is to limit the coverage of this legislation to major research facilities and exclude the thousands of hospitals, clinics, and schools which don't use dogs or cats for research and tests. However, if an institution meets the definition of "research facility," it is subject to regulations in regard to all animals defined in section 2(h). This section 2(f) is identical to section 2(f) of the Senate amendment. A similar provision is included in section 2(f) of the House bill.

(g) The term "dealer" means any person (as defined in section 2(a)) who for profit or compensation delivers for transportation, transports (except as a common carrier), buys or sells dogs or cats in commerce (as defined in section 2(c)) for research purposes.

The definition of dealer is not intended to exclude from licensing or regulation those nonprofit or charitable institutions or animal shelters which supply animals in commerce to research facilities for compensation of their out-of-pocket expenses.

Except for the specific exemption provided in section 3, the term "dealer" would apply to any individual or other person who raises dogs or cats for sale in commerce to any dealer or research facility. Section 2(g) is similar to section 2(g) of the House bill and differs substantially from section 2(g) of the Senate amendment.

(h) The term "animal" is limited to live dogs and cats (defined in sections 2 (d) and (e)), monkeys (nonhuman primate mammals), guinea pigs, hamsters, and rabbits. Section 2(h) is similar to section 2(h) of the Senate amendment. The Latin names for the latter three animals were deleted to avoid confusion. There is no comparable provision in the House bill.

Section 3. This section sets forth the requirements and procedures for issuing licenses to dealers. A separate provision is included in the last sentence to allow persons who do not, for one reason or another, qualify as dealers (as defined in section 2(g)) to obtain a license. This allows persons who would otherwise be prohibited from selling to dealers or research facilities to obtain a license voluntarily and thus continue to provide dogs and cats for research and experimental use.

In addition, a person who derives less than a substantial portion of his income from the breeding and raising of dogs or cats on his own premises would be exempt from being licensed as a dealer under this legislation. This provision was adopted by the conference to allow farmers and other owners of relatively small numbers of dogs or cats to continue to sell their own animals to dealers or research facilities without obtaining a license. Conversely, research facilities and dealers would not be prohibited from purchasing dogs or cats from persons exempted under this section. The term "substantial portion of his income" as used in this provision is subject to the determination of the Secretary. The conferees do not contemplate the licensing of farmers or pet owners who sell only an occasional litter of puppies or kittens or only a few dogs or cats to a dealer or to a research facility. The specific requirement that these exempted persons breed dogs or cats on their own premises is intended to prevent their selling to dealers for research purposes animals which were stolen or otherwise obtained for

that purpose. Section 3 is similar to section 6 of the House bill. Comparable provisions were not included in the Senate amendment.

Section 4. This section prohibits dealers from conducting any dog or cat business with research facilities or with other dealers without holding a valid license. Section 4 is identical to section 4 of the House bill and is comparable to section 4 of the Senate amendment.

Section 5. This section prohibits dealers from selling or otherwise disposing of any dog or cat within 5 business days after the acquisition of such animals or within such other period as the Secretary may specify in regulations issued pursuant to this legislation. The purpose of the waiting period is to give owners, law enforcement officers, and the Secretary a greater opportunity to trace lost or stolen dogs and cats. It is the intent of the conferees that section 5 be construed with section 21 of the conference substitute as granting the Secretary authority to deal with the problem of dogs and cats in transit. The conferees do not intend the holding period established hereunder to include the time during which the dogs and cats are in transit. Section 5 is identical to section 10 of the House bill. The comparable provision of the Senate amendment is section 14.

Section 6. This section requires research facilities (as defined in section 2(f)) to register with the Secretary of Agriculture. Research facilities will not be licensed under this legislation. Section 6 is identical to section 6 of the Senate amendment. There is no comparable House provision.

Section 7. This section provides that as a general rule, research facilities are prohibited from buying cats and dogs from persons who do not hold valid licenses as dealers. However, an exception to this rule has been made by the conferees in section 3 of the conference substitute.

Section 3 of the House bill would have prohibited research facilities from purchasing dogs or cats from any person, except a person holding a valid license as a dealer. Section 3 of the Senate amendment would have prohibited a research facility from purchasing dogs or cats from dealers unless the dealer held a valid license.

In conformance with section 2(a) of the conference substitute, the conferees have rewritten this section 7 in order to require research facilities to purchase dogs and cats only from (1) persons who held valid licenses as dealers or (2) persons exempted under section 3 of the conference substitute or (3) sources that do not come within the definition of "persons" set forth in section 2(a).

The conferees contemplate, therefore, that research facilities which rely on farm sources, municipal dog and cat pounds, and the duly authorized agents of such local governments for their dogs and cats will continue to be able to obtain such animals from these sources.

Section 8. This section extends to departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government a similar prohibition on dog or cat acquisitions as applies to research facilities under section 7. Section 8 as modified is similar to section 5 of the Senate amendment. There is no comparable House provision.

Section 9. This section establishes the principal-agent relationship between dealers, research facilities and their employees. Except for an internal section reference, section 9 is identical to section 13 of the House bill and is substantially the same as section 21 of the Senate amendment.

Section 10. This section requires recordkeeping by dealers and research facilities with regard to the purchase, sale, transportation, identification, and previous ownership of dogs and cats. The Secretary is directed to provide the proper forms for this recordkeeping and these records are to be made available to the Secretary for inspection by him or any Federal officer or employee which the Secretary may designate. The conferees do not contemplate the designation of private citizens or non-Federal Government employees in the administration of this legislation. The conference substitute also makes it clear that records need not be maintained on monkeys, guinea pigs, hamsters, or rabbits. Except for the specific provisions in regard to the monkeys, guinea pigs, hamsters, or rabbits, section 10 is identical to section 10 of the Senate amendment. Section 8 of the House bill contains a similar provision.

Section 11. This section requires all cats and dogs covered by this bill to be marked or identified in a humane manner. The methods, type, and time of marking or identification are to be prescribed by the Secretary. The purpose of such marking and identification is intended as a means of tracing lost or stolen pets. Except for the inclusion of the words "at such time and," section 11 is identical to section 9 of the Senate amendment. The comparable House provision is section 7 of the House bill.

Section 12. This section authorizes the Secretary to establish and enforce recordkeeping requirements and humane standards for the purchase, sale, or handling (which includes treatment, housing, and care of dogs or cats) by dealers or research facilities at auction sales. This section is not intended to prohibit auction sales. On the contrary, the conferees feel that auction sales should be continued and that these public sales present an opportunity for the Secretary to effectively meet the objectives of this legislation as set forth in section 1. Section 12 is a modification of section 16 of the Senate amendment. There is no comparable provision in the House bill.

Section 13. This section requires that the Secretary establish standards to govern the humane handling, care, treatment, and transportation of animals (as defined in section 2(h)) by dealers and research facilities. Standards for the eight categories listed in this section are mandatory, and the Secretary is not given additional discretionary authority as was proposed in the Senate amendment.

The intent of the conferees is clearly set forth in the last sentence of this section which states that the Secretary is *not* authorized to prescribe standards for the handling, care, or treatment of animals during actual research or experimentation by a research facility. It is the intention of the conferees that the Secretary neither directly nor indirectly in any manner interfere with or harass research facilities during the conduct of actual research and experimentation. The important determination of when an animal is in actual research so as to be exempt from regulations under the bill is left to the research facility itself. Research or experimentation is also intended to include use of animals as teaching aids in educational institutions. Except as indicated above, section 13 is identical to section 7 of the Senate amendment. Section 5 of the House bill authorized the Secretary to set humane standards for the handling of dogs and cats by dealers. It also contained a similar prohibition against any interference with research and experimentation.

Section 14. This section requires Federal departments, agencies, or instrumentalities having laboratory facilities to meet the same standards for the humane handling, care, and treatment of animals (as defined in section 2(h)) as are required of research facilities under section 13 of the conference substitute. Section 14 is identical to section 8 of the Senate amendment. No comparable provision is included in the House bill.

Section 15(a). This section directs the Secretary to consult with other Federal departments, agencies, or instrumentalities concerned with the welfare of animals used for research or experimentation when establishing standards of care and treatment. The conferees recognize that other Federal departments have already developed experience in laboratory animal care and this experience should be made available to the Secretary. In addition, continued cooperation with other departments and agencies is directed.

(b) This section authorizes the Secretary to cooperate with State and local officials in preventing the theft of dogs and cats, in the apprehension of suspected dog and cat thieves, and in carrying out the other provisions of this legislation.

Except for an internal section reference, section 15(a) is identical with section 13(a) of the Senate amendment. Section 15(b) is identical to section 9 of the House bill.

Section 16. This section directs the Secretary to make such investigations or inspections as he deems necessary to effectuate the purpose of the bill and insure compliance with the bill or any regulation issued thereunder. The conferees contemplate that these inspectors will be employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The second sentence is intended to permit the Secretary to insure that animals suffering because of inhumane treatment are not left unattended. It is the intent of the conferees that inspectors not be permitted to interfere with the carrying out of actual research or experimentation as determined by a research facility. Section 16 is essentially the same as section 12 of the Senate amendment except for changing the word "person" to "dealer or research facility" for clarification. No comparable provision is included in the House bill.

Section 17. This section directs the Secretary to establish rules and regulations which would require licensed dealers and research facilities to permit inspection of their animals and records by legally constituted law enforcement agencies. The purpose of this section is to expedite the search for stolen pets. It is the intent of the conferees that inspection under this section be specifically limited to searches for lost and stolen pets by officers of the law (not owners themselves) and that legally constituted law enforcement agencies means agencies with general law enforcement authority and not those agencies whose law enforcement duties are limited to enforcing local animal regulations. It is *not* intended that this section be used by private citizens or law enforcement officers to harass research facilities. Such officers cannot inspect the animals when the animals are undergoing actual research or experimentation. This is almost identical with section 15 of the Senate amendment. Similar provision dealing with the inspection of records was included in section 8 of the House bill.

Section 18. This section provides that nothing in the legislation is to be construed as authorizing the Secretary to regulate the handling, care, treatment, or inspection of animals which are undergoing actual research or experimentation. The determination of when research begins and ends is to be made by the research facility. It is the intent of the conferees that section 18 be construed to apply throughout this legislation, and particularly with regard to section 17. This section is the same as section 17(a) of the Senate amendment. A comparable provision was included in section 5 of the House bill which prohibited the establishment of humane standards at any time subsequent to the arrival of dogs or cats at a research facility.

Section 19. This section deals with penalties which are applicable to dealers. Whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that

any person licensed as a dealer has violated or is violating any provision of this legislation or any regulation established thereunder, he may (1) suspend that person's license for up to 21 days, (2) after notice and opportunity for hearing and a finding that a violation has occurred, suspend the license for an additional period or revoke it, and (3) issue a cease and desist order to prevent continuing the violation.

Any dealer who is convicted of a violation of any provision of this legislation would be subject to imprisonment for not more than one year or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both.

Any dealer aggrieved by a final order of the Secretary may, within 60 days after entry of such order, seek review in the manner provided in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

This section is a combination of sections 12, 14, and 15 of the House bill and sections 18 and 19 of the Senate amendment.

Section 20. This section deals with penalties which are applicable to research facilities. Whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that any research facility has violated or is violating any provision of this legislation or any regulation established thereunder and if, after notice and opportunity for hearing, he finds a violation (1) he may issue a cease and desist order; (2) if the research facility knowingly fails to obey this cease and desist order, it shall be subject to a civil penalty of $500 for each offense, and each day such failure continues shall be deemed a separate offense.

Any research facility aggrieved by a final order of the Secretary may, within 60 days after entry of such order, seek review in the manner provided in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

This section is a combination of the House bill and the Senate amendment. It appeared in sections 12, 14, and 15 of the House bill and sections 19 and 20 of the Senate amendment.

Section 21. This section authorizes the Secretary to promulgate such rules, regulations, orders, and other administrative details as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this legislation. As earlier noted, this section is intended to be construed with section 5. This section is identical to section 11 of the House bill and appeared in section 17(b) of the Senate amendment.

Section 22. This section carries a constitutional invalidity clause which states that if any part of this legislation, or individual circumstances concerning it, are held invalid, the remainder remains effective. This section is identical to both section 16 of the House bill and section 22 of the Senate amendment.

Section 23. This section directs the Secretary to charge, assess, and collect reasonable fees for licenses issued to dealers and research facilities. These fees should be adjusted equitably, taking into consideration the type and nature of the operation to be licensed and shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Any additional funds which might be needed to administer this legislation are authorized to be appropriated by the Congress from time to time. This section is a modified version of section 17 of the House bill and section 23 of the Senate amendment.

Section 24. This section specifies that the Secretary shall promulgate the regulations referred to in sections 10 and 13 as soon as reasonable but not later than 6 months from the date of enactment of this legislation. Compliance by dealers with this legislation is required 90 days following promulgation of regulations by the Secretary. Compliance by research facilities is required 6 months after promulgation of regulations by the Secretary. However, in the case of research facilities, the Secretary may grant individual extensions of time to certain research facilities if he is convinced that these research facilities will be able to meet the regulations within a reasonable time. The purpose for this extension of time for compliance by research facilities is to enable those research facilities whose compliance depends upon obtaining additional funds for construction or personnel to secure such funds. Except for internal references, this section is identical to that of section 24 of the Senate amendment. A comparable provision was included in the House bill as section 18.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
JOSEPH Y. RESNICK,
ALBERT H. QUIE,
CATHERINE MAY,
BOB DOLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. POAGE (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 13881 because it is absolutely essential that we have strong Federal legislation to clean up the unacceptable conditions found in the supply trade of animals going to laboratories. Widespread pet theft must be stopped and the facilities and procedures of animal dealers must meet standards of common decency.

Our Nation has a moral obligation to eliminate animal suffering wherever it is possible to do so without impeding legitimate research. The great stake and the great responsibility the Federal Government has in biomedical research is met only tentatively by the laboratory provisions of H.R. 13881.

I should like to state briefly for the record the reasons supporting this position.

First. Of the 11,000 laboratories in the United States, approximately 2,000 will be covered by H.R. 13881.

Second. Of the hundreds of millions of animals consumed by the laboratories, the bill will, at most, bring its limited benefits to 5 million.

Third. But even these limited benefits of housing and care stop when research starts, and once that determination is made, protection for the animal ceases under the terms of this legislation.

Any effective laboratory animal bill the Congress enacts must set up guidelines for research as well as for sale, housing, and care in order to provide coverage for all animals sensitive to pain.

A comprehensive bill must require proper care of research animals consistent with the needs of the experiment, and must provide for postoperative care and the administration of pain-relieving drugs. Care and housing are as important for the animal during long-term drug, nutrition, or behavior studies during research as during the initial portion of its stay in the laboratory before research begins.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the animal dealer provisions of H.R. 13881, but want to emphasize that it does not solve the basic problem of humane treatment for laboratory animals.

It is my hope and earnest desire that the Congress will deal with the problems raised by the use of animals in research at an early date by enactment of legislation before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which provides humane conditions and procedures for such research animals.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mrs. MAY. 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 gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13881 is a comprehensive piece of legislation as it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats to be used for purposes of research or experimentation. There are, however, several particularly meaningful aspects of the legislation to which I would like to make reference.

While monkeys, guinea pigs, hamsters, and rabbits are covered under the humane standards of the legislation, records would be required only for cats and dogs. This would have the effect of dispensing with heavy paperwork loads that had no practical purpose, and it would confine recordkeeping to selective research animals.

The identification of dogs and cats will be a valuable facility in keeping track of these animals as they are transported and handled for research purposes. This identification system will set up records that can prove very valuable in catching up with dognapers and catnapers. The legislation also prevents dealers from disposing of cats or dogs within 5 days after they acquire these animals, or such other period of time as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe. This waiting period would afford time in which to trace lost or stolen dogs and cats.

H.R. 13881 would set up sanitation standards in the handling of research animals, with minimum requirements for housing, feeding, watering, sanitation, ventilation, and so forth. As a practical consideration, however, these standards would not be applied to animals that were in the process of actual research or experimentation as determined by the research facility itself.

In order to protect against overlapping of standards and services, the Secretary of Agriculture would consult and cooperate with other Federal departments and agencies that were concerned with animal welfare. Federal departments

and agencies also would be required to abide by the same rules and regulations on the acquisition of dogs and cats as applies to research facilities in general.

Although research facilities in general would be required to obtain animals for research from licensed dealers, they would be able to purchase these animals from farmers, who would be exempted from a license requirement. Also exempted from the license requirement—and available to research facilities as a source for research animals—would be pounds and animal shelters that either were municipal in nature or were acting, via contract, as duly authorized agents of the municipality or locality.

The preservation of these sources of animal supply is particularly significant in my Fourth Congressional District of Washington. This will assure an adequate supply of animals for the various universities in Washington State where we have no animal dealers.

I feel highly privileged to have served on the conference that produced this legislation in an effort, as the conference report states, "to produce workable and meaningful legislation."

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, and in the absence of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], I call up House Resolution 948 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 948

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. 14810) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize additional amounts for assistance thereunder, to authorize grants for certain technical studies, and to provide for an expedited program of research, development, and demonstration of new urban transportation systems. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half hour to the able gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and to myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 948 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 14810, a bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize additional amounts for assistance thereunder, to authorize grants for certain technical studies, and to provide for an expedited program of research, development, and demonstration of new urban transportation systems.

H.R. 14810 continues and provides additional funds for the urban mass transit program which was first established in the act of 1964. Under that program, Federal loans and partial grants are provided to assist local governments in financing the capital facilities and equipment needed for the extension and improvement of comprehensively planned urban mass transportation systems.

The bill authorizes appropriations of up to $175 million a year for fiscal 1968 and subsequent fiscal years to finance urban mass transportation grants. The 1964 act authorizes appropriations for fiscal 1965, 1966, and 1967, but none thereafter.

The bill also continues the authority for demonstration grant projects for 2 years at the present annual rate.

The bill requires the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, to undertake a study to prepare a program of research, development, and demonstration to develop new systems of rapid urban transportation and authorizes the appropriation of such funds as may be necessary for the preparation of this study.

The legislation also provides two-thirds grants for the planning, engineering, and designing of urban mass transportation projects.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 948 in order that H.R. 14810 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the gentleman from Florida, House Resolution 948 does provide for the consideration of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966, H.R. 14810, 1 hour, open rule.

I listened very carefully to the distinguished gentleman from Florida. I believe he explained the bill precisely as I understand it. I would like to concur in his remarks and save time by not repeating any of his statements.

I would like to add, however, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], has submitted some individual views. He seeks to amend the act to remove the current 12.5-percent limitation on grants to any one State from the total authorization, and to replace it with a preference for high population density areas. There are no minority views other than his statement in the report.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer back to the 21-day rule for a few minutes, if I can. I had intended to comment on this yesterday, when we had the FNMA bill here, but time did not permit, in accordance with a pending Rules Committee meeting.

Mr. Speaker, the use of the 21-day rule continues to be more perplexing, so far as I am concerned, and I want to make a few comments at this time for record purposes as to the use of this rule in the future.

You will recall that on July 25, 1966, the 21-day rule was used in connection with H.R. 14765, the Civil Rights Act of 1966. There was considerable discussion at that time over the fact that the 21-day rule was filed at the same time a request for hearing was made to the Rules Committee. And that, in fact, the final report on the bill was not submitted until some time subsequent thereto.

Now, yesterday, in connection with H.R. 15639, the increase in FNMA borrowing authority, it appeared to me that there was certainly room for question as to the purpose of the 21-day rule.

That bill was received in the Rules Committee on June 24, shortly prior to the July recess. I personally was desirous of having hearings before the Rules Committee on that bill, and I think the other members of the Rules Committee were also interested in hearings. In any event, on July 25 it was scheduled for hearing on the next day, July 26. Late in the afternoon of July 25, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee—namely, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]—advised the Rules Committee that he did not desire a hearing on the bill until the following week, at the earliest, and that he would not appear on July 26. The Rules Committee honored his position and removed the bill from its agenda.

On July 28, just 2 days later, Mr. PATMAN introduced a resolution under the 21-day rule provision.

The following day, on July 29, Mr. PATMAN appeared before the Rules Committee to request a rule on H.R. 14810, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966 which we are considering at this time. During the course of the hearings he was asked whether or not he wanted a hearing on H.R. 15639, the bill to increase in FNMA borrowing authority, and he stated that he did and hoped we would grant a rule. He was joined in this request by the gentleman from New Jersey, the ranking Republican member on the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. WIDNALL].

When inquiry was made as to why a 21-day rule had been filed on July 28, the reply was that he desired to expedite the bill.

The same day in executive session, July 29, the Rules Committee granted a rule on the bill before us today and H.R. 15639, FNMA—the latter without holding hearings. So, even though the Rules Committee was desirous of holding hearings in an effort to expedite the FNMA bill and set the same for hearing, we find that a request was made to remove it from the calendar, a 21-day rule was filed 2 days later and after granting the rule, we find the measure called up yesterday on the suspension calendar.

Now let me refer to H.R. 15890, the Housing and Urban Development Act. A request was made on July 18 to the Rules Committee for hearing. On July 28, part 3 of the committee report was filed. This consists of approximately 40 pages to comply with the Ramseyer rule. The same day—namely, July 28—a resolution was filed under the 21-day rule, even though the bill was not ready

for hearing until the same day. The Rules Committee tries to follow a policy of permitting the members to have at least 1 day to read the bill and report before having a hearing.

Now let us take H.R. 14026, the interest rate bill. A hearing was requested on July 29. On the previous day, July 28, a resolution was filed under the 21-day rule.

Although I did not vote for the 21-day rule change, it is my understanding of the debate at that time that the purpose of the rule was to permit the leadership to schedule a bill when the Rules Committee adversely reports, or fails to report, on a pending matter within 21 days. I am at a loss to understand how the Rules Committee could adversely report or fail to report a bill within 21 days when a resolution was filed on July 28, the day before a request was actually made for hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time will eventually come when the House will be faced with attempting to clarify the purpose of the 21-day rule, and I wanted to make these comments for record purposes because, as I mentioned before, it does not seem to me that this is the proper way to use this provision.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

In regard to H.R. 14026, the Speaker of the House announced at a press conference at noon that he expects to recognize the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and call up that resolution next Monday.

In connection with the 21-day rule, the gentleman's remarks raise a number of questions. I should like to have them resolved for the benefit of all. I should like to have the gentleman's judgment on how long a chairman of a committee should wait before filing a 21-day rule?

Of course, one or two of these rules were filed under conditions I would not care to discuss now because it would take too long. The filing of these 21-day rules were perfectly within the rules.

Anything the rules of the House provide a Member can do, I feel the Member is at liberty to do. As long as the rules of the House say a Member can do anything, I believe the Member is privileged to do it.

When the committee of which I am chairman votes out a bill, invariably a motion is made along this line: "Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee report this bill favorably with instructions to the chairman to take such action as may be necessary to expedite consideration and passage of the bill on the floor of the House."

That is practically the language of the motion made every time.

What is the chairman to do? Should he merely make application to the Rules Committee, and perhaps not even get a reply, which is generally more traditional than nontraditional.

I realize that the Committee on Rules is quite a busy committee, but I do not often receive a reply when I make a request for a rule. Should the chairman of a committee just in silence wait and not file a 21-day rule, which he has a right to do under the rules of the House, or should he wait 2 weeks or 3 weeks or 4 weeks, or what should he do? If the gentleman will give me the benefit of his knowledge and information as to the duty and responsibility in a case like that, I will appreciate it very much.

Mr. SMITH of California. I will say to the gentleman, whatever the distinguished gentleman does, of course, is within his own prerogatives and decision. My only purpose here is to set forth in the RECORD that I am a little confused and I am a little perplexed as to what the purpose of the 21-day rule is, particularly when a resolution is filed 1 day before the day when we receive a request for hearings. I am not arguing with or criticizing the gentleman, but I simply wanted to put the record straight on the history of some of the bills on how the 21-day rule has been used, so that as time goes on, if we are going to use it on everything, then maybe that is what we will end up with, but I do want the RECORD to show it.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, obviously the rule was passed because the House of Representatives believed that the Committee on Rules should not hold up these applications unnecessarily. A majority of the Members of the House voted that they would have a right to get consideration of a bill that was reported out favorably by a standing committee at the end of the 21 days. That was giving an additional protection to the committee to make sure their work would not be overlooked.

Mr. SMITH of California. May I ask the gentleman this: Let us go back to the FNMA bill. I do not wish to get into a personal argument, because we can argue those things outside, but I just want to say here that we set it up for a hearing on a Tuesday, and you asked us to take it off and then 2 days later you filed for a 21-day rule.

Mr. PATMAN. I have to admit that was a little mistake.

Mr. SMITH of California. It is a little confusing.

Mr. PATMAN. You see, we had two or three applications for rules pending, and the information came to us that we were not getting hearings on those, so we decided to file them at one time. I think under the circumstances we were justified in doing it, but if it were to be gone over in the light of what did happen, looking back, of course, we would not have filed a 21-day rule on one of these bills.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of California. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think while we are making this history you might give us some explanation of the fact as to what happened on H.R. 12904. That bill was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency. The report was filed and the same day the report was filed a letter went to the chairman of the Committee on Rules asking for a hearing and a rule. More than 30 days went by, if I recall correctly, and no action was taken. A 21-day rule was then filed, and still no action has been taken, and 30 days have gone by since then.

Mr. SMITH of California. I have no comments or criticism to make on that. I am only commenting on those that have gone through that I know about. The decision on setting hearings, of course, rests with the chairman of the committee. I am not the chairman and have nothing to do with that. I simply wanted to give my comments on these matters and I say that I am a little bit confused and perplexed on them. Maybe someday we will have to clear it up. On the bill you mentioned I have no comments or criticisms to make. You asked us for a hearing, you say, and I assume you did, and that decision is not up to me.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I am surprised to hear of the breakdown of communications at the Capitol. I did not know the telephone service was quite so bad that there could not have been communication between the chairman of the legislative committee and the chairman of the Committee on Rules. I have never found the telephone service to be such that I could not reach the office of the chairman of a committee or any other Member for that matter.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14810) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize additional amounts for assistance thereunder, to authorize grants for certain technical studies, and to provide for an expedited program of research, development, and demonstration of new urban transportation system.

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. 14810) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize additional amounts for assistance thereunder, to authorize grants for certain technical studies, and to provide for an expedited program of research, development, and demonstration of new urban transportation systems, with Mr. Moss 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 Texas [Mr. PATMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

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

Mr. Chairman, by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 29 to 1 the Committee on Banking and Currency favorably reported H.R. 14810, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966. The committee has worked hard on this legislation and, in my judgment, this is an excellent bill.

Basically, H.R. 14810 will continue and expand the urban mass transportation programs begun under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. In that bill, Congress, for the first time, provided for Federal grants to State and local bodies to help in purchasing capital facilities necessary for urban mass transportation. The program was authorized to be funded for 3 years for a total of $375 million—$75 million for fiscal 1965, and $150 million for each of the 2 fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

The program has more than proved its value. The Subcommittee on Housing heard testimony from many witnesses this year expressing strong approval and support for the program. The importance of the program to not only our urban areas but all areas of the country is also reflected in the margin of approval in the committee itself.

The most fundamental fact which developed before the committee in its hearings on H.R. 14810 is that the problems besetting the urban areas of this country in the mass transportation field are, if anything, more acute now than when the 1964 act was passed. We recognized in 1964 that financially our urban mass transportation industry was fighting a losing battle. Much has been done under the 1964 act to alleviate this situation, but much more remains to be done. Many urban mass transportation companies and systems, both public and private, have been given a new lease on life; but many more are in serious difficulty and facing bankruptcy. We feel very strongly that this program must continue.

Your committee is convinced that the demand for funds under this program will increase during the next few years. The Nation's biggest cities will need to make sizable investments in urban mass transportation facilities simply to preserve the mobility we have left. And it has never been the intention of the Congress or of those who administer the program that the large cities should squeeze the small ones out of this program. The needs of all our cities must be taken into account. Your Committee in this bill recommends an increase in the funding of the program to $175 million a year on a permanent basis. The research and demonstration program would be continued at the present $10-million-a-year level during fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

The proposed additions to the programs should make Federal urban transportation activities even more effective. The provision in H.R. 14810 which provides for grants to assist in the engineering and design of transit facilities will fill a great need. It will insure that local transportation planning and construction follows a coherent course designed to create a system meeting the needs of the community. Federal help during the design phase can be invaluable in achieving the maximum benefit for the State, local, and Federal funds spent on planning and construction.

The need for additional research is equally crucial. We cannot know the best solutions to urban transportation problems until we have examined the nature of these problems in detail, and have explored all of the solutions made possible by modern technology. H.R. 14810 will direct the Secretary to prepare a complete program of research which will examine all possible new systems of urban transportation in a systematic way. The program will take account of all of the aspects of the urban transportation problem, and attempt to apply our best scientific and social techniques to finding solutions. The research amendment was offered by our able colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, HENRY REUSS.

In short, Mr. Chairman, the committee has devoted considerable time and attention to this bill and the actual experience of the urban mass transportation program under the 1964 act. We find that it is a most popular program, with strong support among State and municipal officials, the transit industry in general, organized labor and, most important of all, the public who use the facilities and equipment which the program helps to furnish. It is of particular benefit to the elderly, the youth of this country, to the poor, and to the handicapped. Above all, it is an absolute necessity if the cities of our Nation—both large and small—are not to be strangled by the traffic congestion and parking problems. Cities are growing so rapidly in population that the need for economical, speedy, and convenient urban mass transportation for our people is even more urgent now than when the 1964 act was adopted. We urge the passage of H.R. 14810.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas has informed you of the contents of the bill now before us.

One section of the bill, section 2, was originally sponsored by me in my bill, H.R. 13732. Section 3 of the bill follows suggestions made by other members of the committee and me and was agreed upon unanimously in the subcommittee.

Section 4 was sponsored by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] and others of our colleagues on the Housing Subcommittee.

Section 5 was sponsored by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER].

In taking testimony on this bill, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] was particularly helpful in eliciting the facts. It was made clear by the experts who testified before us that this was the kind of bill that they wanted and that they thought would be most helpful. They also wanted it made clear that they wanted it considered apart from other legislation. In presenting it to you in the form that we have, we are following their advice and their counsel.

The measure calls for a modest increase in the amount of mass transit funds available—$25 million—bringing the annual total authorized to $175 million, something considerably less than transportation is costing us to and from Vietnam today.

It also asks that the program be placed on a continuing basis.

I would like to urge favorable consideration of this measure, as it is very important if we are going to adequately plan for the future in an absolute area of necessity, for we are finding a choking of the traffic to and from the cities.

Transportation is a vital service. We do not pay as much attention to it as we should. Deprived of mass transit, however, with our communities tossed on the individual resources and personal means of transportation of its members, we rapidly find what that means to us. No one who has lived through a shutdown of service will deny that we must have it to continue the commerce, the very economic life of our communities.

That is why I personally originally proposed that the measure be made a permanent and continuing operation, at the pleasure of Congress, of course. We must give assurance to those communities undertaking expensive, long-term commitment for new or improved transit systems, that they have the backing of the Federal Government in their endeavors.

To do otherwise, is to face the steadily increasing fact of diminishing trackage and transportation routes throughout the country, to know that more and more of our smaller communities are becoming isolated. We must not neglect a resource that will vanish without our consideration and care.

This operation, of course, is not going to be a cheap operation, and the Members must realize that this is becoming more and more expensive because of a lack of care in this particular area over so many years. Had we begun this program 10 years ago, we and the country would be in much better shape transportationwise than we are today. Inflation has robbed us of many of the trains, the buses, and the facilities that could be serving us today.

Mass transit is a program that can go into any part of the country. The bulk of the grants will go to the smaller communities, the more expensive ones to the larger cities just now, and belatedly, beginning to hear the demanding voice of their citizenry for better transportation.

This is a job-producing measure. Given continuity, it will enable the indus-

try upon which it is dependent for facilities reason to tool up and anticipate our transportation needs for a generation. We will get better trains, buses, and allied facilities and at a better price than if we attempt to do this piecemeal and some years from now.

The original legislation concerned with this matter has just opened the door to the possibilities of the future. We have still to realize our goals. I ask the Congress to pass favorably upon this proposal in order that those goals may be reached, that our transportation be made swift, efficient, and comfortable for this generation and the ones to come.

The subcommittee passed this measure unanimously, and I believe the full committee voted 29 to 1 in favor of its passage. I urge passage of the bill.

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

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I wonder if the gentleman could advise me whether or not the committee has gotten involved in a long-range financing program that will be on a parallel with the highly successful Interstate Highway System? Quite often we hear comments and suggestions to the effect that we should be tapping the Interstate Highway System trust fund to assist in planning a so-called balanced transportation system. I wonder if the committee has gotten into that subject in depth, would the gentleman respond to my question?

Mr. WIDNALL. We have not at the present time gone that far, but I certainly think that such an inquiry should be undertaken within the committee. We urgently have to do a better job than we have done in the past. There must be full recognition of the fact that there will have to be adequate planning of integrated systems throughout the country, so that transportation may be expedited.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14810—and, in particular, in support of the important provision of the bill which would give birth to a new and far-reaching Federal program designed to produce within the next few years fresh solutions to the grave transportation problems facing the Nation's cities.

I refer to section 4 of the bill, an amendment offered in committee by Congressmen MOORHEAD, ASHLEY, and myself, which has received the endorsement of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Section 4 directs the Department of Housing and Urban Development within 18 months of the passage of this act to prepare a 5-year program "of research, development and demonstration of new systems of urban transportation that will carry people and goods speedily, safely, without polluting the air, and in a manner that will contribute to sound city planning."

As Washington, D.C., commuters, we are all twice daily, five times a week, reminded of the serious state of urban transportation in this country.

Morning and evening each weekday we join 45 million other frustrated commuters plying their way to and from work on congested streets and freeways. We idle in our cars—on Independence, Pennsylvania, and Georgia Avenues, on the Whitehurst and Anacostia freeways, or on the bridges to Virginia—inhaling the exhaust from surrounding autos, listening to the helicopter reports of traffic jams and of the daily accident tolls.

As automobile commuters our common lot is inconvenience, frustration, partial asphyxiation, peril.

Rush-hour traffic congestion is only the most familiar and dramatic of a complex of urban transportation problems:

Urban transportation is unsafe. Last year in urban areas there were 8,800,000 motor vehicle accidents causing 14,000 deaths, 690,000 injuries, and untold property damage. Nearly three of every four accidents take place on urban streets.

It pollutes the air. Gasoline and diesel engines are and will remain a principal source of air pollution. The exhaust devices to be installed on 1968 model cars are only a temporary remedy. By 1980 an increased number of motor vehicles will spew a volume of exhaust into the air equal to the exhaust now suffocating our cities.

Our urban transportation system shortchanges the poor, the young, the elderly, the handicapped—those who do not have the service of an automobile in going from place to place, and must rely on inadequate public transit facilities. The McCone report on the Watts riots concluded that the residents of the area were locked in and unable to travel to places of employment as the result of an inadequate public transportation system.

Urban transportation is a problem of the long-distance traveler who already spends more time in limousines or on buses than on the airplane, when flying from Philadelphia to Chicago.

Our urban transportation system is a major cause of our current poor urban planning. Unsightly highways, parking lots, service stations eat up valuable urban real estate. In Los Angeles, half of the usable real estate is paved to accommodate automobiles. Twenty-six percent of all urban land in the United States is dedicated to motor vehicle use.

It is a problem of economics. The new Bay Area Rapid Transit System will save the residents of the San Francisco area an estimated $50 annually in reduced travel time, accidents, automobile insurance, parking charges, freight handling charges, and traffic control costs.

And, more broadly viewed, improved urban transportation presents a great opportunity to improve the quality of urban living by increasing the alternatives open to city dwellers. Greater mobility provided by improved urban transportation systems would produce a greatly expanded range of choices of places to live, work, and relax.

We urgently need a new research, development and demonstration program designed to break out of an urban transportation pattern established 50 years ago. Even on the tight time schedule written into section 4, the results of research, development, and demonstration will not be available on a large scale until 1973—6½ years from now.

By that time the automobile population of this country will have grown from 75 to 90 million, an increase of 20 percent.

If we do not act now the colossal December 30, 1963, traffic jam in Boston—where from 5 to 10 p.m. nothing in the city moved—will pale beside the traffic jams of the 1970's.

Today's Federal programs are expanding an urban transportation system which was introduced by the model-T. In fiscal year 1966, the Federal Government spent $1½ billion for the construction of freeways, and $51 million for additions to mass transit capital equipment—such as new buses and subway cars to replace worn out stock.

It spent only $24 million on urban transportation research and development. This research and development was devoted almost entirely to making minor improvements in our present auto, bus and subway systems—experiments in better bridge design, new systems for collecting fares, and the operation of the minibuses which are a familiar sight here in Washington.

In sharp contrast to Federal programs for intercity transportation, both ground and air, there is no Federal program to apply space age technology and research and development methods to intracity transportation.

One year ago, Congress approved a $90 million research and development program to design a new high-speed intercity ground transportation system along the northeast corridor from Washington to Boston.

Just last May we appropriated $280 million for fiscal 1967 for the estimated $1.3 billion program to develop a supersonic transport airplane.

Section 4 of this bill would remedy this gross deficiency in our urban transportation program.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to report that Secretary Weaver, ably assisted by Charles Haar, Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development, has already given much thought to the kind of comprehensive research, development, and demonstration program which will have the practical payoff of producing viable new ways of transporting people and goods in our cities.

The Department has sought the advice of many of the Nation's leading transportation experts and has drawn on the experience of the Department of Defense and NASA.

Here is their tentative plan of action which section 4 of this bill would authorize:

Within the next 18 months, perhaps sooner, the Department would complete four closely related studies.

One study would define ideal urban transportation systems to serve different purposes in different kinds of cities. The use of new technologies—such as the fuel cell, advanced storage batteries, air cushion vehicles, automated highways,

gravity-vacuum tube systems—would be explored.

A second study would concentrate on evolving new urban transportation systems from our present automobile, bus, and subway systems. Improved bus design, automated parking lots, improved traffic control devices would be some of the improvements examined.

A third study would consider what immediate improvements could be made in our present transportation systems. The uses of streets exclusively for buses, trucks, or pedestrians would be considered. Expanded use of computers to control traffic, moving sidewalks, radios for bus and traffic control would be investigated.

The fourth study would examine the requirements for good urban transportation systems in different sizes and types of cities. The purpose of the study would be to describe how a good urban transportation system should perform in terms of convenience, safety, cost, service, use of land, and other factors.

Only the fourth study would be made by the Department. A nucleus of transportation experts qualified to oversee the full-scale 5-year research, development, and demonstration program, when it gets underway 18 months from now, would be collected to do this study. The other three studies would be contracted out to the three or more corporations, universities, or nonprofit research organizations best qualified to do them.

Mr. Chairman, section 4 of this bill outlines the first program applying space age know-how to save our cities from strangulation by freeways and suffocation from auto exhaust. I urge that we vote today to improve transportation within the Nation's cities just as we have already authorized programs which are actively improving rail and air transportation between its cities.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does the bill make provision for financing metropolitan local transportation, or is its thrust for transportation solely within the boundaries of an urban community?

Mr. REUSS. The thrust is entirely metropolitan, and the language specifically uses the word "metropolitan."

As we know, in Chicago, Milwaukee, and half a hundred other cities, the problem of urban transportation cannot be handled on just the central city alone basis. It must be a metropolitan approach.

Mr. YATES. How are such studies then to be financed? As I understand what is proposed here, applications for funds are to be made by the cities themselves, and no State is entitled to more than 12½ percent of the amount allocated at any one time. May a city combine with its suburbs in a joint financing? Is there any provision for combined financing?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, there is. Under all the provisions of the bill, metropolitan combined financing not only is permitted but also is encouraged.

For example, in the planning and engineering section, section 5, which is the brainchild of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER], is it explicitly provided that these grants may be made to metropolitan transportation associations? Equally this is true of section 4 and other sections of the bill.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, a bill that is of the highest importance to the cities of this Nation. I strongly support it.

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

Mr. REUSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SECREST. The 1964 act, in my opinion, has been most successful not only for the large metropolitan areas but for the smaller cities as well.

In Zanesville, Ohio, a grant of $113,000 was made. Eight new buses were purchased, and a busline which was rapidly deteriorating showed an immediate increase in passengers and is now one of the most successful operations that can be found for small bus operations in the country.

The city of Newark, Ohio, will probably request a grant in the near future. I want to help them and the passage of this bill is essential.

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

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill because it is a good bill, but I think we can make it a better bill.

My greatest regret concerning this program is that it does not adequately come to grips with the overwhelming needs of urban mass transportation.

These problems are concentrated in our cities—and under the Mass Transportation Act, there is a 12½-percent limitation on the amount of money that can go to any one State during the year in question. This means that of the $150 million to be authorized for the coming fiscal year, the maximum amount that can go to the State of New York will be about $19 million. That means that New York City—and probably the entire New York metropolitan area—will be lucky to get about $12 million a year.

You know and I know that this is "small potatoes" compared with New York City's great needs. The annual subway deficit is five times the sum of $12 million.

So if the urban mass transportation program is to do its job, it must be restructured to stop being a pork barrel with a small morsel for everybody and start being a program designed to meet the needs of the big metropolitan areas.

I am not proposing that we give the program any more money. Unlike some people, I do not wear a pair of rose-colored glasses which allow me to think that this country can undertake vast new domestic programs in the midst of inflation and war.

I could say that this program deserves more money because it does a job, and does it without wasting money on plush poverty salaries and that sort of thing. But I will stick to my guns. I will not urge new spending for new programs while we are in the middle of inflation and war.

I do feel, however, that there are changes which can be made in this program to improve it without adding to its cost.

I proposed a number of these changes in a bill I introduced this spring. One such change would be to remove the 12½-percent limitation on money that can be spent in any one State. Another improvement would be to change the maximum Federal contribution to 90 percent instead of 66 percent, if the local tax burden warrants it. After all, this is the way highway moneys are given to the States, and such a Federal share would stimulate more mass transit development.

Lastly, I proposed that Federal mass transit funds be OK'd by Congress for use in paying the interest costs of bond issues floated by States, municipalities, or agencies thereof for proper mass transit purposes which have been eligible for aid. This would be an improvement on the piecemeal Federal aid dole, which comes yearly in small spurts. If the localities could float bond issues with a Federal commitment to pay a good part of the interest, they could mobilize large chunks of money, and Federal aid would not be scattered in small yearly projects. I think this theme is worth pursuing.

But I am only going to offer one amendment today. I am going to offer an amendment to strike the 12½-percent limitation on the funds that can be spent in any one State. I believe this is unjustifiably crippling to metropolitan areas like New York City.

In closing, let me say that I urge this House to support mass transit programs. They are very worth while. They help people without controlling them, without dictating the way they live and work and socialize.

This administration's motto is billions to undermine the neighborhood school, but reluctant nickels and clipped pennies for mass transportation and commuter service.

I urge this House to support mass transit. It is a good program. We do need transportation. I urge this House to support this mass transit bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

Mr. FINO. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I am interested in the gentleman's other suggestion about making the Federal contribution 90 percent. It would seem to me that the great problems of our urban communities today are in coming up with their proportionate share of the matching programs. I know this is true with respect to urban renewal. I think there will be many communities that will have difficulty in matching the share that they have to come up with for the Federal contribution. I hope that the gentleman offers his 90 percent amendment.

Mr. FINO. As I indicated earlier, I thought the 12½ percent limitation is a very important one, and I thought I would withhold any other amendments at this time, because I want to see this bill go through.

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

Mr. FINO. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Does the gentleman have any figure on what it would cost for the Federal Government to subsidize the payment of interest even at the low rate of 4 percent a year on a bond issue for the city of New York for transit?

Mr. FINO. On a $400 million bond issue at 4 percent for 25 years, would cost about $16 million a year.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you.

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

Mr. FINO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Pursuing the point I made a moment ago with the gentleman from New Jersey, and as the gentleman from Chicago just commented about the fact that the Federal Government should allocate 90 percent of the funds through an amendment you have given thought to, I would admonish both of you to realize that the Federal Interstate System, which is built on the basis of a user tax concept, has worked very, very successfully, and while we think in terms of money, you might redirect your thinking toward the development of a program that would be financed consistent with the concept already successfully employed in the Interstate System. No highway system nor any transportation system can hope to be successful unless you develop a positive program of finance. Long-range planning to accomplish the desired objective will never be truly effective until we organize a method of finance to meet the need. I do not believe enough attention has been given to this and I would urge this committee to give immediate and serious consideration to my suggestion. If you desire a balanced system of transportation, you must develop balanced methods of finance. I believe we should be working toward this end.

Above all, we cannot condone the attempts to raid the highway trust fund with the extraordinary requirement for funds to complete the Interstate Highway System on schedule and permit us to add new mileage for the future—in the interest of safety.

And, so, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], as a member of the committee, join with some of us who are advocating this in order to encourage a positive program to finance an effective system.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER].

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14810, the urban mass transportation bill. In 1961, the Congress authorized a limited demonstration program to explore the problem and possible solutions. In 1964, we made an important advance in our efforts to aid towns and cities by enacting the basic program of Federal aid to local mass transit systems. The bill before us is needed to continue that program, and is well justified by the record of growing success achieved under that program.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency which handled this legislation, and I also know firsthand that my own city of Atlanta is well advanced in its efforts to overcome local transportation problems. Atlanta, like so many cities, found that it was faced with traffic congestion and that additional roads, highways, and expressways, desirable as they are, were not a complete answer.

Considering the essential role that buses and commuter trains and the like play in moving people in and around cities, it is surprising that their problems were so long neglected. Nationally, there has been a steady decline in transit ridership. Evidence presented at our committee hearings indicated that this decline has occurred mostly in the off-hours, while mass transit remains essential for rush-hour movement, and is necessary to those who, because of age, income or physical handicap, do not have the option of private automobiles. This paradox of a decline in the number of riders and a drop of revenues, while at the same time, mass transit is providing a vital service, has confronted both public and private transit systems with serious problems in meeting the new investment needs required to provide attractive and adequate service and, in some cases, even to stay in business. The program authorized in the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 assists equally public and private systems, though the grant, naturally, must be made to a public body. The equipment and facilities can be, and in most cases are, made available to regulated private operators.

I am particularly pleased that the committee accepted my amendment to provide for mass transit planning grants under this program. Until now, cities have had to apply for planning assistance under the separate urban planning program which was not exactly suited and which has periodically run out of funds. I believe that the improved planning directly within this program will more than pay for itself by the greater efficiency and economy of systems so planned, to the benefit of everyone.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was approved by the Committee on Banking and Currency by the overwhelming vote of 29 to 1, and I hope it will receive equally strong support on the floor of the House today.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I also supported the 1964 act.

Mr. Chairman, every city in the United States must have mass transit; some already have it, but most are beginning only now to build and plan transportation systems for the future. Mass transit is in fact the only alternative cities have to ward off strangulation. Without mass transit, cities will turn into vast concrete jungles, and movement within them will become ever more difficult and ever more hazardous.

The absence of effective mass transit is causing us to spend hundreds of millions of dollars every year on transportation that could have been obtained at far less cost. We could be moving ourselves from place to place faster and at less cost than we are now. In the future, we must either adopt more efficient transportation or watch our cities strangle beneath the pressure of traffic and congestion and smog.

Mr. Chairman, there is evidence on every hand that we cannot continue to depend so exclusively on private automobile transportation: it is too costly and it is too inefficient. It is too costly in terms of investment, depreciation, maintenance, and it is too inefficient in terms of speed and safety, and all you have to do to prove it is to go through morning traffic here in Washington any day of the week, and read the accident statistics.

Mass transit will not solve all our problems, but it is essential to the future of every major city in this country. It offers no alternative to the private automobile, but rather should be an adjunct to it. What we need is to bring order from chaos, to create integrated, efficient transportation. There should be no reason why there is only one way to go from place to place; there should be a variety of ways, and they should offer the traveler transportation at the greatest possible speed and lowest possible cost. Where today we have no choice but to travel by car, tomorrow we must find a way to travel by car and mass transit, for we cannot continue to add cars and highways, at the present pace, to our land and leave room for anything else in the future.

I hope that the enactment of this bill will enable our presently strangling cities to breathe again, and enable our embattled population to move again at better than a snail's pace, and that tomorrow's bright promise will not be clouded by smog and buried under pavement.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased to rise in support of H.R. 14810, the amendments to the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, which incorporates the provisions of my bill, H.R. 13309. Many of us have struggled for many years to solve the problems of transportation within our metropolitan area and this bill is a wonderful step forward. It should be stressed in this debate that mass transportation facilities are not competitive with highways and other automobile facilities but are absolutely necessary if our highways are going to function as they were designed.

The "7 to 9" and "4 to 6" traffic jam started to creep into our metropolitan centers during World War II. Since then it has become a major problem to our citizens. It was thought for many years that high-speed freeways could solve the

problem. The contrary has been true, and in many instances the impact of high-speed 8- to 10-lane freeways meeting the traditional central city grid pattern of stop lights, traffic controls, and on-street parking has aggravated rather than solved the problem.

This bill will allow the development of the new type transportation systems which are necessary to meet the problem of peak-hour traffic. America has suffered from a terrible lack of research and engineering talent being devoted to the problem of the new mass transportation vehicle. Only now are some of the major corporations and governmental groups beginning to actively work on such vehicles as the computerized "sky bus" and other vehicles which can successfully operate through the whole range of high-density, medium-density, and low-density belts that form our metropolitan centers.

We should not be trapped into the traditional heavy, inefficient rail vehicles of the past as being the alternative to our present congestion. In other fields our technology has soared and there is no reason why we cannot expect lightweight, efficient, eye-pleasing mass transportation vehicles that can move the bulk of our working population in and out of the city during peak periods so the automobile may function all day in an efficient and pleasant fashion.

I am particularly pleased that this bill contains the section I proposed to authorize the Secretary to make grants to States and local public bodies and agencies for the planning, engineering, and designing of urban mass transportation projects. It is absolutely necessary that we fill the gap between the planning grants and construction grants which exist under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. The practical problem faced by local public bodies in developing a mass transportation system is to raise their share of the necessary local funds. This requires, in many instances, not only a plan but sufficiently detailed engineering and design work that the system can be placed into the form of a proposition to be submitted to the local voters for a bond issue or to justify an increase in taxes. For example, in my congressional district, which is generally the south half of metropolitan King County containing Seattle, Wash., the city of Seattle has received a planning grant from HUD in the amount of approximately $125,000 to plan a $110 million mass transportation system through the city. In order to raise the city's portion of the funds necessary to build this system, it will be necessary to establish local support, probably leading to the submission of a bond issue to the citizens. This means that the city must present detailed engineering and design information as to costs of rights-of-way, equipment, and specific—as opposed to general—plans. To submit to the public a bond issue on any other basis can lead to disaster, since the total cost after engineering studies may well exceed the costs arrived at in the planning stage and a bond issue which has been submitted to the citizens and passed may be completely inadequate to carry the project. The governments, Federal, State, and local, will then have been put to the cost of planning and submission of the plan to a vote of the people only to find the financing is inadequate, whereas if they had been able to engineer and design the system prior to submission to the people, the system would be feasible and could go forward.

Since I have mentioned the problems of the central city, I would be neglectful if I did not emphasize the even more pressing problem that faces suburbia and which will require, in my opinion, further assistance by the Federal Government to the local governments similar to the assistance given to local highway programs.

A central metropolitan city will usually have a substantial property base for taxation as well as a considerable amount of commercial activity which will form a basis for raising local funds. The suburban communities surrounding the central metropolitan core, however, are generally much smaller governmental units. Some of these will be small bedroom communities, and others will be small semi-industrial or retail centers. These communities are generally governmental units completely separate from the central core city and have very limited financial resources in terms of assessable property or commercial activity. In addition, the suburban communities are usually already heavily burdened with taxes for the establishment of new schools, sewers, sidewalks, roads, and so forth.

The suburban areas are an integral part of the metropolitan area but by themselves they cannot possibly fund the development of even their share of the mass transportation system which is needed for the entire area. For example, in my district even if the city of Seattle creates a mass transportation system from border to border of its corporate limits, it will not solve the problem. Instead we must have a system that will connect with and be extended through the governmental boundaries of the county and smaller cities that surround Seattle. This means that some type of governmental vehicle must be created by the governmental units surrounding Seattle to present a unified and comprehensive plan for the entire metropolitan area. This bill will be a giant step forward in providing Federal assistance in the planning stage for this comprehensive plan and thereafter in assisting the engineering and design stages so the surrounding suburban communities will be able to prepare a specific proposal to present to the citizens in the surrounding suburban area for their approval.

We have taken great strides in the development of highway and air traffic between cities. We have been tragically lax in meeting our inner city metropolitan problem. It is a well-known fact that the advent of the jet makes it possible to spend less time traveling great distances between our cities than it takes to travel from one's home or business to the airport. We must move swiftly and massively to meet this problem.

I congratulate the committee for having presented this bill to the House and I urge its speedy passage.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, this bill represents a very modest response to a very major problem—the preservation and improvement of public transportation facilities for the 70 percent of our people who live in urban areas.

Of all our transportation problems—from getting a man to the moon to reaching agreement on a new department—the urban mass transportation problem has been the toughest to solve. It is toughest because it involves the movement of hundreds of millions of people daily in relatively tiny areas which are vastly overcrowded, on systems which are often outmoded and poorly planned, and in facilities designed for an age long since past.

We need, therefore, new and modern equipment, more convenient schedules, a more rational, integrated, and coordinated system of routes—in brief, a balanced, areawide mass transportation system which will get people where they want to go with maximum speed, convenience, and comfort, and at minimum cost.

We have a long way to go to achieve this ideal—this necessity. This bill will help. But we are still at the beginning, especially in the case of the Federal Government. In the context both of what needs to be done and of what State and local governments have done and plan to do, the Federal role to date has been very little and very late.

It was only 5 years ago, and only after prolonged effort by those of us who daily confronted the problem in our own areas, that Congress first recognized the need and first accepted a measure of responsibility. And during those 5 years—at a time when the experts have estimated it will cost tens of billions of dollars to develop adequate urban transportation systems—the Federal Government has approved a total of less than $135 million in capital improvement grants, repayable loans, and demonstration grants.

While somewhat more than this has been authorized and appropriated, and will be spent before the end of the present fiscal year, I cite this figure to demonstrate the fact that the Federal Government is in no danger of taking over the urban mass transportation effort in America. At the present rate, in fact, we are being hard pressed even to hold up our very minimum end of the load.

The present bill, Mr. Chairman, will not significantly change this situation. We propose only these very limited changes: first, recognize that the urban mass transportation problem is a long-range one, and provide continuing authorization for the Federal program; second, increase the annual authorization from $150 million to $175 million; third, within this overall figure, increase the share of funds which can be spent for research, development, and demonstration purposes, from the present $10 million a year to $20 million in fiscal

1968 and $30 million in fiscal 1969; fourth, and still within the overall authorization, provide that funds can be used for the detailed planning and engineering of mass transportation projects; and, fifth, authorize an 18-month study by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development of possible ways to secure technological breakthroughs in developing new methods of urban transportation. The aim of the study, as I understand it, would be a program similar in kind to the present high-speed rail research program for the northeast corridor.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is a most moderate proposal. It represents far less than the Federal Government, under ordinary circumstances, ought to be doing. But I recognize, too, that these are not ordinary times. Confronted by extraordinary demands on our financial resources and threatened with a runaway inflation, Congress and the administration must keep a firm check on expenditures and follow a realistic order of priorities. Every program and project must be measured against the others and all must be subjected to the test of "is it necessary," and "can it be postponed?"

In this perspective, a $175 million mass transportation program is the best we can do, I believe. It is a fair allocation of our resources. It is reasonably proportionate to the need. But it is a minimum program. Anything less would represent a turning back from one of the Nation's most challenging problems—a turning back, incidentally, which would cost us a great deal more to overcome in the future.

It is important, Mr. Chairman, to remind our colleagues that the urban mass transportation program is, in a special sense, a congressional program. It is a regrettably rare example of a major domestic program whose inspiration and chief features have come from within the Congress, not from the administration. Despite the vast amount of attention which administration spokesmen devote to urban problems in general, and urban transportation in particular, its performance has not matched its rhetoric.

The administration has been delinquent, I suggest, on at least three counts:

First, its request this year for a simple 1-year extension of the existing program was clearly inadequate.

Second, it has starved the administration of the program to such an extent that the responsible office has been unable to handle properly the increasing volume of applications and requests for information, not to speak of the coordinating problems involved in a program which affects so many other Federal, State, and local activities so directly. To attempt to man a program of this size and significance with only nine professional employees reflects either a lack of responsibility or a lack of seriousness about the program, and unless the situation has changed in recent weeks, the program has only nine professionals to staff it.

Third, it has done altogether too little to implement congressional mandates to coordinate the mass transportation and urban highway programs or to obtain the kind of comprehensive transportation planning in urban areas which is essential if balanced transportation systems are to be more than empty phrases.

And, fourth, it has opposed the transfer of the mass transportation program to the proposed new Department of Transportation—a transfer which could give the program the status which its importance requires and which could make possible effective coordination of all kinds of transportation in urban areas.

Mr. Chairman, a successful mass transportation program is a major part of the effort to improve the life of our cities and suburbs. It is essential in every part of the country and in urban-suburban areas of all sizes. The alternative is growing chaos, as too many people struggle to transport themselves on overcrowded highways which consume progressively larger amounts of expensive urban land.

This bill will continue a program which is already contributing in an important way to the solution of the problem, and it will improve that program in modest but significant respects. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I think that is the best we can expect. But we cannot accept less.

I urge support of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to take some time to ask some questions about this bill of some members of the committee on either side. To this point we have simply heard the bill is good. I want to know what it has accomplished and what we can expect.

In the description of the program the statement is made that before Federal assistance may be provided, the Secretary must determine that, first, the applicant is a public body, which may be a State, a local public body, or agency, or an agency established by the action of two or more States.

Does that mean that no one can participate in this legislation except a political subdivision which operates as a public body? Would some member of the committee care to answer that question?

Mr. PATMAN. Private companies can do the actual operating, but some political entity must exist or be created in order for the project to be considered.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Then is the gentleman in effect saying that grants are indirectly available to private transportation agencies as well as publicly owned transportation agencies? That privately owned transportation agencies are the recipients of subsidies in some instances.

Mr. PATMAN. In that way, yes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The bill talks about increasing the funds for research and development and demonstration projects, increasing the amount of the authorization. Could the chairman of the committee or some member of the committee tell me what funds have been expended in the past of the money already authorized and appropriated for specific demonstration projects? What demonstration projects have been conducted?

Mr. REUSS. In answer to the question propounded by the gentleman from Louisiana, it would not be correct to say that the funds for demonstrations have been increased. They will continue at the $10 million annual level. Thus far the total demonstration grants made available, as of August 15, 1966, which is quite up to date, are $38,540,201—very close to the total authorized in the past years.

Forty different States and communities have participated in those demonstrations, and they range from the relatively large demonstration grants in the San Francisco Bay area for rapid transit engineering, for fare collection, and for rapid transit equipment tests, totaling close to $8 million, down to one in Seattle, Wash., for $10,000 for monorail experiments.

Mr. WAGGONNER. One would assume that the demonstration funds which have been expended——

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

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

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

[Roll No. 223]

Anderson, Ill.	Farnsley	Murray
Andrews, Glenn	Fisher	Olsen, Mont.
Ashbrook	Fogarty	Olson, Minn.
Baring	Ford, Gerald R.	O'Neill, Mass.
Barrett	Ford, William D.	Pool
Bolling	Garmatz	Powell
Bray	Gubser	Purcell
Brown, Calif.	Hagan, Ga.	Quie
Buchanan	Hanna	Rees
Burton, Utah	Hawkins	Resnick
Callaway	Hébert	Rivers, Alaska
Cameron	Herlong	Roncalio
Celler	Holifield	Rostenkowski
Clawson, Del	Ichord	Scott
Clevenger	Jonas	Senner
Cohelan	Kastenmeier	Steed
Conyers	King, N.Y.	Stephens
Corman	Landrum	Toll
Cramer	Long, La.	Tunney
Daddario	Martin, Ala.	Tupper
Davis, Ga.	Martin, Mass.	Tuten
Dent	Matthews	Walker, Miss.
Diggs	Mink	White, Idaho
Duncan, Oreg.	Moorhead	Willis
Edwards, La.	Morris	Wilson, Charles H.
Evins, Tenn.	Morrison	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Moss, 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. 14810, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 356 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] had 1 minute remaining. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman had just finished before the quorum call answering a question about demonstration projects. The next logical question is, What new has resulted

in the conduct of these demonstration projects? In the conduct of research and these demonstration projects, what new systems, what new modes of transportation have been developed or appear to be feasible as a result of this expenditure of funds?

Mr. REUSS. Unfortunately, the main emphasis of the existing demonstration grant program, with its rather limited funds, when you consider the huge size of the problem has been on the existing modes of transport—buses, subways, and so on. This is not to say that there has not been some experimentation. For example, in the San Francisco Bay area there has been development of a rapid transit system.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Then would it be fair to say that the bulk of money which has been expended under this program thus far has been spent merely as a subsidy for existing transportation systems?

Mr. REUSS. That is entirely correct, and that is why the bill contains section 4, which, looking toward the future, would try to develop new technologies for the final third of the century.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The bill contains a section having to do with labor standards. We have been talking about subsidies. You have said that most of the money spent has gone for subsidies for existing systems. Could the gentleman tell me whether or not any of the money appropriated under this bill was spent in subsidizing labor in the New York City transit strike earlier this year? Is labor in any way subsidized by this bill?

Mr. REUSS. Not a penny of the grant funds has been spent on subsidizing labor. Specifically, nothing was spent having to do with the New York transit strike.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to alert the Members of this House to a glaring inequity in the present Urban Mass Transportation Act that actually works against the bill and the communities that it seeks to serve.

The mass transit legislation, Mr. Chairman, is deficient in providing solution to a problem as exemplified by a very serious situation that has come to pass in Yakima, Wash., in my congressional district.

The situation, which I briefly described on the floor of the House on May 10, is this. The bus company operating in Yakima was losing money. They notified city officials that with the expiration of their franchise on May 31, 1966, they would have to go out of business. In order that the city not be deprived of bus service, the city officials arranged to take over the bus and other transportation facilities of the transportation company and operate the system itself, doing so at an expense to the city itself.

To finance this solution, the city government proposed the institution of a householder tax and sought also to obtain a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. They also set up a referendum as required by law in advance of the May 31, 1966, deadline.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Chairman, cleared the grant, amounting to $172,232, in all particulars except for the section 10(c) which was inserted into the act for the purpose of protecting union workers. In the Yakima case, the eight bus drivers involving all union members were to have their hourly wages raised from $2 an hour to $2.40 an hour. They were also to receive additional fringe benefits upon becoming city employees under the city civil service system. As city employees, however, they had to give up their union shop contract although the city officials were willing to continue their collective bargaining rights. All eight employees were union members so they had a de facto, if not de jure, union shop.

In effect, city officials in Yakima were advised by HUD that before the Federal grant would become available to them, the bus drivers would have to have a closed shop, the right to strike and compulsory arbitration. This, in spite of the fact that the bus driver's individual positions would not have been worsened, but bettered.

All these proposed revisions in a new labor contract, Mr. Chairman, are directly contrary to Washington State law and the charter under which the city of Yakima must operate. The city attorney and city manager, quite rightfully, could not see how they could agree to these proposals or a union shop for that matter, without making themselves personally liable for law suits charging that they had violated State laws.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that it had been my hope that long before now the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Labor would have gotten together to resolve this problem. This has not been the case, however, because the situation has remained unresolved. It has remained unstudied and unattended to by these two departments of our Federal Government. I suspect that possibly they feel the decision is not in their hands. Be that as it may, it is their responsibility and it has not been resolved.

In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, the city of Yakima, with a population of 43,000 people, is without any kind of public transportation service and has been for many weeks. Our cleaning women, dependent on the buses, have been without jobs because of this. Our elderly, and our blind, and our disabled, and our children going to city schools have been without bus service. Finally, the bus drivers are not driving buses. They are without their jobs. Their situation, coupled with the need for bus service in this city, has made the whole situation a devastating one which has cried out for attention but has remained unresolved.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I am today going to offer an amendment that will retroactively and in the future exempt the Government employees from the provisions of 10(c) as relates to compulsory membership, but not to decrease their personal situation.

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

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation—H.R. 14810—as a realistic and needed step toward meeting the complex demands upon transportation in our ever growing urban areas.

The cry of mass transit and essential commuter services in our cities and metropolitan areas has never sounded so desperate, nor has the need for the Federal Government to come to their aid been more urgent.

Statistics indicate that New York City's rapid transit network serves as the largest railway in the world in terms of passengers carried. Approximately 4.5 million persons are using mass transit every day in New York City.

We live in a modern age, but with an archaic and chaotic transportation system. There is little question that with the technological know-how of our country together with proper planning, we can meet the transportation problems of tomorrow. Our first order of business, however, is to meet the pressing needs of today.

We do not need another transit strike, such as the one New York City experienced not long ago, to point up the fact that our present systems of transportation are inadequate.

According to a recent report of the Regional Planning Association, which functions as a nonprofit organization of planners from 22 counties of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, $2.5 billion is needed in the next 10 years to finance improvements necessary as of now in the tristate metropolitan area.

Anyone who has traveled by automobile in New York City knows the traffic problems too well. Statistics indicate traffic in midtown and downtown Manhattan moves at a pace of an average 8.5 miles per hour. Moreover, the average speed on the expressways is not much faster, and they have been described in rush hours as one long series of parking lots.

It is not enough merely to expedite the building of longer and wider highways and expressways and employ more stringent regulation and exercise of traffic control.

In fact, an unfortunate factor involved in these approaches has been that they only forecast the continued expansion of vehicular travel on our expressways, highways, roads, and streets until eventually only expressways, roads, and streets will remain.

Mr. Chairman, the transportation problems of an advancing age do not necessarily have to weave our cities into a web of strangulation.

The authorization of $175 million a year for fiscal 1968 and subsequent fiscal years to finance urban mass transportation grants as provided by the bill before us today—H.R. 14810—would be a definite beginning. In my view, however, this extension or continuation of the program for fiscal 1966 and 1967 is not going to be satisfactory to meet the transportation needs of the urban commuter service in urban areas.

On May 3, 1966, I introduced a bill, H.R. 14843, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3, together

with my statement on page 9758, which would amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act to authorize certain grants on a temporary basis to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas. In addition, my bill would increase the existing 12½-percent limitation on grant funds which any one State may receive under the present law. It has long been recognized that presently the highly urbanized States such as California and New York do not receive a just proportion of available funds. Yet, the 12½-percent State limitation remains a black spot of economic discrimination against the densely populated cities. This is ironic because obviously the crowded cities are the one area in which the help is most needed. Moreover, the statistical population trends consistently indicate this situation will worsen.

New York State, for example, contains approximately 9.4 percent of the total population of the United States, and with the 12½-percent allowance seemingly receives its full amount. But because New York State has many densely populated cities—the largest, of course, being the city of New York—in effect the 12½-percent limitation is an unwarranted restriction on the Federal funds available.

My bill—H.R. 14843—would increase the limitation to 15 percent in the case of any State in which more than two-thirds of the maximum grants have been made or committed for projects and where the Secretary determines that there is a substantial need for such an increase in order to carry out existing programs.

I also have introduced a bill—H.R. 14844, which appears with my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3 at page 9758—to permit a State to elect to use funds from the highway trust fund for purposes of urban mass transportation. Expert planners have long recognized the need for flexibility in transportation planning as well as the need to focus attention on the plight of urban mass transit systems.

While the decision as to whether Federal highway funds are to be used for highways or mass transit would under my bill remain in the State capitol, I am hopeful that the increasing realization of the advantage to all of meeting the cities' needs will dictate a direction of a large portion of these funds toward mass transit.

Mr. Chairman, my predecessor in the 17th Congressional District, John V. Lindsay, testified on April 28, 1966, as mayor of the city of New York, before the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on legislation to provide Federal assistance to urban mass transit systems. I would like to include at this point in the RECORD some pertinent portions of his testimony:

The United States is developing into huge city complexes, among them Boston, New York and Baltimore-Washington. Between Washington and Baltimore, the theoretical boundaries of the historic city have been overrun. Geopolitics tells us the entire Eastern Seaboard from Boston to Norfolk will be joined in a community of cities well before the end of this century.

Metropolitan New York, the largest of any of the existing city complexes, will stand at the center of this massive concentration of people. Already, 1 of every 10 Americans lives within commuting distance of New York City.

New York City's rapid transit network forms the largest railway in the world in terms of passengers carried. Every weekday, the city's Transit Authority dispatches 8,500 trains along 30 routes and 240 miles of track. They carry about 4.5 million persons. Most of the passengers are en route to or from their place of work. Another 100,000 persons travel on 2,500 Transit Authority busses every day—a number matching less than 10 per cent of the rail system's volume.

The city's subways transport almost 1.5 billion persons a year. Most of them ride between 7 and 10 a.m. and between 4 and 7 p.m. The destination of the majority is the area of Manhattan Island south of Central Park. To a great degree, consequently, many functions of our rapid transit system are frozen in both time and space.

The cost of transporting millions of New Yorkers and commuters is formidable. Almost 26,000 employees are needed to operate and maintain the subways. The subways' operating costs this year, including electricity charges, will total $271 million, about $64 million more than operating revenue.

The bus lines operated by the City Transit Authority employ another 9,000 persons. Bus operations cost $84 million, and this year the lines will lose about $12 million.

Transit Authority expenses, then, are expected to exceed operating revenues this year by more than $76 million.

Operational losses tell only part of the discouraging story: In fairness the city's bus and subway system should also be charged with debt service on $1.25 billion of debt incurred by the city on their behalf and still outstanding. The principal and interest on this debt amount to $120 million annually.

Even if the city succeeds in meeting the deficit this year, its success will be short-lived; for if present revenue, expense and debt service figures are projected over the next 10 years, the Transit Authority may show a $250 million deficit in 1976.

Although the loans for capital improvements have been sizeable, most of the money spent in recent years has been devoted to beating off obsolescence. Despite minor alterations and extensions, the quality of the city's rail service has not improved substantially over the past 25 years.

The imbalance of the past 20 years in favor of roads must be redressed. The massive capital needs of mass transportation must be supplied. We first must enlarge the present system to carry people where they want to go with a reasonable amount of comfort and speed. At the same time, we must strive to make the present system attractive enough to capture its desired share of the total transportation market.

By "desired share," I mean that share which represents the best use of our resources—time, land and money. One illustration will explain better than several generalisms:

A mile of new, two-track subway in New York today would cost about $25 million, fully equipped: It would handle 50,000 passengers per hour at peak periods and would not consume any appreciable amount of real estate.

By contrast, a mile of new arterial highway in the city costs at least as much, carries about one-tenth as many people, and consumes about 30 acres of taxable real estate. Once built, operating speeds are about the same and operating costs favor the subway over the private car.

In twenty-five years the New York subways have not suffered a single passenger fatality due to operational failure. I'll skip the obvious comparison with highways.

A satisfactory program for new subway construction for New York City and its suburbs—with air conditioning and other improvements—would require an expenditure of $4 billion over the next ten years. The sum represents about 40 per cent of New York City's entire capital budget for the period. The outlay is plainly impossible without large amounts of Federal funds.

Federal aid to transportation has proper precedents in the Federal support given at crucial stages to inter-city railroads, ocean shipping, aviation, and highways.

I submit that the case today for Federal support of urban mass transportation is equally compelling.

Mr. Chairman, I support the bill before us today as evidence of recognition by this great body of the tremendous needs in the field of mass transit and a commitment to help resolve the mass transit problems of the urban areas. While it is not nearly enough to do the job, it provides a definite program for a good beginning.

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill before us. There is no doubt in my mind that the problems of urban mass transportation are of paramount concern to us all. Two-thirds of the population of our Nation lives in metropolitan areas. In 4 years, it is estimated that figure will be closer to three-fourths. With the great cities tending to merge into clusters of urban areas, the need for coordinated planning and massive assistance to urban mass transportation becomes urgent.

Consider, for a moment the sudden effect of the recent great electrical blackout on the vast urban complex in the East. Transportation, the backbone of the cities' economy, and the lifeblood of its commerce was forced to come to a virtual standstill. Traffic patterns, without traffic lights, were chaotic. Subways were forced to halt, and urban mass transportation amounted to urban mass confusion.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that major U.S. cities are fast approaching a permanent state of total paralysis, due to inadequate and archaic forms of transportation and lack of coordination of those transit systems. The bill before us attempts, with several significant approaches, to correct today's gloomy urban transportation picture.

The first major section of the bill provides needed financial aid to communities which have the will, but not the financial way to make capital improvements in present transportation systems and to coordinate transit systems with existing highway and transit networks.

Included in the uses of Federal grants and loans is the concept of the demonstration project. This is a sign of hope for the welfare of our cities. Through this authorization, we are encouraging local officials to plan transportation systems which will be swift, safe and fully integrated into the urban complex. For too long cities have regarded transportation as a piecemeal effort. The demonstration grants section has successfully induced city planners and metropolitan

officials to think of urban, mass transportation in terms of the long-range total topographic picture—in terms of the proper relationships between residential and industrial areas, between rural and metropolitan areas. The idea of comprehensive planning is being accepted and welcomed.

The section raises the total level of grants and loans to $175 million per year. This increase of $25 million per year reflects the growing urgency and complexity of the problem. It also attests to the increasing popularity of the concept of comprehensive transit planning. The sum is a pittance compared to the vast Federal outlays for highway construction—$250 million for fiscal 1966. We should realize, moreover, that as we increase highway use, we are adding to the headaches of the cities. For all our modern roads lead to our modern Romes—congesting urban transportation systems.

Section 3 of the bill would authorize increased grant funds to finance research, development, and demonstration projects. Such increases are also justified by the growing number of cities willing to concentrate planning resources on the problems of modern urban transportation, and the increased transit problems of the cities.

I am especially pleased with section 4 of the bill, which directs the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Commerce to cooperate in thorough research into new systems of urban transportation. Such initiative is long overdue, and the joint effort of the two Departments superbly characterizes the spirit of this legislation—that urban transit must be fully integrated into the metropolitan complex through comprehensive planning. A 5-year research program is planned which will look into alternatives to the inadequate urban mass transportation systems deteriorating daily under constant overloading. I am happy to have sponsored legislation which aimed at coordinated research and development of new modes of urban transportation.

The last section of the bill further carries through the purpose of this legislation by authorizing grants, up to two-thirds of cost, to localities preparing surveys and research on comprehensive planning of urban transportation systems.

I know only too well the problems of urban mass transportation which the bill seeks to alleviate. Urban downtown areas are losing commerce and industry. Commuters in my district in Queens must wait in lines two blocks long in rush hours in order to catch a bus which might well break down before the weary commuter is home. This scene could easily become the accepted norm if we do not take immediate steps now to search for new modes of transportation to improve the vital mass transportation systems of our cities.

The local initiative is there if the funds are. The Jamaica-Queens Chamber of Commerce proposed extending subway service to additional sections of Queens by using Long Island Railroad tracks. This would conceivably reduce bus overcrowding. Such a program might well qualify for a demonstration grant, unless, that is, we tell such local programs that we are stopped by a self-imposed arbitrary limitation of funds.

Mr. Chairman, we should realize the existing need for comprehensive planning of transportation systems that are fully integrated into the urban complex. City planners envision great regional expanses of urban areas. But one may already witness the development of such a megalopolis today, when one flies from Washington to New York at night. One sees an almost unbroken chain of lights between these two cities. This chain is no "unidentified flying object" formation in the sky. It is the shape of things to come. We should recognize that comprehensive interstate transportation planning is necessary not tomorrow but today.

I heartily support these sections of the bill, since I believe they will attack the mass transportation problem through the means which hold the best hope of providing a solution to this urban ill. However, the hoped for results of these new provisions may not materialize if the present State limitation on funds is left standing.

At present, no one State may receive more than 12½ percent of the total authorized grants. While this may, on the surface, seem reasonable, closer examination will reveal that it is far from adequate to meet even the dire minimum needs of the great cities like New York whose transportation systems draw nearly as many persons into their environs as their total population.

Of course, I would like a broader bill. So would many of us whose constituents live with this problem day after day. I would have preferred the broader features of my own bill, H.R. 13698. But in substance this is a good bill. It is vital legislation. It's purpose, I maintain, is to concentrate resources into urban areas to solve mammoth transit problems. However, the existing limitation will obviate this purpose. I intend to offer an amendment which will direct funds to the Nation's largest cities, with highest population densities. It will give priority to the urgency of need, and will enable the spirit of this legislation to be fully realized in practice.

I trust that at least a limitation flexibility pool can be set up so that urgently needed programs that may reach the ceiling can be continued.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for H.R. 14810, the proposed Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966, but I am convinced it is inadequate.

Obviously, aid to urban mass transit is of tremendous importance if we are to rejuvenate our decaying urban centers, enable planners to provide effectively for orderly development of the suburban communities and help protect the low- and middle-income families against the mounting pressures generated by rising living costs.

The cost of operating a family car is estimated at about 10 cents per mile. For the commuter, living 10 miles from the factory or the office where he works, this means about $2 per day, about an hour's net wages for the average factory worker—assuming he can park for nothing. A few years ago, a car was a luxury for the average man, to be considered after basic living costs were met. Today, for too many, a car is a necessity and a second car in the family may spell the difference between comfort and great difficulty.

Originally, the alternative to the family car, or cars, was to live near public transportation; the maximum economy was to live at some point beyond the trunkline mass transit, along the feeder lines that connect to the main arteries of mass transit. This is where the rents were lowest. Consider, if you will, what has happened to a moderate-income family which chose remoteness as a means of economy. If they moved to parts of the more populous New York City areas in the Bronx, Brooklyn, or Queens, they probably chose an apartment which was connected to the downtown area by a route which entailed first a bus and then the subway.

Not so very many years ago, this ride cost 10 cents each way, 20 cents per day. Today, that same, long trip costs 40 cents each way, 80 cents per day—a four-fold increase. Moreover, we are told that it is unlikely that the fares can be maintained at this level and that the cost of the round trip will probably rise by another 20 cents per day to where it costs the wage earner a dollar a day just to go to and from work. Add to this the travel costs of his wife for shopping, the kids to the doctor, and traveling to visit friends and you can see the impact. This is the fare for an overcrowded bus and subway system that does not even guarantee that you will start very near your home or get off within two or three blocks of your place of work.

We are told that about 70 percent of our fellow Americans reside in urban areas and that this figure is rising. The suburbs face the prospect of overcrowded roads, increasing time for the drive to the destinations normally frequented in metropolitan areas and the inability effectively to plan for population concentrations as the core city population emigrates.

The need for improvement in our mass transit capacity is obvious though the response, as reflected by the bill before us today, understates that need to a really incredible extent. In contrast to the $175 million provided for the next fiscal year for mass transit, this House voted, less than a week ago, to put $4.5 billion into highway aid next year. This bill before us would provide no increase in the mass transit aid level during the following year. Less than a week ago, this House voted to increase fiscal 1967's $4.5 billion to $5 billion for fiscal 1968. That increase alone will be almost three times the total transit aid.

On page 3 of the report accompanying this bill, we have the recitation of the requirement that for a mass transit facility to receive aid, it must be part of

a "unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area." How can there be an "officially coordinated urban transportation system"—or "comprehensively planned development"—without taking into account the relationship between mass transit facilities and highways? Yet, the Congress does not allow the localities to decide relative priorities between these two types of transportation. The Congress has in effect prevented balanced planning and proper coordination by decreeing that highways shall have 25 times as much Federal money as mass transit—$4.5 billion compared to $175 million. The only acknowledgment of the interrelationship appears in section 8 of the bill which provides for "consultation" between the Secretary of Commerce—as he dispenses billions for roads—and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as he doles out funds from the $175 million allocated for mass transit.

I feel constrained to note, too, that this bill permits grants only for construction or overhaul of mass transit systems. There is no provision whatever for aid in financing the operation or routine maintenance of such facilities. I will support the amendment to delete the 12½-percent maximum allowed to a single State, but must point out that, even if grants for New York State were not so restricted, the failure to permit any grants to meet operating and maintenance costs means that we are still not recognizing mass transit as a vital and valuable public service. What is sorely needed is not only construction aid but also aid to meet operating expenses while mass transit facilities are being improved. I have cosponsored with Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey, a bill which would provide the latter type of aid provided there is an approved plan being implemented. The aid under this bill—H.R. 12407—would continue for up to 10 years. When the planned work is completed, the mass transit system should be at optimum efficiency and probably self-supporting with a reasonable fare.

When this House was considering the highway aid bill last week, I described, once again, another proposal of mine which would permit use of some of the huge highway subsidies for mass transit where, in the judgment of local officials, local needs for a balanced transportation system require it. My remarks appear on pages 19104–19105 of the RECORD for August 11, 1966. I need not recapitulate them here.

I am heartened that an increase in mass transit aid is to be provided under the bill before us. I am disheartened, however, to note the gross inadequacy of this modest increase in an inadequate program, as measured by the need and as measured by our effort in behalf of superhighways. It is today possible to drive from New York to Philadelphia in less time than it takes to go by mass transit from the north Bronx to southeast Queens.

This Congress appears more willing to finance new highways within New York City to take additional cars into the congested downtown streets than it is to help build and operate mass transit facilities which could move more people faster and cheaper between the same points. This may make sense to some people, but it does not to me or to most people familiar with the problems of my city. I daresay that the same judgment probably applies to many other large cities.

I urge passage of this bill because it is a step in the right direction. But, it is a woefully small step.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS].

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966. The provisions of this act are designed to provide a coordinated approach to the problems of mass transit. The increased annual appropriation to finance grants under the 1964 act is vital; for the problems of our cities, far from disappearing, threaten to overwhelm the urban areas of our Nation if we do not redouble our efforts.

However, just as crucial in the long run as money, are the provisions of this act for research and development aimed at dealing with mass transit in a long-range comprehensively planned and rational manner. This bill deals with transportation. But in today's sprawling megalopolises the state of mass transportation affects employment, it affects the efficiency of private enterprise, the distribution of goods and services to the public, the national defense, and in short, the well-being of our people. By directing the Secretaries of HUD and of Commerce to prepare a program of development which will consider all the ramifications of the transit problem, and by emphasizing the necessity for including transit planning in a comprehensively planned program of urban development, this act goes a long way toward providing urgently needed technical information and coordination.

If the day ever existed when it was possible to say that cities could muddle through without method or design, allowing vital services and institutions to shift for themselves in a sea of pressure groups, politicking, and ignorance, that day is long gone. This body has already demonstrated its foresight and wisdom by its approval of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 and by the overwhelming support which the Committee on Banking and Currency has given to the present bill. These are difficult times when many complex problems vie for our attention and for funds; but as I have no doubt of the urgency and wide extent of our urban problems, I also have no doubt of our determination to solve them. I give my support and I urge the House to give its support to this important bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH].

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of H.R. 14810, the urban mass transportation bill of 1966. The report of the Banking and Currency Committee fully documents the nature of the current problem and the need for the legislation recommended to help solve it.

The urban mass transportation program, presently being carried on by the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is necessarily complex. It requires coordination of public and private mass transportation systems; areawide planning covering all the local political jurisdictions, labor protective arrangements, determinations as to revenue financing ability, air pollution controls, and so on.

In spite of this, the program has already achieved a remarkable degree of success. Commitments in favor of mass transit systems are being made throughout the country in cities of all sizes, as the committee's report points out. In many cases this is being done at public referendums. Recent cases in point include the cities of Dallas, Tex.; San Diego, Calif.; and Salem, Oreg.

Small cities, in which the rate of attrition of transit systems has been most acute during the past decade, have also been struggling to reestablish such systems. A demonstration grant project on structuring a small city system is currently in progress, for example, in Rome, N.Y., which abandoned its privately owned system in 1955.

I am most familiar, of course, with the problems of the New York metropolitan area, and especially the Newark area. Here commitments far in excess of those provided in this bill are required. But what has happened to date has all been in the right direction.

Currently in execution, under a capital grant authorized in July 1965, is a project popularly known as the Aldene plan. It is being sponsored by the State of New Jersey and is part of a plan for an officially coordinated mass transportation system for the northern New Jersey-New York metropolitan area. This project has an estimated gross project cost of $9,110,486 and is being assisted with a $3,622,124 grant from HUD, approved in July 1965.

The project will permit Jersey Central passenger trains, which now terminate at a ferry terminal in Jersey City, to be rerouted via the main line of the Lehigh Valley Railroad to the Newark station of the Pennsylvania Railroad. There, passengers will be able to utilize convenient existing connections to downtown and midtown Manhattan and to Jersey City.

This project will permit abandonment of the outmoded and undependable ferry service, and provide passengers with an all-weather, all-rail route to both midtown and downtown Manhattan.

It will also reduce the economic burden of passenger service on the Jersey Central. The State of New Jersey has determined that the Jersey Central provides an essential public service despite continuing financial losses, and has subsidized the railroad through direct payments of over $30 million since 1960.

Also essential to the success of the Aldene plan is a project being undertaken by the Port Authority Trans-Hudson Corp.—PATH. This project, approved in July 1965, provides for the purchase of 44 new rapid transit cars,

rehabilitation of 47 cars, station upgrading, and equipment and track improvements. The gross project cost is $15,020,000, and the capital grant from HUD is $5,100,000.

This project is concerned primarily with upgrading of PATH facilities between Jersey City and Newark. It will improve service to about 20,000 daily passengers who presently use the system to and from Newark and will encourage expanded use by others. The system is an important transportation link to urban renewal projects underway or planned in Newark and Jersey City, and will strengthen lower Manhattan as an employment location for New Jersey residents.

These projects demonstrate that a complex mass transportation plan, involving both public and private enterprise and various public authorities, can be worked out successfully and can provide broad public benefits. Mr. Chairman, under the mass transportation program and funding as presently authorized we are merely scratching the surface of our urban transportation needs.

I consider the strengthening and improvement of the program, as proposed in H.R. 14810, to be very important. I strongly urge passage of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to support this legislation to authorize expansion of the mass transit systems serving the many urban complexes throughout America.

In the city of Cleveland, we have a public mass transit system operated by the Cleveland Transit Board which is one of the model transit systems in America. Under the mass transit legislation previously passed by Congress, we were able to expand our public transit system to the Cleveland Airport—linking jet air transport to the central city and all points on our rail rapid transit system. The Department of Housing and Urban Development provided a grant of $6,995,000 to make possible this rail rapid transit extension 4 miles from the present western terminus of the system to the Hopkins International Airport. The project cost of this extension will total $13.9 million. The Federal grant program has therefore stimulated the involvement of extensive local resources to provide this transit extension which would otherwise have been impossible.

It is my hope that this new authorization will make it possible for the Cleveland Transit System to apply for further Federal assistance to extend the rail rapid transit system throughout the south and southeast portions of greater Cleveland. This will make our system a comprehensive metropolitan system. As a system expands to serve all sections of the metropolitan area, it will increase in use and efficiency and thereby prove the wisdom of current expenditures which are made at the Federal and local level.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my wholehearted approval of the work of the Committee on Banking and Currency in the preparation of H.R. 14810. It is only to be expected, after the demonstrated excellence of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 which began the program of Federal grant and loan assistance to mass transit systems. H.R. 14810 as approved by the committee continues, with minor amendments, and expands this program, which has proved to be of the utmost benefit to the people of this country.

I think that one of the most beneficial aspects of the urban mass transportation program as a whole, under the 1964 act, has been the extent to which it has induced State and local governments, the Federal Government, and private industry to cooperate and pool their respective resources in the public interest. President Johnson has characterized this as "creative federalism" when he recently said:

> Many of our critical new programs involve the Federal Government in joint ventures with State and local governments in thousands of communities throughout the Nation. The success or failure of these programs depends on timely and effective communication and on readiness for action on the part of both Federal agencies in the field and the State and local governmental units.

In my home city of Cleveland, Ohio, we are experiencing an outstanding example of "creative federalism" under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, in connection with a 4-mile, $13.965 million extension of the Cleveland municipal rail rapid transit system to the Cleveland International Airport. In addition to serving the airport itself, it will provide rapid transit service to a densely populated residential area in the vicinity of the airport. This project is made possible by a $6.995 million capital facilities grant under the 1964 act. It has also involved close and active cooperation not only on the part of the city of Cleveland and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, but also on the part of Cuyahoga County.

The city is investing a considerable sum in parking lots at two new rapid transit stations and for a new access roadway to airport lots, and Cuyahoga County will make a substantial contribution by providing five new bridges along the rapid transit extension. As a result of this cooperation, not only will Cleveland reap the benefits of having a rapid transit connection with its international airport, but the thousands of people who live in the vicinity of the airport and along the new extension will be integrated much more effectively into the urban environment of Cleveland than would otherwise be possible.

As Mr. Secretary Weaver said at the ground-breaking ceremonies at Cleveland a few weeks ago:

> We must recognize, in short, that transportation must help create the urban environment we seek; that the principal problem of a city is not how to move, but how to live.

This is being done in Cleveland today. Before this airport extension project was considered, Cleveland had a municipal rail rapid transit system of which it was justly proud. It was financially self-supporting and gave the people of Cleveland convenient, efficient and economical service. My good friend FRANK J. LAUSCHE, former mayor of Cleveland, Governor of Ohio for five terms, and now senior U.S. Senator from Ohio since 1956, had a great deal to do with and deserves a great deal of credit for organizing and establishing that system on a sound and efficient basis. However, it was found that the revenues of the system alone, even with the help of the city and county, could not adequately finance this much-needed extension. Nevertheless, by virtue of the Federal assistance made possible under the 1964 act, it can be done and is now in process.

The urban mass transportation program under the 1964 act has more than proved its worth in the 2 years of its existence. More and more States, cities, towns, and other local public bodies have been turning to it for assistance in meeting their mass transportation problems. In many, many cases the situation has been so acute that only the assistance provided for under the act has enabled local authorities to avoid a complete and total breakdown of transit service. This basic situation has not changed, although much progress has been made under the present program. Our cities continue to grow both in population and in number of automobiles, by leaps and bounds. The rate at which applications for transit aid are being received has grown to an annual level of $200 million. H.R. 14810 merely continues the existing program at an increased annual authorization of $175 million instead of $150 million. Surely, this is a minimum operating level if this program is to continue to benefit our people as it has shown it can.

I urge the passage of H.R. 14810.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I regret that the funds involved are not greater and that the bill does not face the question of operating expenses in the mass transit systems of major cities. I think it is important that we recognize that our cities themselves have very limited resources and cannot finance operating expenses which should be included as well as capital expenses.

However, H.R. 14810, will continue and enlarge the Urbai. Mass Transportation Act of 1964. There is no need to speak at length here about the need for greater urban mass transportation. No one can deny the inability of automobiles alone to meet the commuter needs of our great metropolitan areas. As Mayor Joseph Barr, of Pittsburgh, told the International Conference on Urban Transportation last February:

> Everywhere there is an increasing awareness and a growing urgency for drastic ac-

tion soon to help us solve the transportation problems of our great population centers . . . we in Pittsburgh have learned—as so many other communities are realizing—that total reliance on the private auto for transportation is leading us recklessly down a dead-end street.

Nowhere is there greater realization that there cannot be total reliance on automobiles than in New York City. The consequences of relying on automobile transport alone were painfully demonstrated by the transit strike early this year. Utter chaos was averted only by emergency measures. As it was, there was enormous economic damage and personal inconvenience.

The subway strike added a dramatic illustration to the mounting evidence that our cities must have good mass transit systems. If this was evident in 1964, when the first legislation was passed, it is even more evident in 1966. However, the Federal aid which has been given up to now is only a beginning.

It must be extended. The capital grants which have been approved so far represent only a very small part of the total investment required to build and equip adequate transit systems in our cities.

This investment could now be carried on under the provisions of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966. The act authorizes up to $175 million a year in grant funds for fiscal 1968 and subsequent years. This is but a small increase over the present authorization of $150 million a year for fiscal 1966 and 1967, although the provision for continuing authority provides some assurance to our cities that this is a long-range program. City officials may be encouraged to move ahead with long-range systems development and planning if Federal aid is not limited to a specified time period.

Another aid to planning in this bill is contained in section 5. This section would amend the 1964 act to authorize Federal assistance for detailed system and project planning. This type of planning would carry one step further the mass transportation planning now included under the comprehensive urban planning program authorized by section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954. It would provide the specific information needed to inform officials, and the public as well, as to the costs and probable results of transportation proposals. As we know, grants are only as effective as the programs they finance. Federal funds will be better spent after more extensive planning at the local level.

An important section of the bill is section 4, which calls for the investigation of new methods of urban transportation. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, consulting with the Secretary of Commerce, would be directed to prepare a program of research, development, and demonstration of new methods of urban transportation. A report on the program, together with any recommended legislation, would be submitted to the President within 18 months of enactment of this bill. It is anticipated that such a program would concern itself with all aspects of new urban transportation systems for metropolitan areas of various sizes and would provide national leadership in this field.

The proposed new program of research would tend to counteract the present built-in bias toward traditional systems. Our present systems have been allowed to deteriorate so badly, and the need is so urgent to bring about some improvement, that there is a tendency to use the very limited Federal funds available to shore up existing systems. New York City, for example, has received a $23.4 million capital grant for 400 new cars for its subway. Other cities have received capital grants to help buy new equipment for their bus companies. This investment in new equipment is certainly needed, but it does not represent any real breakthrough in design or system concepts. Even San Francisco's new $1 billion rapid transit system, which has received Federal aid in the form of both capital and demonstration grants, does not involve any really radical departures from existing rail transportation.

Perhaps a new program of research will ultimately bring the dawn of a new era in the movement of people in our cities. I hope so, but such hopes are undoubtedly in vain unless we begin to revise our thinking on the scope of what needs to be done in our cities. In this regard, I am compelled to point out that this bill, while a step forward, is but a very small step. It does nothing to really balance the transportation networks of our cities. Compared to the billions of dollars in Federal aid available for roadbuilding, the funds provided in this bill are insignificant.

Under this mass transportation bill, because of the 12.5-percent limit on funds which may go to any one State, the maximum which New York State could receive would be $21,875,000 a year. Of course, New York City would receive less than this. I can hardly foresee a dramatic improvement for the riders of New York's transit system as a result of this legislation.

A very small city might conceivably have its one busline rejuvenated with the amount of Federal aid provided, but our huge, sprawling metropolitan centers can only receive peripheral help. There is a need for sufficient Federal aid to develop sophisticated new transportation systems.

Only such systems, combined with imaginative new housing, more and better schools and recreational opportunities, can save the people in our large cities from a late 20th century version of life in the Dark Ages. Surely it was possible to travel at a quicker pace through the streets of medieval cities than through midtown Manhattan today.

Therefore, although I support the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966, I contend that it does not go far enough. It does not provide enough funds, and the funds that are provided are subject to arbitrary limitation. To correct the latter problem, I have introduced legislation (H.R. 12823) which eliminates the 12.5-percent limitation. To augment the available funds, I have also introduced a bill (H.R. 12852) which would permit a State to use revenues from the highway trust fund for mass transit purposes. It would provide additional funds for crucially needed mass transportation without adding one dollar to the President's budget.

As I said at the beginning, neither does H.R. 14810 do anything toward alleviating the operating expenses of our mass transportation systems. Many commuter lines—including subways such as in New York and Boston—have proven their inability to finance their operations merely out of fares and revenues. They need direct cash grants to keep operating, grants well beyond the financial resources of our cities. I have therefore introduced H.R. 12850, which would allow the Federal Government to underwrite a major portion of the operating losses of any transportation facility which provides commuter services in a metropolitan area. Such legislation faces up to the real financial problems of urban mass transportation—a challenge avoided by the present legislation.

Under this proposal, grants, which would be on a two-thirds, one-third matching basis, would be available to public transportation authorities which have broad responsibilities for maintenance of commuter transportation. There are no objective reasons why Federal aid for mass transit should be limited only to subsidizing capital improvements. It is very artificial to draw clear-cut lines between Federal responsibility to aid in financing the purchase of new equipment and Federal assistance in underwriting operating deficits. Operating expenses are all part of the costs of running a commuter system, and the system has to be preserved, regardless of cost. How can a line that is about to fold take advantage of Federal funds for capital improvements if it cannot meet its payroll or continue to sustain even the most marginal kind of service?

Mr. Chairman, the legislation we are considering today is basically sound and should be quickly enacted. It is a step forward in the program of Federal aid to urban mass transportation. The new planning and research provisions are well conceived.

The program is still hobbled, however, by inadequate funds. Speed and massive action is needed to help our great metropolitan areas keep ahead of growing population pressures which are creating intolerable traffic congestion. I hope that we will soon have the opportunity to vote for complementary measures which will allow this program to spurt ahead in our large cities.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to rise in support of this bill with the hope that in years to come we will assist the cities far more effectively in meeting their need for cheap, efficient, comfortable mass transit.

Mass transportation is no longer a problem of interest only to experts and technicians. Events of recent months have dramatized that the problems of mass transportation have the most sensitive and explosive implications for

the health and vitality of our urban communities and for the viability and soundness of our human and intergroup relations.

The McCone report on the Watts riots of last year made it clear beyond doubt that the absence of cheap, swift mass transportation which could get workers to where the jobs are, was one of the basic causes of the alienation and frustration which led to that explosion of rage and bitterness.

The cessation of operations of the New York City subway system in recent months has heightened our consciousness of how indispensable mass transit is to all of us, but most especially to the low-income groups in our community who do not have options—who do not have viable alternatives.

It seems a manifold injustice that in the same year in which transit fares in New York City have been substantially raised by government fiat, in effect imposing a regressive tax on the poor, we should have eliminated luxury taxes on expensive leather luggage, jewelry, furs, and foreign cars.

New York City has received only a fraction of the several hundred million dollars which New York State, under the Rockefeller administration, has tendered to our commuter rail system serving prosperous residents of affluent suburbia. We must have adequate, comfortable commuter transportation for those who live outside the confines of our cities but who make their livelihoods in the cities and contribute to the economic health of our cities.

But certainly we have no lesser need for adequate mass transportation which meets the needs of our urban population. And, to date, the efforts of the Federal Government, as well as the States, in aid of urban mass transportation, have been pathetically inadequate to the need.

Our urban centers are in desperate need of comprehensive planning which will integrate both the physical plans and financial and rate structures of our commuter railroad, bus, bridge and highway systems, with our urban mass transport systems.

If a fraction of the long-term planning, as well as the Federal financial aids invested in our highway system were devoted to the planning and financial needs of our mass transit, there would be a rapid improvement in the way of life not only for our urban working population which depends almost exclusively on mass transit, but indeed for all of our urban population whose daily lives inevitably depend directly or indirectly on the availability of efficient, cheap mass transit.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GRABOWSKI].

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14810, a bill to authorize further grants for technical studies and to provide for an expedited program of research, development, and demonstration of new urban transportation systems.

Mr. Chairman, the problems of mass transportation continue to plague our large cities, and even our little ones. It is paradoxical that modern man, equipped with the fastest means of transportation ever known to man, finds himself bogged down, at least twice a day in most of the cities of our technically advanced country in traffic jams, and traveling at a rate slower than one on horseback. If we are to escape the entrapment of our own creation—the explosive growth of the number of automobiles on our highways —we must continue to search for solution in mass transportation.

The bill under consideration will provide a continuance of the step in the right direction which was initially taken in the 88th Congress. I am proud that I participated in that bold and imaginative action when the Congress passed the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. A good start in a worthy program has been made. Let us today provide for a continuance of that program.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, mass transportation is a serious domestic problem that cries out for solution. But a Federal solution is not always the best solution.

I point out again that the Federal revenues collected primarily from personal and corporate income taxes, are not an appropriate source for financing local urban transportation systems.

A few large cities which neglected their transportation needs for many decades are now asking all U.S. taxpayers to pay their obligations.

Mass transportation systems enhance the local property values of the local property owners and local businesses. Local sales tax, local property tax and the coin box are the appropriate methods for financing local massive transportation systems.

If local officials—if State legislators—would get hold of their courage and levy the necessary income taxes for education purposes, as one example only, there would be ample local property sources to finance local services.

The income tax is the appropriate source for financing education—there is a correlation between income and education, and vice versa.

Services which enhance local property values should look to local property and sales for tax support.

There is little correlation between the income taxes paid by individuals and corporations throughout the United States and any benefit they could possibly receive from local transportation subsidies.

I suggest that local officials with transportation ills revise their tax systems and methods so that the taxes exacted from their citizens are more related and more equitable to the services which they want to provide for their citizens.

Here, in an era of accelerating inflation, we should be concerned about the extraordinary spending of the Federal Government—especially when the Federal Government is spending more than it is taking in.

For the reasons that the source of revenues is inappropriate and inequitable and that the proposed authorization exceeds the President's budget, I must oppose this bill. These problems deserve better solutions. The U.S. taxpayer deserves better consideration.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I told the House yesterday during debate on the FNMA bill, our esteemed and able colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman WILLIAM A. BARRETT, chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, cannot be present because of the unfortunate death of his brother. Otherwise I know he would deeply want to be present here today to support the mass transit bill. His Housing Subcommittee held extensive hearings on the subject and reported an excellent bill to the full committee. Mr. BARRETT asked me to urge his colleagues to support this legislation so vitally needed by our cities, large and small, to help them cope with the staggering problems of mass transportation which are besetting our cities and towns.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the urban mass transit bill is urgently needed to continue the very important program of Federal aid to meet the needs of towns and cities of every size and in every part of the country. As the chairman of our committee has stated, the widespread support for the bill was shown by our favorable vote of 11 to 0 in the Subcommittee on Housing and 29 to 1 in the full committee. Moreover, testimony we received in the course of 4 weeks of hearings before the Subcommittee on Housing on this and other housing and urban development legislation shows that the program has broad support throughout the country. It is wholeheartedly endorsed by mayors, labor, and private mass transit operators as well.

This bill is needed to extend the authorization of the original 1964 act, which was limited to 3 years. The principal provision is the authorization for appropriations of up to $175 million annually. This section was taken from the bill introduced by our ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. I would like to say that his strong support for this program has been very important to its success.

Because of the necessary leadtime for planning and development in an industry like mass transit, it is important that funds be made available as soon as possible. In recognition of this, the Committee on Appropriations has cooperated fully and has appropriated funds a year in advance. As a result, funds have already been appropriated for 1967 but what is needed now is an authorization for fiscal year 1968 to carry out the President's request for an appropriation to cover that year so that the business of planning and development can go ahead right now even though the actual expenditure will not be made until later.

Basically, the bill continues and provides additional funds for the urban mass transit program which was first established in the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Under that program, Federal partial grants are provided to assist local governments in financing the capital facilities and equipment needed for the extension and improvement of comprehensively planned urban mass transportation systems. The Federal grant can cover up to two-thirds of net project cost—that part of total cost which cannot be financed out of revenue. While these grants naturally can go only to public bodies, the equipment and construction can and in nearly all cases is used to aid privately owned systems through leasing arrangements.

Mr. Chairman, the 1964 Mass Transportation Act authorized a level of $150 million for this program in the current fiscal year. The modest increase to an annual rate of $175 million beginning in fiscal 1968 is well justified by the increasing activity in this field. During fiscal 1965, mass transit projects amounting to $51 million were approved and during the past year, this jumped to $106 million. On June 30 of this year, the Department of Housing and Urban Development had a backlog of 40 applications under review totaling $108 million. Undoubtedly, the rate will continue to rise because the need is great.

It is little short of amazing how an industry as vital as local mass transportation was so long neglected. In recent years, there has been an actual decrease in the number of riders in spite of our expanding urban population. Most of the decrease appears to have come during off hours, while the number of people dependent on mass transit to get to and from work has held up. However, the effect on transit revenues has been significant and the industry has been hard put to invest in the most modern and efficient equipment and to maintain adequate service which is necessary to attract riders. The modest margin of assistance provided under this program is serving to revitalize local transit systems, not only for the benefit of those who actually ride our buses, subways and commuter trains, but for the benefit of everyone who travels in and around our cities.

The program also has a broader benefit in that a healthy transit system is vital to community development and, particularly, to maintaining our tremendous investment in downtown areas. If our other efforts to rebuild our cities through housing and urban development programs are to succeed, it is vital that the local transportation system be efficient and up to date.

While the use of private passenger cars will continue to increase, we cannot rely on them to meet all of our transit needs. Already fully half of the land area of some of our major cities is devoted to moving and storing cars. This involves a tremendous cost and loss of local tax revenues. Also, these drivers will share in the benefits of efficient mass transit through lessened traffic congestion. Moreover, not everyone has the alternative of his own automobile because of age, income or physical handicap. For these people, mass transit is a necessity.

Mr. Chairman, for all of these reasons, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 14810, the urban mass transit bill.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to speak in support of H.R. 14810, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966, as reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The committee, under the able leadership of its chairman, has reported a bill which should help the cities establish a more balanced and efficient transportation system.

I have long felt that the Federal Government has provided outstanding assistance to the State and local governments for building roads, but we have neglected the great mass transportation needs of our large cities. The bill we are voting on today, along with the original Mass Transportation Act of 1964, is a necessary step in redressing the imbalance between automobile and mass transportation in the cities.

I am particularly interested in section 4 of H.R. 14810. This section authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to prepare a program of research, development, and demonstration of new methods of urban transportation. Last year I, along with several other Congressmen, introduced a bill to provide for this. I am pleased that the committee has incorporated my proposal in section 4 of the bill before us today.

There is a great need for research and evaluation of radically improved methods of transportation that are being proposed and developed. I hope that this section will give new impetus to transit development, and that we can achieve our aim of breakthrough results within 5 years, as stated in the committee report.

Mr. Chairman, the Council of Metropolitan Area Leagues of Women Voters has just issued a very valuable study on transportation in the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul. The study was prepared by the transportation committee of the league. The chairman, Mrs. Milton Hughes, and her fellow committee members spent hundreds of hours in research to provide information on the transportation needs of the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

One part of their study is of particular importance to the research and development of mass transportation systems. This part of the study lists the modes of mass transportation, and I include it at the end of my remarks:

MODES OF MASS TRANSPORTATION

Discussed below are existing modes of mass transportation, one or more of which are in use in many areas, and new methods, or new slants on old methods, for mass transit. Among them are modes suitable for shuttle service within a city, and for transportation within a metropolitan area.

Motor buses are the most commonly used form of mass transit. They run on existing streets and highways. Some lines serve as feeders to rail rapid transit. Travel through congested areas and frequent stops cause bus service to be slower than autos. To increase speed, some cities have express buses operating along city arterials and on freeways and have reserved transit lanes in downtown areas.

Rail rapid transit is an electric railway for passenger service which runs on tracks above or below ground. It commonly serves urban areas within six to eight miles of the center city, makes stops every one to two miles, and is principally fed by local bus service and outlying parking lots.

Commuter trains provide high speed service for large numbers of passengers. They serve suburban areas 30 to 40 miles from the center city, are usually owned by a private railroad, make stops every three to five miles, and are fed by walkers, autos, and occasionally by feeder buses.

Monorail began its first trial operation in this country along a 970 foot line in Houston, Texas, early in 1956. Passenger cars move on a single rail. The first monorail train was installed in Wuppertal, Germany, some sixty years ago. It offers no advantages over trains.

Westinghouse Transit Expressway is based on the use of lightweight automated vehicles operating singly or in trains. It uses rubber tired vehicles resembling a bus and runs on a roadway composed of two concrete tracks which may be an aerial structure, on the ground, or in a subway. The train can operate at 50 m.p.h. Westinghouse has built a demonstration expressway near Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Electronically Controlled Bus. An experimental model has been manufactured by the Flexible Company, Loudonville, Ohio, and Barrett Electronics Corporation, Northbrook, Illinois. Operated by a regular driver, this bus would start out in suburban areas. After collecting its passengers, it enters an expressway where it is coupled with other buses into a continuous bus-train which moves to the city at high speed on electronic guides embedded in the pavement. This system eliminates the need for transferring from private car or bus to other rapid transit and the time losses which such transfers entail.

The Commuter Piggyback, a concept of the Pullman Company, proposes that buses, after collecting passengers in suburbia, be loaded on trains without requiring passengers to leave the buses.

The Jet Skimmer is an air cushion vehicle accommodating fifteen passengers which travels on both land and water on a four foot thick air cushion. It went into service in August, 1965, making ten trips daily between the Oakland and San Francisco airports and downtown San Francisco, thus eliminating a long trip by freeway. The operation is under the sponsorship of the Port of Oakland, in cooperation with SFO Helicoter Airlines Inc. and Textronics Bell Aero-Systems Company. It is assisted by a grant from the U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The Uniflow Berggren Mass Transit System, developed by a Minneapolis engineer,

would utilize a vehicle accommodating up to 20 passengers which would float .15 to .25 inches above the surface of a duct containing air jets which would lift and propel the vehicle at speeds of 30 to 60 m.p.h. The vibrationless, frictionless, and silent vehicles would run inside a tube ten feet wide (for two-way traffic) above, on, or below the ground. Each car could be separately programmed to offer nonstop service from any point of origin to any destination with a minimum distance between stations of 1,200 feet. Smaller vehicles accommodating six passengers would require a tube less than three feet wide (for one-way traffic) and could operate in existing freeway medians. Cost estimated for on or above grade service is $2 million to $4 million per mile.

The Teletrans system uses four passenger electrically powered cars which travel in tubes and are controlled by a computer. Travel is non stop at 45 m.p.h. to a destination selected by depositing an IBM card in a slot. A one mile demonstration line will be built in downtown Detroit in 1966 by the Teletrans Corporation of Detroit, Michigan.

Hovertrain, now operating in Hythe, England, rides on a one-half inch cushion of compressed air generated within the train. Its track is a concrete trough. Potential speds are 300 to 400 m.p.h.

Walk on-walk off conveyors (escalators and conveyor belts for pedestrians), are fully automatic, operate unattended, and handle passengers in a continuous process. They are used to move people between floors of buildings, along sloping walkways, and from place to place in some airport terminals. Escalators are much more common than conveyor belts, although the latter are simpler and are perhaps slightly faster. Low speeds (up to 3 m.p.h.) make these devices relatively unattractive for service on level walkways.

The vehicular conveyor consists of booths with seats mounted on a conveyor belt. A short length of this type of conveyor was built in New York City in the 1800's. It was used as a pleasant way to sightsee and to transport people between two points of interest. A modern example is the "Carveyor," the trade name of a mass transit system developed by Stephens-Adamson Manufacturing Company and the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company. It was originally envisaged for the shuttle line betwen Times Square and Grand Central Station in New York. Because this system operates with a minimum of personnel, it was opposed by the transportation union and thus never installed. It can attain speeds of 15 m.p.h. and, with further development, may be able to operate at speeds up to 50 per cent greater.

The helicopter as a form of mass transit is primarily used to transport people between downtown areas, between airports, or between downtown areas and airports. Extended use is limited because of the noise, size, and cost.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, on page 2 of the committee report—House Report No. 1487—there is an indication that we have $55 million in carryover funds for this program.

It says the 1964 act provided a 3-year authorization totalling $375 million in Federal grants, but that the amount appropriated for that period totals $320 million—$60 million for fiscal 1965 and $130 million each for fiscal 1966 and 1967.

Evidently, then, if we approve a bill authorizing a total of $325 million for 2 years, as this bill provides, we actually are approving the availability of $380 million.

The President has wisely asked that we restrict spending in this critical time of an overheated fiscal condition. We will be making a real mistake if we proceed with the authorization as provided in this bill.

The authorization should be reduced at least to a level of $125 million for each fiscal year, 1966 and 1967. With the $55 million in carryover funds, the total availability will be $305 million.

This total would be a more nearly responsible figure for us to approve.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the need for attention to be given to the problems of traffic congestion in our large cities. I also recognize the need for fiscal responsibility in our handling of legislation.

The House will also be presented soon additional legislation affecting metropolitan areas including mass transportation—the bill proposing demonstration cities and metropolitan development districts. The costs of these programs are also extremely vague—virtually unknown.

Mr. Chairman, when we in this body act so irresponsibly as to authorize funds over and above a bare minimum in a time of national fiscal tension such as this, we totally forfeit our right to ask that anyone in the Nation show responsibility, whether it be management and labor, or the administration.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to record my unqualified support for H.R. 14810 as reported by the committee.

The extension of the Mass Transit Act, as provided by this bill, is a most necessary step that must be taken to assure the continuation of this most valuable program. We from New England have a special interest in this program and a special appreciation of its merit since the New Haven Railroad, which services my district, benefits from the $3 million mass transit demonstration grant. Although this grant supports the New Haven's west end commuter service, it in effect helps to keep the railroad alive during the present difficult period of transition, and thus benefits the whole service area of the New Haven, including my State.

I note with some concern that the other body yesterday reduced its own committee recommendations for funding of these valuable programs from the proposed $225 million annual amount to $150 million annually, which has been the amount allowed heretofore. For this reason, I hope that the House will allow the modest increase to $175 million proposed by our own committee.

I am especially interested in the provisions of the pending bill which make allowance for new programs of research and development into new concepts of urban transportation and also support grants for planning and for comprehensive review of new programs by the Secretary. These are the features of the pending bill that will permit the program to be much more forward-looking and will help it to meet the needs of the future.

In this respect the pending bill complements the excellent program enacted last year under the High Speed Ground Transportation Act, which was passed largely through the efforts of my colleague in the other body, Senator CLAIBORNE PELL of Rhode Island. That legislation also finances a far-reaching program of research and development that can lead to a whole new generation of high-speed ground transportation equipment. It also finances the construction of new railroad equipment to be used in consumer demonstration tests beginning next year. I dare say that some of the features of the bill before us today would not be there if it were not for the new perspectives that were opened as a result of Senator PELL's outstanding work and initiative in this field.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I support the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966. It is a measure that serves a continuing and pressing need in our urban centers—the need for transportation for all of our citizens.

Many Americans find that the automobile is the answer to their transportation requirements. It is convenient; it is private. Yet we must remember that not everyone can drive, and not everyone can afford an automobile.

Miami, for example, has many senior citizens who must depend upon public transportation. Many workers, particularly women workers, would not be able to get to their jobs without bus service. This is true in almost all of our cities.

Therefore, we cannot let urban mass transportation falter. We must help provide the public support that is necessary to insure transportation for all.

Furthermore, with increasing population pressures, more and more Americans will find that driving to work is increasingly expensive and time consuming. We must plan ahead to avert traffic bottlenecks by diversifying the transportation alternatives in our cities.

The metropolitan area of Miami has increased 14 percent in population between 1960 and 1965. We are now over the million mark. By 1985, the Dade County Planning Department estimates that we will have close to 2½ million residents.

Similar figures are projected for many areas, particularly in growing south Dade. Intolerable traffic congestion is inevitable unless we both continue our roads program and also use these rights-of-way for transit vehicles. Transportation chaos will stifle growth and substantially reduce economic benefits and potential.

The bill we are considering today provides only a modest increase in the urban mass transit program, and cities throughout the Nation are applying for vital assistance. I urge that we enact this legislation and thus demonstrate our continued support for a balanced transportation network for our urban areas.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the proposed motion to recommit. While I sympathize with the great need to trim spending during this period of war and inflation, it seems to me that there are better places to make the cut.

Mass transit is one thing that the cities need badly which does not come loaded with either Federal control or

padded Federal payrolls. Mass transit money is money spent well. I am in favor of economy, but let me make a suggestion as to where Congress might find a lot more fat to carve off the budget. I refer to the poverty program.

Why cut $25 million off this good, unpolitical program when the $1.8 billion a year poverty program, a veritable bonanza of waste, is available to be cut? Let me suggest that we leave the $25 million in the mass transit program and slash $250 million from the poverty program. That will be 10 times smarter and 10 times more profitable.

After all, there must be plenty of fat in a poverty program that can afford to subsidize LeRoi Jones' "Black Arts Repertory Theater"—which the police raided this spring, only to discover a black nationalist arsenal.

The mass transit program is a good program. I hope the House will not make it pay for the trouble sowed by programs like the poverty program. Let the poverty program pay directly.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago Congress, by enacting the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, inaugurated a program to help the cities cope with their crippling public transportation problems. The legislation before us today enlarges and improves upon this program in recognition of the increasingly urgent needs of our metropolitan areas for adequate transit systems.

The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966 provides a three-pronged attack on the urban transport problem through a grant program for the constuction of transit facilities, through research and development into new types of urban transport, and through assistance for the planning, engineering, and design of urban transportation projects.

The coordination and leadership in all three of these areas is desperately needed by all the major cities in this Nation, and most of the medium-sized ones. Individual cities have neither the funds nor the other resources needed to initiate and carry out the drastic overhauls in transit systems required to prevent their self-strangulation. Many metropolitan areas, including the very largest, have relied almost exclusively on highways to serve the hearts of their cities. All too often, such a policy has threatened to make over these cities into gigantic, continuous traffic jams which have become the bane of every urban dweller's existence.

Those who run these cities are not entirely to blame for the dominance of highways in urban areas. The interstate highway program and other Federal road programs have been so attractive that city governments cannot neglect to take advantage of them. It was only 2 years ago, almost 10 years after the inauguration of the interstate highway program, that the Federal Government recognized it also had a responsibility in the area of public urban transportation.

By passage of the legislation pending today, we reassert our conviction to squarely meet this responsibility.

Let me describe in more detail how the program proposed in this legislation will work, because it is important to understanding direction in which Federal programs for the support and improvement of urban transportation systems probably will move.

First, the construction grant program. The proposed measure puts this program on a permanent basis. It also increases the total authorization for Federal construction grants by $25 million to a new annual maximum of $175 million. The installation of adequate transport facilities in our urban areas call for terrific capital expenditures, just as the construction of roads are very expensive propositions. City governments, or even metropolitan area governments, cannot be expected to finance the construction of transit facilities. By putting the construction grant program on a permanent basis we are recognizing the need in this area for continued help by the Federal Government.

Second, is the program of research and development of new systems of urban transportation. The present bill continues the modest proposal of $10 million annually to run demonstration tests of new features of existing transit systems. But it only continues this authority for 2 more years, by which time the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which administers this program, is required to have formulated a full-scale research program to develop new systems of urban transport.

Today, our urban transportation systems are relics of a bygone technological era. With few exceptions, the systems we now use are variations of the bus or the trolley, both of which were designed and developed decades ago. They do not really reflect the technological sophistication and genius of which we are capable today. The proposed research program would be designed to close this "technological gap" and bring our urban transit systems fully into the space age. While we do not yet know what this research and development will bring us, there are some hints off on the horizon. Basically, those who are experts in interpreting the images revealed by the transportation crystal ball speculate that the urban transport vehicle of the future will be one with most of the advantages of the automobile and few of the disadvantages. In short, it will be a form of individualized transportation that will be ready to leave when you want to leave, take you directly to your destination without stops or transfers along the way. And it will not get you caught in traffic jams, or make you cough from exhaust fumes.

Finally, the third prong of the 1966 attack authorizes Federal grant assistance for preparing mass transportation project surveys, plans and other preliminary activities for the construction or improvement of urban transportation facilities. This phase, of course, is extremely important if we are to have sensible, coordinated, efficient, and effective systems of transportation in our urban areas that incorporate the best features of roads, rails, air and other types of transport.

Therefore, I strongly urge passage of H.R. 14810 today.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the urban transportation bill because I consider it one of the most important pieces of legislation ever passed by Congress.

This measure will have a profound effect on the future development of my congressional district.

Earlier this year, the people of Chicago approved a $27 million bond issue to provide one-third matching funds for the money we hope to get from the Federal Government to expand our rapid transit system in Chicago.

If the measure before us is approved, and I sincerely hope it will be, Chicago will apply for approximately $50 million in Federal assistance; and we have every reason to believe this much-needed help will be forthcoming.

This money will be used to extend the Logan Square elevated into the median strip of the Kennedy Expressway to Central and Foster, and ultimately to at least Cumberland Road.

The CTA expects to get started on this project almost immediately and hopes to have the entire project completed by the end of 1968 or early 1969.

When completed this rapid transit extension will make it possible for any one of my constituents on the far northwest side of Chicago to get to the Loop in no more than 30 minutes from any location.

This legislation also makes possible the extension of the rapid transit system into the Dan Ryan Expressway and will also make funds available for the renovation of the rapid transit depot at Kimball and Lawrence.

I urge my colleagues to support this very important legislation which will help America's large cities and small cities free themselves of the transit strangle which they are now all suffering.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966 I would like to bring to the attention of the Members a vigorous campaign being waged in Minnesota. This campaign is taking place in the seven-county Twin Cities metropolitan area in and around Minneapolis and St. Paul.

The campaign advocates modern rapid mass transportation and opposes more freeways. It is under the sponsorship of the Fifth District Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs, with Mrs. E. Hane Carlson and Mrs. A. E. Bowman serving as codirectors of the campaign.

The efforts of Mrs. Carlson and Mrs. Bowman and their fellow workers have aroused a strong civic interest in mass transportation. Full information and campaign materials have been furnished to local, State, and Federal officials, committees, commissions, and civic groups. The campaign is primarily directed at furnishing information to the people of the Twin Cities area, urging them to make their preferences for mass transportation known to their elected officials. I have received many communications from constituents who have been inspired by this campaign.

The directors of the campaign believe that in too many metropolitan areas the

citizens have been told that in order to get a modern rapid mass transit system sometime in the future, they must agree to accept all proposed freeways. This solution is then called "balanced transportation." The directors contend, however, that practically no modern transit has been built throughout the country, while great numbers of metropolitan freeways have been built, with resultant car chaos, urban sprawl, and air pollution—but no transportation solution. The directors want to turn the situation around and put the primary emphasis upon adequate, modern mass transit before additional freeways can be built.

In their campaign, the Fifth District Women's Clubs quote the views of nationally recognized experts, such as Morris Ketchum, Jr., president of the American Institute of Architects:

Highways are being built through cities blindly . . . with disastrous results.

Mr. Ketchum resigned in protest as a Government adviser on highway design.

Also used in the campaign are statements of Reginald Issacs, a Harvard University regional planning professor:

If things are not to go clunk one day and halt, use of private cars will have to be reduced in the city center . . . freeways will be saturated soon after they are completed, and mass transit must be devised.

Also furnished to the people in this campaign are the views of I. M. Pei, the noted architect and planner:

A city to be great needs heart . . . the new cities of the Southwest, built after the car and its mobility, are in real trouble. Their centers are usually scattered, separated from each other by freeways. They must bring life back to their main centers—build apartments in their downtown so that there will be life after dark to nourish the cultural and business life of the city.

Also covered in the campaign material are air pollution, health hazards, the cost factor, and the effect on neighborhoods.

Civic leaders in other urban areas throughout the country who are interested are invited to write Mrs. A. E. Bowman, 2642 Burnham Road, Minneapolis, Minn., 55416, for the campaign materials being used in the Twin Cities area.

Through the passage of the Mass Transportation Act of 1966 and future legislation, I hope that Congress will place increasing emphasis upon rapid mass transit so that people in urban areas will have an effective choice between metropolitan freeways and mass transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14810

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 "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966".

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 4(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967; and $175,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter".

SEC. 3. Section 6(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and to $80,000,000 on July 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "to $30,000,000 on July 1, 1966, to $40,000,000 on July 1, 1967, and to $50,000,000 on July 1, 1968".

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, undertake a study to prepare a program of research, development, and demonstration of new systems of urban transportation that will carry people and goods within metropolitan areas speedily, safely, without polluting the air, and in a manner that will contribute to sound city planning. The program shall (1) concern itself with all aspects of new systems of urban transportation for metropolitan areas of various sizes, including technological, financial, economic, governmental, and social aspects; (2) take into account the most advanced available technologies and materials; and (3) provide national leadership to efforts of States, localities, private industry, universities and foundations. The Secretary shall report his findings and recommendations to the President, for submission to the Congress, as rapidly as possible and in any event not later than eighteen months after the date of enactment of this Act. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for its preparation.

SEC. 5. (a) The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as amended by this Act) is further amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 9 through 12 as sections 10 through 13, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 8 the following new section:

"GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL STUDIES

"SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States and local public bodies and agencies thereof for the planning, engineering, and designing of urban mass transportation projects, and for other technical studies, to be included, or proposed to be included, in a program (completed or under active preparation) for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area. Activities assisted under this section may include (1) studies relating to management, operations, capital requirements, and economic feasibility; (2) preparation of engineering and architectural surveys, plans, and specifications; and (3) other similar or related activities preliminary to and in preparation for the construction, acquisition, or improved operation of mass transportation systems, facilities, and equipment. A grant under this section shall be made in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary and shall not exceed two-thirds of the cost of carrying out the activities for which the grant is made."

(b) Section 3(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 10(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 11(c)".

Mr. FINO (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINO: On page 4, after line 6, insert two new sections as follows:

"SEC. 6. The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out section 13 (as redesignated by section 5 of this Act).

"SEC. 7. Section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary shall give priority to the urgency of the need existing in the Nation's largest cities with high population density, while assuring the widest possible distribution of such assistance among the States'."

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to remove from the Mass Transportation Act the limitation by which only 12.5 percent of the yearly expenditures can be made in any one State.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this House to think for a moment about New York City. It is the heart of a tristate region, made up of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. Yet New York City is restricted insofar as the money it can receive is concerned by the fact that it is located within one State.

Mr. Chairman, clearly the mass transit program is a program for big cities. It should not be so restricted that the individual big-city States can only get "small potatoes" assistance from this program.

Mr. Chairman, of all the Nation's cities, New York has the most clearly defined mass transit needs which will never be dealt with adequately under the mass transit program as it is presently structured.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that it is unreasonable to strike the 12.5-percent limitation so that New York City can obtain a fair share of the mass transit money, as befits the tristate hub of the greatest urban complex in the world.

Mr. Chairman, as I said before, mass transit is an urban program. It is a program for big cities. It should not be unduly restricted so that its impact in the key big cities is negligible.

Mr. Chairman, let me stray for a moment. Let me talk about the cotton support program. It is for the Deep South. Do we have a 12.5-percent limitation upon the amount of funds that can go into the Mississippi River Valley? We do not. We do not because such a restriction would cripple the economic thrust of the program. It would keep this program from working in the South.

Mr. Chairman, the 12.5-percent limitation contained in this program has kept the mass transit program from doing what it should in our several large cities. I urge that we change it, and make it more realistic.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WELTNER. Would, in the gentleman's opinion, the sum of $175 million a year be adequate with which to meet the transportation needs of New York City?

Mr. FINO. Would 12.5 percent of that amount be adequate?

Mr. WELTNER. No, if the gentleman will yield further, the amount of $175 million for the next 3 or 4 years. Would that be adequate with which to meet the needs of New York City?

Mr. FINO. That amount would be substantially helpful; yes, it would.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, am I correct in believing that there would be nothing contained in this section which would prohibit the Secretary from allocating every penny of the funds appropriated under this legislation to New York City; is that not correct?

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Georgia knows full well that the Secretary in exercising his discretion, will not allocate the entire amount authorized for appropriation, although he would not be limited to the 12.5 percent, or 15 percent, or something more adequate.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, under the statute as written, assuming that the gentleman's amendment is passed, there would be nothing to prevent the Secretary from allocating every penny of the funds appropriated under this authorization to the city of New York?

Mr. FINO. The gentleman is correct, but I am sure that the Secretary, in whom I have great confidence, will not abuse that discretion.

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

Mr. FINO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman from New York to say that $175 million would take care of the additional needs of the city of New York for transit purposes?

Mr. FINO. No, sir; it would not take care of them, but it would help to take care of many of the problems which now exist in New York City.

Mr. MULTER. Of course, you have in mind the fact that the annual New York City deficit just on the city-owned transit system amounts to some 80-odd million dollars a year.

Mr. FINO. Exactly. I mentioned that earlier today in debate.

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

Mr. FINO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, that would depend, too, on whether the transit workers decided to work, would it not?

Mr. FINO. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I do not urge this House to vote more money. We are not asking for more money under this bill, but I do urge the House to help free this program from a restriction which would cripple our efforts to help the cities throughout this Nation at no expense in the efforts along this line. The adoption of this amendment would remove the limitation of the 12½ percent.

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

Mr. Chairman, many of our housing programs have State limitations to assure that every part of the country has an opportunity to share in the benefits. The mass transit program is still a relatively new one, but it is one that meets a national need and is helping towns and cities of every size in every area. It is essential to the longrun success of the program that this continue to be true.

I sympathize with the problems of our very large metropolitan areas which have equally large and costly problems but the solution to their needs is to provide adequate funds as it becomes necessary, not to remove a limitation needed to protect the rest of the country. I am informed by the Department that at present no State is pressing against the existing 12½-percent limit nor do they foresee any immediate problem.

If we should remove this needed protection, in a year or two we might suddenly be confronted with one city gobbling up a greatly disproportionate amount of the funds then available which would freeze out the majority of the Nation. I believe the House has a duty to protect the rights of small- and medium-size communities which need this aid just as much as the big cities and I feel a better way to meet the problem when it arises is to study the proposal then made and the problem it is designed to overcome and, if the facts warrant it, make adequate funds available at that time to take care of our largest metropolitan areas, while at the same time providing for smaller towns.

I hope this amendment will be defeated.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] said that the city of New York takes care of a large part of the transit needs of Connecticut and New Jersey. There are three States involved. That means that 37½ percent of the funds will be available to those three States in that area and that is a large part of the funds.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, under this bill New York State can only apply for and the limitation as to New York State will be, a 12½-percent ceiling. That is the most they can receive even though their transit activities may cover the other two States, New Jersey and Connecticut.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to defeat this amendment. This bill will go to conference. Yesterday in the other body an amendment was hastily written and put into this bill which affects this 12½-percent provision and removes it under certain conditions.

Mr. Chairman, if we were also to adopt this amendment, the hands of the conferees will be tied. If you leave this bill as it is now before us and let it go to conference, consideration will be given to this amendment and I know the right thing will be done.

So I hope the amendment is defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment that is now pending before us despite the fact that if it were possible to get $175 million—which is the annual authorization of this bill and get it all for the city of New York, I would vote for such a bill. I would join my colleagues from New York in presenting such a bill if there were a chance of it being enacted. But I know there is no such chance. Therefore, let us not confuse the issue and not overlook the fact that what we are dealing with here is a demonstration program.

Mr. Chairman, as was just pointed out by our able chairman of the full committee, if the State of New York, the State of Connecticut, and the State of New Jersey should consummate a tri-state compact for mass transportation, they will be entitled to receive 37½ percent of the annual contribution or authorization for their demonstration program. I think that that should be ample to do the job, having in mind that up to the present time the entire State of New York including the city of New York has applied for and obtained a maximum total of less than $5 million of the grant money that has already been authorized and appropriated under the existing law.

I asked our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. FINO], during the general debate, what he thought was the amount required to finance merely the interest on a bond issue which he suggested for New York City transit. He answered me that it was $40 million. He has corrected his remarks, as, of course, he has a right to do, and the record now reads $400,000. He has again corrected the figure to read $16 million, which is 4 percent of $400 million.

Even that figure is incorrect. He should have said $10 million a year. In his individual statement accompanying the report on this bill, he suggests a bond issue of $250 million—that is a quarter of a billion dollars—with 4 percent interest that would require $10 million a year in interest. He suggests instead of the present provision in the law that the Federal Government subsidize the payment of that annual interest, or $10 million a year in interest in lieu of a 12½-percent limitation as called for. The interest subsidy would be less than half of the $21 million that we are entitled to get under the 12½-percent provision now in the law.

What bothers me is this—not that I do not want New York to get its full share, and even a little bit more, if we could get it under this bill—but if we adopt the amendment that is offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] what will happen is that there will be a race between all the big cities—San Francisco, Los Angeles, Atlanta, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston and New York—and whoever gets there first will get the maximum amount, in accordance with the discretion of the Administrator, and possibly use up the whole fund.

New York then may not even get the $5 million that they have already gotten under existing law.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very bad amendment. While I would go along with an amendment which would increase the 12½ percent to 15 percent or possibly even 20 percent, I do not think that we should open the door wide, remove the limitation entirely, and create a race betwen the big cities as to which one will get there first and who can prove greater need in accordance with density of population.

The city of New York is the most densely populated city in the country.

It should come first by that standard. I am sufficiently cognizant of the facts of life to say that if that is what you would do with this bill, you will never pass the bill, because this House is not prepared to give the city of New York all the money that is provided for under this bill.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. FINO. The gentleman has made reference to a compact between New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, and that if such a compact were possible, they would absorb 37½ percent of all the funds. Does the gentleman realize that 80 percent of the problem exists in New York, that is, the transit problem?

Mr. MULTER. Whether 80 or 100 percent of the transit problem is in New York, the other big cities that I have mentioned have just as big a problem. If you are going to try to limit this bill to the city of New York, we might as well forget about it. We will not get the support of this House unless every city in the country receives some help under the bill.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. FINO. It is not my intention at this time or at any time to take all the funds that are made available under this program and throw them into New York City. What I am asking under the amendment is that we remove the limitation or ceiling of 12½ percent and give the Secretary of HUD discretion to give a little more to the city of New York if he finds that the need exists.

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

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? Hearing none, the gentleman is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MULTER. The trouble with what the gentleman from New York has said is that he ignores the second part of this amendment, which states:

> (b) In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary shall give priority to the urgency of the need existing in the nation's largest cities with high population density.

Under that language, no other city in the Nation could come ahead of the city of New York.

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

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

Mr. FINO. I assure the gentleman from New York that the amendment would apply to Chicago, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia, as well as New York.

Mr. MULTER. This gentleman in the well is unwilling to take that risk and create a race between the big cities of the country as to which shall come first, and which will persuade the Secretary to use his discretion in favor of that city as against any other.

Let us keep the criteria we have in the law now, except possibly to increase the percentage limitation.

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

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. In other words, the gentleman is telling this body that he does not have faith and confidence in the Secretary of HUD?

Mr. MULTER. I have the utmost faith and confidence in the Secretary, but I do not want pressures exerted on him by each of the big cities, so he will then have to make a decision as to which city will come first. Let us treat them equally.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I wish to take issue with the statement of my friend from New York that this is a bill for big cities. It is not a bill for big cities. It is a bill which can help big cities. It also can be of inestimable value to many of the medium-size and small cities.

This bill is not directed only toward alleviating, in some measure, the massive traffic pains of the great metropolises of the country. It is also directed to providing stimulus and assistance for communities who foresee that unless they make adequate plans at this point in their development, they, too, will suffer from massive traffic pains. It is a bill for small cities. Many cities in this country have absolutely no mass transportation facilities. The bill, as we passed it in 1964 and hopefully to be amended today, can be of assistance to those communities. It is a bill that can help a city such as Atlanta, which finds itself between the 1 and 2 million point in population. That seems to be the point, Mr. Chairman, where either the traffic problems are solved, or else they become so massive as to be almost incapable of solution.

So I rise in opposition to this amendment, and particularly point out to my colleagues that this is not a bill just for the big cities. It is a bill that can be of lasting value to all of our communities.

If this amendment is passed, however, I fear it might indeed be, as the gentleman from New York indicates, a bill for big cities. I do not believe the members of the committee wish that. Certainly I do not wish it. Nor do I believe a bill that can assist only the residents of New York or some other great metropolitan center of population will command the support of all of us. It was stated that 80 percent of the problem is in New York City. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that 80 percent of the transportation problems of Atlanta are not in New York City. They are right there. All of the cities need this help, and I urge defeat of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. FINO. I want to assure the gentleman from Georgia that I am in complete agreement with him. This is a bill for all cities that have a transit problem. The point of my amendment is to place emphasis on the situation that exists in some of the larger cities, so that the Secretary of HUD can focus on some of these problems, without taking away from the problems that may exist in Georgia.

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

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this gentleman from New York subscribes to all that the gentleman from Georgia has said. I hope nothing I said will be taken to indicate that this is a big city bill. I simply tried to point up that if the amendment prevails, it can become a big city bill. That is the last thing we want to have happen.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask of the committee what the budgetary situation is on this bill. I notice the committee report has no reference to what the President has budgeted. Under title I, we ask for $175 million. What is the President's request in this area?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to respond to the question of the gentleman. In the budget for this bill was $150 million, starting in fiscal year 1968.

Mr. CURTIS. That includes some carryover balances, does it not?

Mr. REUSS. That does include carryover balances. The bill itself is in excess of that, and raises the budgetary request to an authorized figure of $175 million a year. That was a recommendation of our distinguished colleague and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], generally agreed to on both sides.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that.

This House has taken a report from the Committee on Banking and Currency. I must say that so far as the Committee on Banking and Currency is concerned, I commend the committee for coming forward with a project it believes is desirable and with the funds it believes are needed to make the program go forward.

The House itself, under the leadership of the Democrat majority, and hopefully the minority leadership, has to be concerned about the overall budget, and that of the President gives us some guidelines.

Again I want to recount that the President of the United States called the leaders of the Congress on both sides of the aisle in both bodies before him and pointed out that the Nation is in a serious fiscal situation. The President criticized the Congress and the leadership for going beyond his budget figures.

I said earlier this year I thought we could afford both guns and butter, but pointed out I did not believe we could afford rancid butter, meaning programs which were not properly conceived.

In light of developments, and certainly in light of the presentation of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee when presenting the defense appropriation bill to this House, it is quite clear we are going to have to come in with another $8 or $10 billion supplemental for the Vietnam war on top of the vast $58 billion military appropriation bill. I observed then we had reached the point we had to distinguish between good pro-

grams, and establish some kind of priorities.

If the President of the United States did not in his judgment request the committee or this House to go beyond his budget, desirable as this program might be, and from my standpoint, since I come from St. Louis, a metropolitan area, where there are these kinds of needs, I might be arguing that this should be given priority among many of the other programs we have or will have to consider—we must recognize that all of us will have to start tightening our belts. I plead with the Members of the House to start paying attention to these things.

The committee certainly should have given the information to the House that this was beyond the budget request of the President.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to finish. I had a difficult enough time getting the floor, since I am not a member of the committee, to make these points. Obviously, the members of the committee are not going to make these points. These have to do with related programs, relating this program to the programs coming from the 19 other committees.

I believe we have to start reporting from the committees concerned the information the House needs as to how a request fits in with the President's budget. Thus, when it comes time to vote, hopefully the leadership on the Democratic side will offer amendments to conform to the President's budget unless it is pointed out why overriding reasons—there may be some here; I do not know—indicate we should break the President's request and go beyond his budget.

I believe Congress should not merely abide by the President's statement, but we should pay attention to his requests and consider them, and override them only in the event reasons are presented.

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

(On request of Mr. MULTER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CURTIS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman, and I yield to him.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I should like to call attention to certain facts.

For fiscal years 1965, 1966, and 1967 a total of $375 million already has been authorized under existing legislation, the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1964.

Mr. CURTIS. Could the gentleman tell me from where he is reading in the report?

Mr. MULTER. This is not in the report. These are the figures available to all Members.

Mr. CURTIS. Available from where? What is the source of it?

Mr. MULTER. The Bureau of the Budget will make them available to you and the Housing Department will make them available to you.

Mr. CURTIS. No. I am asking you what you are reading from.

Mr. MULTER. This is a memorandum prepared for my use here in the event that this question was raised. These figures are accurate.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not questioning the gentleman's figures at all, but I am trying to find out the source of it so I can evaluate it.

Mr. MULTER. The Department of Housing and Urban Development will supply them to you. They supplied them to me. And also they are available from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, the gentleman is saying HUD supplied the figures?

Mr. MULTER. However, quite apart from where these figures on this paper came from, we can get them directly from the act that we passed, that is, the authorization act and figures of the amounts of the appropriations also come from the appropriation acts. They are all available in the Department of HUD and in the Bureau of the Budget.

With regard to the appropriations for the fiscal years 1965, 1966, and 1967, we appropriated a total of $320 million. So we have not appropriated all of the $375 million that has been authorized. If we enact this bill, we will authorize the continued appropriation of that unappropriated difference of $55 million. The Appropriations Committee we hope will bring in such a bill for that $55 million plus $95 million, making the total of $150 million for fiscal year 1967. So we are well within the budgetary figures for fiscal year 1967 and the appropriation for 1968 will not come to us until 1968.

Mr. CURTIS. But the authorization is beyond the President's budget.

Mr. MULTER. For 1967 it is not, but for 1968, of course it is.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. And what I am speaking to among other things is the fact that that kind of data should be in the committee report. All committees should bring this kind of data in if we are going to pay attention to this very serious fiscal situation that faces this country.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased the gentleman called this matter to the attention of the House, because once again, and it is repetitious and I apologize for saying it again and again, but so many times the President of the United States has pointed his finger at the Members of Congress for increasing his budget requests. If you want to assume the responsibility of being blamed by the President, that is your business, but I feel strongly we should not go above his budget. It is the President's responsibility and not ours. I assure you the President has a list of every instance where the Congress has gone above his budget request. He is saying that overspending this is the fault of the Congress. We must not be placed in that position so let us not go above his budget.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman, and I point out that that is what I am trying to say here, but I am also saying that the President's recommendations are mere recommendations. I do think we should pay attention to them, and if we do go beyond them—and maybe there are instances where we should—then we should come prepared in the committee studying it to point out why they think that the President's judgment is not good or maybe the judgment has changed due to the time element involved since it is 2 months or 6 months since the budget was presented. I am not trying to judge this, but the fact of the matter is that we should have this information so that we will continue our debates in the future on these bills in some context with the serious fiscal situation facing this country. Gentlemen, this is no joke. The figures show it. Inflationary forces are at play, and we are all seeing the effects of them. It is undermining the basic strength of our economy as well as our national defense. So it does behoove us to conduct a debate on this bill and other bills in this kind of a context. Yet here I am, not a member of the committee, but the only one to discuss it.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. WIDNALL. I very much appreciate the remarks that have been made by the gentleman from Missouri, but I differ with him in my approach to this matter in this respect. I feel mass transit is a matter of national priority today. There are many of us, including my colleague, who have been urging that the President and the administration set up priorities for spending here in this country.

I just voted, within a matter of days—and I believe the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] did also—against $450 million for beautification which we felt had no place in the spending program at the present time in view of the very urgent needs in education, in housing, and for Vietnam. The mass transit program should also have priority.

Mr. Chairman, we have an existing program. I think it has been proved to be successful. It is increasingly expensive to carry out the various matters involved in this program because of the increased costs in material and labor.

Mr. Chairman, the modest $25 million increase over the administration request

only reflects increases in the cost of continuing this program.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey, because this brings the matter into context. As pointed up by the gentleman from New Jersey, for whom I have great respect as I have for members of the committee on the other side of the aisle—I am pleading that we start discussing matters in terms of priority. He speaks in terms of priority. I cannot pass judgment myself. I do not know. I listen to the committee. I listen to other committees with their priorities. But here I am trying to conduct some sort of debate with reference to priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, felt very strongly that this beautification money, which was not requested by the President at all, should have gone out of the authorization bill last week. But we did not have enough support. We almost did.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleading with the House, though, to start applying priorities, and for the committees which consider these bills to be prepared to defend them on the floor of the House when they go beyond the President's budget.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think that we should stop and think about the effect, not only in this program, but in other Federal aid programs, of the arbitrary ceilings which have been imposed.

Here, Mr. Chairman, we have a 12.5-percent ceiling imposed upon the amount of funds available for any one State for mass transit.

Mr. Chairman, there is a 12.5-percent ceiling on funds available for urban renewal. There is a 15-percent ceiling on funds available for public housing. There is a 12.5-percent ceiling on funds available for air pollution abatement under the Clean Air Act.

In every instance the effect is to restrict the amount of money available for our metropolitan regions. These restrictions do not apply only to the city of New York. They apply to other urban centers as well.

Mr. Chairman, mass transit funds are needed in all large urban areas whether it be Atlanta, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, New York City, or Boston, the picture is the same.

This limitation is arbitrary, capricious, and manifestly unfair to our large urban centers which are most in need of expanded Federal aid. Certainly there should be a fair distribution of Federal funds throughout the country, but such a distribution is not best brought about by the present arbitrary limitations.

No urban area faces a greater hardship than New York City. Although H.R. 14810 provides an increased authorization for the Federal mass transportation program, it will not begin to meet New York City's needs. Under present law, New York State—and that is the full State, of which New York City comprises but a part—is entitled to only 12½ percent of $150 million annually, or $18.75 million. If the present bill is passed, it will be able to get 12½ percent of $175 million annually or $21.875 million. This assumes that the full authorization is appropriated, and it was not during the past 3 years. It was $55 million short.

The difference is just over $3 million; if you assume that the city will receive one-half of that money—and that is certainly not assured—New York City will receive enough added funds for three subway trains.

Similarly, even if New York City managed to obtain the entire State share of next year's authorization, it would receive less than $22 million. The New York City subway operating deficit last year was almost four times this figure. How can our large urban areas solve their problems with this level of aid? It is like asking Babe Ruth to hit a home run with a toothpick.

Already many areas have felt the pinch of the 12½-percent provision. Under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, each State was allowed up to $46.8 million—12½ percent of $375 million. Yet Pennsylvania, which has already been granted $19.8 million, has asked for $38.3 million more. That is just what they have applied for, Mr. Chairman, not all of what they need.

Another case is California's, which has received $26.4 million in grants and applied for $20.1 million more. This would not come close to solving the problems of San Francisco, let alone those of the whole State. Massachusetts, which has received $21.2 million already and has $27.3 million in applications pending, is being held back in similar fashion.

New York's case is the most severe. Its population surpasses the population of six cities—Boston, Washington, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Cleveland, and Baltimore. The six cities each have access to the 12½ reserved for their State, yet New York is limited to the 12½ percent allocation for one State. This is unfair and must be changed.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe we should tie the hands of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. What the amendment would do, if adopted, would be to free the Secretary to assign priorities, and to see to it that funds are available to all of our large metropolitan centers.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the amendment should be supported, and that we should eliminate this arbitrary restriction.

I have introduced legislation in the past to remove these restrictions (H.R. 12823, H.R. 3968, H.R. 12915, H.R. 10124), and I have testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency in favor of eliminating these restrictions in Federal aid programs.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the adoption of this amendment would be in the interest of our major urban centers regardless of what part of the country they are located.

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

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

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that the Secretary does not want this discretion. He supports this limitation. Whether the limitation is correct as to the percentage, is not the question pending before us. The Secretary does not want the pressures that would be placed on him by the big cities if this limitation is removed.

Mr. RYAN. We are legislating, and the Secretary is not legislating. We should remove the arbitrary limitation, permitting the Secretary to make a fair allocation. I think the Secretary will be fair and equitable in the distribution of the funds. It would be in the interest of all major urban centers, in whatever part of the country they are located, to adopt this amendment, and I join in supporting the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise briefly to address myself to some comments of the gentleman from Missouri. Earlier in the day we heard about the need, and I certainly recognize the need, to maintain independence between the three branches of the Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. We hear almost daily that we in the legislature are abdicating our responsibilities to the Executive. Yet here comes the gentleman from Missouri and he says that if the President through the Bureau of the Budget does not recommend an authorization or an appropriation, we should not consider it.

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

Mr. JOELSON. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is misquoting me. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I said just the opposite. I said that we should not be bound, we certainly should pay attention and we should be ready to advance the reasons if we decide to go beyond the President's recommendations. I was saying almost what the gentleman started out to say.

Mr. JOELSON. If that is the case, I certainly agree because I feel that in this body, although we must pay due respect to the administration's executive recommendations, we still have the authority for authorizations and appropriations. Although we have to give courteous respect to the suggestions, we have to work our own will.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, when we consider priorities, I think high on the list is the need for this mass transit program. Therefore, I wish to express my support for the program.

Mr. Chairman, if I misunderstood the purport or the thrust of the argument of the gentleman from Missouri, I certainly wish to correct it.

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

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman now has the matter in correct context. We are now in agreement.

Mr. JOELSON. I am glad we are in agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FINO), there were—ayes 8, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALPERN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALPERN: At the end of section 12 of the Mass Transportation Act of 1964, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That the Secretary, shall first reallocate sums not used in any fiscal year within the limitation herein prescribed and may without regard to such limitation, enter into contracts for grants under Section 3 aggregating not to exceed $12,500,000 (subject to the total authorization provided in Section 4(b)) with local public bodies and agencies in States where more than two-thirds of the maximum grants permitted in the respective State under this section has been obligated."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment overcomes some of the objections raised to the one offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] and yet will provide the flexibility I think all of us would want. This is not a big city amendment or a little city amendment. It could very well help any locality in this country that qualifies under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was accepted yesterday by the Senate and incorporated into the Senate version of the legislation before us. The amendment gives the Secretary more flexibility in allocating funds where they are needed most.

This amendment retains the existing 12½-percent State limit, but allows the Secretary to use his discretion with a $12.5 million pool within the $175 million total authorization. These would be unused funds up to $12.5 million. This pool may be allotted in varying amounts to projects in those States which have already used up two-thirds or more of the $22 million limit per State.

The reasoning behind this amendment is logical. The provision will take away some of the frustration which the existing State limitation imposes. For example, if the Secretary is asked to approve a worthwhile project within a highly urbanized State which has almost used up its modest allotment, under existing limitations, he may be forced to reject the project, since it may push the States total amount over limitation by a small amount.

However, my amendment will correct this situation. It will give the Secretary the authority to exceed the 12½-percent limitation by a small but vital amount in cases of States which have nearly used up their allotment, but which have projects which the Secretary feels are so urgent that the 12½-percent ceiling will frustrate an important project.

The less urbanized States will conceivably not use amounts near the 12.5 percent limit, so that there may be this existing pool of $12.5 million which might otherwise be left unused and unclaimed.

The discretionary authority I am asking for the Secretary is already embodied in urban renewal legislation for the very same reason—that we may be arbitrarily cutting off urgent projects by a self-imposed limitation.

I trust the House will see the wisdom in this amendment designed to permit flexibility and to inject rationality into the allocation of these vitally needed funds.

It is difficult to understand how anyone can oppose this amendment. I might say I have spoken to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and he, Secretary Weaver, assured me he had no objection whatsoever to the amendment. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, he said, and I quote:

It's a good amendment. It would confront absolutely no difficulty and in my personal opinion it would improve the bill.

He added:

I'm all for it and I don't see how anyone can object to it.

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

Mr. HALPERN. I am happy to yield to my colleague from New York, who is a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. MULTER. I am impressed with the gentleman's argument. Am I not correct in saying that the amendment was neither submitted to nor considered by the committee, either the subcommittee or the full committee, on the House side or on the Senate side?

Mr. HALPERN. That is correct, but I am sure you will agree with me that there is always room for improving legislation, and I believe that the amendment would do just that. That is our obligation on this floor. That is why we have deliberation and consideration.

Mr. MULTER. I am just wondering whether or not the amendment may go further than the gentleman anticipates. A few moments ago I did read the gentleman's amendment very hastily. Frankly, I have not given it enough consideration. I will say that the gentleman's argument has impressed me, but I do not know that we should be pressed to take it at this time. It will be in conference. The Senate has adopted that very language you are offering; is that correct?

Mr. HALPERN. That is correct.

Mr. MULTER. So it will be in conference, and we will have an opportunity to consider the precise language carefully.

Mr. HALPERN. But as a deliberative body we have the duty to act on legislation. This is the place where legislation should be acted on and we should not have to rely on a conference.

Mr. MULTER. If the gentleman will yield further, when the conference brings its report to the House, the House deliberates upon it and considers it. I am just suggesting that we take a little more time to consider the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HALPERN. Admittedly it is a good amendment. The Secretary believes it is. The Senate approved it overwhelmingly. The gentleman who has risen concedes that my arguments are good and convincing. I cannot see how anyone can object to it.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be given 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has suggested that the Secretary had approved the amendment. Does the gentleman have a statement from the Secretary?

Mr. HALPERN. Not in writing. But earlier today, at your suggestion, I spoke to him. If you recall when I showed you the amendment you asked how the Secretary felt about it and, wisely, you advised that I solicit his views. I phoned the Secretary and I discussed the amendment. I took down his comments exactly as I quoted him in my remarks.

Mr. PATMAN. There is always a risk of the other party not understanding it exactly over the phone.

Mr. HALPERN. But I am certain he had an opportunity, because the Senate already had acted on it. I am sure he knows exactly what the amendment does, Mr. Chairman.

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

This amendment was not presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It was not considered by our committee at all. We did not know anything about it until the last hour.

It is true that the amendment was presented on the floor of the Senate. It was written on the floor of the Senate yesterday. It just comes in from scratch. It was changed on the floor of the other body two or three times. It is printed in the RECORD on page 19431, of August 15, 1966. There it can be seen that the amendment was offered and changed at the suggestion of the Senators.

Real consideration has not been given in either the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House or in the Senate. There is only about one column in the RECORD of consideration by the Senate.

The Members of this House know that in the other body, oftentimes when a Senator insists upon a certain amendment, they know that when it goes to conference it will be given consideration. If they get it, all right, but they say, "Let me get my amendment in." Oftentimes that is done. We all realize that.

In this case probably there was no injustice done by putting it in, in the other body, but if we were to adopt it now, the legislative situation would be

that we are locked in as conferees, if we have made a mistake and a terrible mistake—and it is possible we would. We have to be in a position to take into consideration all the factors that should be considered in connection with a far-reaching amendment like this.

We do not know what the consequences of it will be. But between now and the time that we will be in conference to write the actual language, we may know more. If we adopt this now, we are locked in. We cannot change it at all. We cannot change the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t". This is a dangerous way to legislate.

Turn this amendment down. It will still be in conference. Then, if it is right, the conferees will be reasonable and after that, of course, what they do will have to be submitted back to the House and the other body. If it is not right, each Member has his recourse and can take action for consideration. But it seems to me it would be very unreasonable to insist that the House just lock itself in on an amendment that is so far reaching, which was only considered less than 24 hours ago for the first time in the other body, which was presented and written there on the desk of a Senator, which was never considered by a committee in either the House or the Senate, and which was changed several times to meet the objections of different Senators. No information has been presented in the RECORD to indicate exactly what the meaningful effect of this amendment will be.

Therefore, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his amendment and ask consideration in the conference. It is bound to go to conference, and he could possibly be one of the conferees. In that way he will get complete justice of getting careful consideration. I hope that is done.

If he does not withdraw it, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALPERN), there were—ayes, 6; noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARSHA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARSHA: On page 2, line 1, after the semicolon, strike out "and $175,-" and all of line 2, and insert in lieu thereof "$150 million for fiscal year 1968".

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I do not need to go into all of the reasons for this particular amendment. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri outlined the various needs ably, I believe.

All this amendment will do is meet the request of the President of the United States. As I understand it, he requested in his budget the sum of $150 million for fiscal year 1968.

With the exploding cost of living and the continual rise in the price of food and daily necessities, and with the Vietnam commitment costing us many billions of dollars—as I understand it, the latest report in this is in the neighborhood of some $2 billion a month—certainly we should consider the President's request and keep this expenditure within his suggestion. I have not known him to be miserly in his requests before.

I certainly believe $150 million will be sufficient, considering the provision in the bill regarding carryovers. I understand some are available, and carryovers can be appropriated in any subsequent year. This should be sufficient to meet the problem. Certainly within the next year and a half we can look at the picture again and take into consideration the overall national interest and the situation at that time. I am not arguing the merits or lack of them of this program but the overall national interests dictate that we remain within the budget requests wherever possible. The President has continually chided Congress to stay within his budget requests. And upon end authorization for $175 million yearly from now on—indefinitely—can only add fuel to the fires of inflation.

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

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding so that I can give a recapitulation of what the act of 1964 did by way of authorization.

The act provided that in fiscal year 1965 there should be an authorization of $75 million, in fiscal year 1966 of $150 million, and in fiscal year 1967 of $150 million.

For the fiscal years 1965, 1966, and 1967 there were the following actual appropriations: $60 million in 1965, $130 million in 1966, and $130 million in 1967.

In the light of past appropriations and in view of the President's request only for $150 million each year in new authorization, it seems to me it would be wise for the House on this occasion to stay within the President's budget request.

As the gentleman from Illinois pointed out a few minutes ago, the President has had the leadership from both the other body and the House, both Democratic and Republican, down for a conference on two occasions to discuss the problems of inflation and the increases in the cost of living. On each occasion the President has stated very categorically that the House and the Senate had persistently and consistently increased his budget requests.

The President does point out that so far this year the Congress has increased his budget in authorizations by $6 billion.

It seems to me we should not compound that problem—an inflation of serious proportions—by now approving an authorization provision which goes $25 million beyond the President's request for fiscal year 1968.

For that reason I hope the gentleman's amendment will be approved.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, any amount appropriated remains available until expended. In addition to that, any amount authorized but not appropriated for any fiscal year may be appropriated for any succeeding fiscal year. Now, according to the figures that the gentleman from Michigan just referred to, there is a balance of unappropriated but authorized funds of $55 million. Adding this together with the $150 million authorization for fiscal year 1968, it leaves a total of $205 million available. The bill as it presently reads grants an open-end authority with $175 million from now on. I think that this is going a little too far and is showing complete disregard for the request of the President and the interests of those citizens required to live on fixed incomes.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STANTON. I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with the fact that yesterday in the urban mass transit bill in the other body the authorization was reduced to $150 million in accordance with the President's request.

Mr. HARSHA. As I understand it, the other body did reduce the authorization to $150 million for fiscal year 1968.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have long felt that one of the areas in which we have been guilty of shocking neglect has been the support of mass transit programs. In times of national emergency we must have alternate means of transportation. We must continue to develop the most feasible type of rail transportation that can be offered to the American public, being sure that there is adequate maintenance, and facilities are being preserved and maintained and erected throughout the country. I have personally felt—and I think many other Members of the House will agree with me—that this bill should have a priority over many other programs. In order to be meaningful it should be a continuing program. We have been operating on a hand-to-mouth basis for years, and for 10 years we have watched the deterioration of transportation throughout the country. Of course, this is not entirely a rail bill or a rapid transit bill, but it covers all forms of transportation on the ground. It seems urgent to me that the Congress should face up to its responsibilities in this area.

The minority leader has mentioned visits to the White House. The minority leader did not mention that the President himself sent up a request for $600 million more than the original request in connection with the demonstration cities program. That is upping his original request for the year by $600 million. I think we have to be selective in the use of money. I certainly feel that this area is one which demands attention, immediate attention, and continuing attention. I very much regret to see us go backward by going to a 1-year basis and also reducing the request that is in this bill for $175 million.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one word in support of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. Mr. WIDNALL has worked on this

Mass Transit Act as much as any Member of Congress. He has done some fine work in connection with it in persuading Members of Congress to believe that we should enact a bill of this type and a substantial bill, one that will look to the future.

This amendment, which has been offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA], would considerably weaken, if not destroy, this urban transportation program.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Not at this moment. You cannot do too much in 1 year with reference to mass transit affecting many States and cities and towns located in all of these States.

You must have a longer life program in order for it to be effective.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with every word that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] said, and I hope that this amendment is defeated.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

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

Mr. HARSHA. The gentleman from Texas says that to reduce this sum to $150 million would not only weaken but would destroy the program.

The gentleman in effect is saying that the President of the United States wanted to destroy it, because that is all the money he requested?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I say possibly destroy it; I said considerably weaken it, and probably destroy this act. It would depend upon the action of the Congress at the end of another year. We do not know what will be the score at that time.

So I sincerely hope that the amendment is defeated.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] which would reduce the authorization of the present bill.

It is difficult to understand how the Congress can ignore the crisis in urban mass transportation by reducing the Federal effort toward solution of these problems. Our cities cannot live with less money for this program; if anything, the program is too small already. Far more funds should be authorized to carry out the objectives of the urban mass transportation program. The authorization proposed by H.R. 14810 is a disappointment. Anything smaller would be a tragedy.

How often must the House be reminded of the inability of the State and local governments to pay for their mass transit needs? How often must the House be reminded of the enormity of those needs?

Five years ago, a report by the Institute of Public Administration estimated that the total capital requirements for mass transportation during the 1960's would be at least $9.8 billion.

All indications are that even this figure is too low. For instance, last February the Regional Plan Association, a nonprofit organization of planners from 22 counties of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut which comprise the New York metropolitan area, issued a report calling for the expenditure of some $2.5 billion in the next decade to bring about immediate improvements in public transportation in that great metropolitan center. This means that if we retain the figure proposed by the committee, it would take 14 years just to meet the problems of the New York metropolitan region. How can we expect a Federal mass transportation program to succeed if we fail to authorize enough money to meet the problems of one metropolitan area?

Yet the sponsor of the amendment would reduce the authorization even further. There can be no justification for this. Last Thursday the House approved a bill authorizing almost $12 billion for the next 2 fiscal years for highway construction.

This is almost 80 times the amount we are spending annually on urban mass transportation. Why is there always enough money for highways, but when it comes to a mass transportation program to help our cities, we run out of cash? If inflation is the problem, is it not just as inflationary to spend money to solve rural problems as it is to solve urban problems?

Mr. Chairman, I have consistently criticized the slow awakening of Congress to urban problems. I have pointed out the need for a new day for our cities. With the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, we glimpsed the dawn of that new day. Are we to plunge back into legislative darkness by reversing the trend of increasing Federal awareness and responsibility?

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARSHA) there were—ayes 38, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WIDNALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIDNALL: On page 4, after line 6, add the following new section:

"SEC. 6. The section of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 redesignated as section 10 by section 5(a)(1) of this Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) It shall be unlawful to abandon any commuter rail service as a result of an order or recommendation of abandonment issued by a court or regulatory body, whether issued in connection with a rail merger or otherwise.'"

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this as an amendment to H.R. 14810 and, at the conclusion of my remarks, I shall ask unanimous consent for its withdrawal.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of the House was shocked by yesterday's Federal court injunction against proceeding with this morning's House Committee on Un-American Activities meeting. Several Members of this House took the floor to express their amazement at yesterday's action. I was particularly impressed by the remarks of the majority whip, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana. He pointed out that on countless occasions in the past the Congress has had before it proposals that would have interfered with either the executive or the judicial branches.

He reminded us that on virtually every occasion, such proposals have been rejected for fear of their ultimate impact on our cherished separation of powers.

The amendment I have just offered is a perfect example of what the majority whip was talking about. If adopted, my amendment would make illegal any court order permitting abandonment of commuter rail services by railroads. The amendment recognizes that abandonment of present commuter services with its consequent loss of invaluable rights-of-way can undo and work at cross purposes with the intent of Congress in providing for better commuter services through the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

There is much to be said for an amendment such as this. In my own district, and in my own State of New Jersey, we may in the months ahead be faced with the prospect of a court order permitting the Erie-Lackawanna Railroad to abandon its commuter services. Obviously, it makes no sense for the Congress to write into law urban mass transit legislation, costing the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars, while at the same time, the judicial branch of our Government permits abandonment of commuter services—commuter services that within a few years may prove to be profitable through technological advances.

Yet, as much merit as my amendment has, and as much as I am in accord with its intent, I recognize that adoption of my amendment would completely disregard the checks and balances implicit in our Government's three separate and equal branches. Adoption of my amendment would completely disregard the degree of comity between the legislative and judicial branch so essential to our form of government.

Adoption of my amendment, while lofty in its goals, could create an unmanageable impasse and in fact judicial chaos.

Mr. Chairman, because Members of the House of Representatives apparently place a higher value on the delicate balance between the branches than do certain members of the judiciary, I feel confident the House will accede to my request when I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MAY

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MAY: On page 4, after line 6, add the following new section:

"SEC. 6. Subsection (c) of the section of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 redesignated as section 11 by section 5 (a) (1) of this Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the second sentence the following: '; but any such provision which requires compulsory membership in a labor organization shall not apply with respect to Federal, State, or local governmental employees'."

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] said that this was legislation that applied to all cities of all sizes in all States.

The amendment that I have offered would make sure that this would apply to all cities of all sizes in all States.

Mr. Chairman, during general debate I pointed out that the present legislation has a very glaring inequity in that it makes it impossible for the people of a city in my district—and this could apply to cities in your district, to come under the provisions of the help offered under this act to save their bus service because of section 10(c).

Mr. Chairman, very quickly to recap what has happened in Yakima, Wash., in my district, a city of 43,000 persons. In May of this year our private bus company notified city officials that they could no longer continue bus service for the city of Yakima because they were losing money.

The city officials rather than deprive the city of its public transportation arranged to take over the buses and other transportation facilities of this private company and operate the system itself at their own expense. But to finance the solution, our city government proposed the institution of a householder tax, and to complete financing applied for a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development cleared this grant in all particulars, but refused to go ahead with it because of section 10(c) which the Members of this House well know is in the act for the purpose of protecting union workers.

Now the city offered the eight bus drivers a job with the city at a raise in wages from $2 an hour to $2.40 an hour. They also offered them additional fringe benefits under the city civil service system. But as city employees, however, under our city law they had to give up their union shop contract although the city officials said they were willing to continue their collective bargaining rights.

As I pointed out earlier, all eight employees were union members, so they had a de facto if not a de jure union shop. However, the city officials in Yakima were advised that before the Department of Housing and Urban Development would OK their grant and make it available, the bus drivers would have to have a closed shop, the right to strike, and compulsory arbitration—this in spite of the fact that the bus drivers' individual positions would not have been worsened under the new job setup but bettered.

But, as I pointed out before, all these proposed revisions in the new labor contract are directly contrary to Washington State law as well as to the charter under which the city of Yakima must operate. Therefore, obviously, our city attorney and city manager could not agree to the proposals offered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, because they would become personally liable for lawsuits charging that they had violated State laws.

Meanwhile, our bus service has been completely stopped. Forty-three thousand people are without public transportation. The bus drivers, whom the unions are supposed to protect, are without jobs.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment which would make it possible for cities like this in my State, as well as throughout the Nation, to be able to become eligible for Federal grants when they are OK'd by the Department of Housing and Urban Development without having to break the existing laws of their State. I urge your support and adoption of this amendment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the gentlewoman be good enough to explain to me a point. As I view the amendment, you are really trying to extend the section 14(b) principle into this act. I do not know how you could possibly hope to develop a transportation program if you are going to have a myriad of standards of labor relations along the way.

Mrs. MAY. My amendment would apply only when their conditions would not be worsened but bettered, and they could not require the breaking of existing State laws before these people could get a job. I do not see how this Yakima situation has helped union members. These bus drivers were members of the union. In fact, the members of the unions involved were not all in agreement on compulsory union membership. But here they had not only their own right to membership but also better wages and fringe benefits from the city. Yet the Department of Housing and Urban Development said that they had to have all these provisions in the contract, which would be against State law.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Washington whether or not, as she said during general debate, the amendment is intended to be retroactive and, by its language, would be retroactive.

Mrs. MAY. Actually the language or term "retroactive" in general debate was perhaps misleading. I merely wanted to make sure that the amendment would cover a situation such as exists in Yakima, Wash., where a Federal grant has been applied for but has not been granted.

Mr. MULTER. Do I correctly understand that it would be made retroactive only to the effective date of the act of 1964?

Mrs. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The clear purport of the amendment, as I understand it from the gentlewoman's discussion in the general debate and now, is that it would be retroactive to 1964. It would create an incredible hodgepodge. The ultimate effect of this amendment, I might say to my distinguished friend from New York, is pure and simple. Its purpose is to destroy the labor section of the act and make labor-management relations impossible in these situations. The amendment should be very strongly opposed.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. May I ask a question of the gentleman from New Jersey, who just spoke? Would the gentleman have any suggestions, therefore, on how this act might be amended, so that where union members actually better their position they can be allowed to better their position, instead of being refused the right to have better paid jobs and better fringe benefits and have a job? These eight busdrivers, who are union members, no longer have their jobs. I do not call that proper protection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there are only eight members. My suggestion is that the gentlewoman withdraw her amendment, and everyone will be in better shape.

Mrs. MAY. I believe the eight involved are very important, if I might answer the gentleman. The eight families are suffering just as much as any others. It is not the number of members. I think it is the unfairness of it, that eight union members lose their jobs and a chance for better advantages.

Legally, there is no way to help them, the way this act is written.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the answer to the gentlewoman's problem is to amend her State law.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MULTER. When we considered this bill originally and enacted the law in 1964, and each time we have amended it, we have taken into consideration two things.

First, to protect private enterprise. We did not permit this act to be used by any city or county or State government to take over private enterprise. We protected that.

Second, on the other hand, we tried to protect labor and provided for that, so that they cannot through the back door break a union contract.

This amendment, as I see it, could be used to break union contracts. I do not accuse the gentlewoman of any ill motive or say that this is her idea. I am sure it is not. But this provision as written could very easily be used as an anti-union provision. It could easily be used

to break existing union contracts with private facilities.

Under this law we want the private companies to continue to operate mass transportation. We want to help them do it. As a matter of fact, there are grants for municipalities, to enable them to acquire facilities which, in turn, they will lease to private enterprise. We have also in mind that unions which have contracts with private entrepreneurs will be protected.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I believe the gentleman has made a strong point. I believe it is important to point out that if the gentlewoman's amendment were to prevail, there would be tremendous pressure for these private companies to become publicly owned facilities. The unions do not want publicly owned companies wherever it can be avoided. I believe her amendment would force these privately owned companies into public ownership.

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

After listening to the arguments against the amendment of the gentlewoman from Washington, I would say that they are about as shallow as any I have heard on this floor.

This amendment certainly is not going to force State ownership or interfere in any manner with private enterprise. It merely protects those political subdivisions that are faced with the problem—and everybody knows it. I just feel the amendment is sound and proper. It is not going to bring about any of the results which those who have opposed the bill have mentioned.

I do not agree with the statement of the gentleman from New Jersey, who said that simply because there are only eight men involved, we should ignore their plight. A more ridiculous argument is that the State should change its law because it conflicts with Federal law, which again is about as shallow an argument as I have ever heard.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. There are more than eight bus drivers involved, Mr. Chairman. There are thousands of people, who are elderly, or invalids, or children who have had no public transportation for several months.

We have no recourse under the law. This is going to be taken from a householder's tax. The referendum is on our people. It refers only to Government employees, where the law is such that they cannot have these things in their contract that the Department of Housing and Urban Development is demanding they have in their contract.

We have no other recourse. The last thing in my mind, I can tell my colleague from Illinois, as he has said, is that I would do anything to break the present protection of our union members under this contract. I am trying to find out how I can protect the union members who lost their jobs as a result of the provisions of this act.

Mr. COLLIER. I should like to make a further observation.

There is also a small matter of the public interest involved here.

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

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I believe what the lady is trying to accomplish can be accomplished as it is now being accomplished, by privately owned companies continuing to operate the transit systems and continuing their present agreements with the labor organizations, with the municipal government merely acting as a conduit for channeling funds of assistance into the private system.

If the lady will examine her amendment carefully she will see what is involved. I fear that the most desirable thing, leaving these companies in private ownership, would be affected. This would force municipal ownership of these companies against their will.

I know the lady is sincere in offering her amendment. If she will study it she will find if we will leave the situation as it is now, these private companies are working out their problems.

Mr. COLLIER. I believe the gentleman is oversimplifying, and he knows it. He knows that the private companies, from an economic standpoint, simply cannot operate under the conditions the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] has described. Why deal in conjecture or platitudes when the facts are they cannot continue business on that basis?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have had a full discussion of this amendment. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. MAY) there were—ayes 38, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 4, after line 6, add the following new section:

"SEC. 6. The section of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 redesignated as Section 11 by Section 5(a)(1) of this Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) It shall be unlawful for any person to damage or destroy, or attempt to damage or destroy, through a willful act committed as a part of or in connection with a riot or other civil disturbance, any vehicle which was acquired, constructed, or reconstructed with Federal financial assistance provided pursuant to Section 3 or Section 6 of this Act. Whoever violates this subsection shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than two years or both.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will not belabor this amendment with an unnecessarily long explanation——

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I just reserved a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure that your point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the point of order comes too late. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman from Texas, being the student of the rules he professes to be, knows when debate has started on an amendment it is too late to try to make a point of order.

Mr. PATMAN. It is an opinion as to who is on his feet and when.

Mr. GROSS. The Chair has ruled.

Mr. Chairman, I will take only a minute or two to explain this amendment, because it is perfectly obvious what the intent of the amendment is. It is to say to the rioters and demonstrators that they will be subject to penalty if they use fire bombs, rocks, bottles, and other weapons to damage vehicles provided by all the Federal taxpayers' money under the terms of this act. It is just that simple. I hope I may have the support of the Members of the House in behalf of an amendment which I think is in the interests of all the people.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman for offering this amendment. In my opinion, it is needed. It does not make sense for the Federal Government or for any private organization to put money in buses or subways and then have people who seem to be beyond the laws of the States or the cities destroy them by fire bombs, brickbats, and whatnot.

Mr. GROSS. It is an insufferable situation when the taxpayers of Iowa and all other States are called upon to provide the money for vehicles used for public transportation and then see those vehicles destroyed or damaged by rioters, demonstrators, and hoodlums.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, because the amendment which is proposed by the gentleman from Iowa, and which is seconded by the gentleman from Alabama, would destroy States rights in this country as we know them.

Let us see what the amendment does. Let us just take as an example the fine city of Waterloo, Iowa, which is in the State which the gentleman from Iowa has the honor to represent. The city of Waterloo has just, as of June 30, been the beneficiary of a grant under the Urban Mass Transit Act of 30 new buses to replace old equipment. They will get 30 new buses under this federally financed law. The utility there will have an additional 30 buses which they will procure outside of the Federal law.

Let us suppose two desperadoes from the East, with their hearts full of battery, come out to Waterloo and desperado No. 1 throws a rock and breaks a window in

a federally financed bus. Then desperado No. 2 takes a rock and breaks a window in a privately financed bus. The duly constituted law-enforcement officers of the great State of Iowa then find that as to the man who threw his rock against the locally financed bus, the orderly processes of the Iowa criminal law obtain.

But as to the man who came in and threw the rock at the federally financed bus, the Federal Government will have preempted that phase of the criminal law, and the great State of Iowa will be powerless to deal with it.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment—which is so destructive of States rights—will be voted down.

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], what I am trying to do is see to it that those buses about which he talks that go to the city of Waterloo, Iowa, are used for the purpose for which intended, and that is the safe transportation of passengers, and that demonstrators and rioters from Wisconsin and from Chicago do not come out and destroy them without at least being punished.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his purpose, but the amendment, if I may say so, is so imperfectly drafted that it would produce just the opposite effect that the gentleman wants to accomplish, and that is why I urge that it be voted down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. WAGGONNER. Yes. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the gentleman from Wisconsin, being the perfectionist that he implies he is, for not asking him to draft the amendment for me. And, if the gentleman is such a perfectionist and is interested in protecting the transportation that he wants to provide through the enactment of this bill, the gentleman himself would have offered an amendment to take care of the situation.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, we here in the House of Representatives have long been concerned about the rules of the House, and we have always required that any amendment offered on or to any proposed legislation be germane.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe anyone has questioned the germaneness of this particular amendment. But there is a matter of concern now that has not been before us too long. I believe we ought to give some consideration to it in this instance. I would just simply like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], who offered the amendment, whether the gentleman has checked the amendment out with Judge Corcoran? After his incredible decision of yesterday with regard to the House Committee on Un-American Activities we can look for anything.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. No; and I doubt very much that I will in view of the unbelievable decision to which the gentleman from Louisiana has referred.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I understand the point which the gentleman is trying to make. For my part Judge Corcoran should be forgotten. He has no place on the bench.

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

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS), there were—ayes 49, noes 75.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: On page 4, after line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 6. (a) The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as amended by this Act) is further amended by inserting after section 13 the following new section:

"'USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION PURPOSES

"'SEC. 14. (a) The Governor of a State may elect to have any funds apportioned to such State after the date of enactment of this Act under section 104 of title 23, United States Code, made available, in a manner prescribed by regulations of the Secretary of Commerce, to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for making grants, for urban mass transportation purposes within such State, under section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

"'(b) For purposes of this section:

"'(1) the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, and

"'(2) the term "Governor" means the chief executive officer of a State.'"

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is not germane.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order and reserve it?

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves his point of order.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not increase the authorization and would not add to the cost of the program incorporated in the present bill. It does make it possible for a State at the option of the Governor to develop a more balanced transportation system.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, while very important and a major step forward does not provide adequate funds to meet our mass transit needs. If appropriated, $175 million will not be sufficient. If it is not appropriated—and under the act of 1964 we know that the Congress did not appropriate the full authorization—I believe that in the last fiscal year $130 million was appropriated despite an $150 million authorization—if the full amount is not appropriated, it will be all the more woefully inadequate.

In addition, there is a 12½-percent limitation which imposes an arbitrary ceiling on the amount which may go to any one State. We debated this point earlier this afternoon. We know that for the State of New York less than $22 million would be available for each year under this program, and that is for the entire State—not simply for the city of New York. This 12½-percent restriction applies throughout the country.

So it is clear that, if our chaotic transportation system is going to be reconstructed, if mass transit is to be adequately financed, we are going to have to reassess our priorities. Mr. Chairman, I suggest we must have an additional source of funds.

Last week we authorized $12 billion for the next 2 fiscal years under the Federal-aid highway program for highway construction. This is part of a $51 billion program. We are spending about 80 times as much per year for highways as will be authorized under this bill for mass transit.

Mr. Chairman, the discrepancy between the amount spent on highway construction and the amount spent on mass transit has resulted in chaotic transportation systems in our cities. We pour automobiles into our cities. Our cities are literally being choked to death by automobiles.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offered provides an opportunity to correct this situation at the option of the Governors. There is no requirement placed upon the Governor. There is no compulsion involved. A Governor may use funds which are available for transportation either for highways or for mass transit to achieve the proper kind of mix.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has set aside billions of dollars for highway purposes. This fund is a logical source of funds to meet the mass transit needs which confront our Nation.

The concept of the mass transit bill before us is sound. It recognizes the Federal responsibility.

This bill, unfortunately, does not provide sufficient money. If the Governors are allowed to use highway funds which are apportioned to them, they can in their own judgment and discretion balance the two—balance the rails and roads. That will achieve a much more effective transportation system in our major urban centers.

Mr. Chairman, if large masses of people are to be moved efficiently in and out of our cities, we must make an investment way beyond the scope of this bill. It is essential to embark upon a massive grant program for mass transit and to develop comprehensive balanced transportation systems in metropolitan areas.

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

Does the gentleman from Maryland insist upon the point of order?

Mr. FALLON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to transfer funds from the highway trust fund to this pending author-

ization bill. I insist on the point of order on the ground that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RYAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, may I simply say that last Thursday, August 11, when we considered the highway bill, I offered a similar amendment. At that time the Chair ruled that it was not germane because it dealt with mass transportation and was foreign to the highway bill then under consideration.

Today we are dealing with mass transportation and, therefore, if it was not germane last week, it certainly is germane today on this bill which is concerned with financing mass transportation. Last week this amendment was viewed as being relevant to mass transportation. In fact, the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], suggested that this point be discussed this week when the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966 would be on the floor.

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

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

Mr. FALLON. On that point you deal with urban transportation. You are not dealing with highway transportation. You are dealing with urban transportation, and I insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment of the gentleman from New York clearly goes to funds covered under title 23. It is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works, and after carefully examining the rules the Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is not germane. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time only—and I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes—to announce that the motion to recommit will be the amendment which was previously offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA]. It will be offered as a motion to recommit by the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT]. The motion to recommit will provide that the authorization will be reduced from $175 million per year to $150 million a year.

The motion to recommit will not have a continuing indefinite authorization. It will be limited to fiscal year 1968.

I reaffirm what I said a moment ago. The President in his budget document, in his recommendation to the Congress, proposed that the authorization be $150 million. The motion to recommit will coincide with the President's recommendation, and those who vote for the motion to recommit will be voting to support the President's budget. Those who vote against the motion to recommit will be voting to inflate the President's budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the pro forma motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. I think the point has already been made—and it should be restated—that despite the fine statement by the distinguished minority leader, the fact is that the instructions do more than address themselves to the budgetary requirements for fiscal 1968. The amendment would go much further. Instead of continuing this program under existing law for 3 years but requiring year-by-year appropriations, it will cut it off and require an authorization each year beginning with fiscal year 1968. That is the real purpose of the motion to recommit with these instructions, and that was the real purpose of the amendment. It was not so much to cut it back to $150 million, because that is all we called for in this bill as presented for fiscal year 1967. But the amendment and the motion to recommit would definitely go much farther and cut the program off at the end of fiscal 1967.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I wish to propound a question to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. Am I correct in my understanding that the motion to recommit, if adopted, would go counter to President Johnson's request for a 3-year authorization for the continuation of the urban mass transportation program?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman is correct in that regard. We are limiting the dollar amount and the dollar proposals submitted in the budget document by President Johnson.

Mr. REUSS. Yes, but in addition to limiting the dollar amounts, you are also cutting two-thirds out of the President's program by making it, in effect, for only 1 year rather than for 3 years. Is that not so?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. That is correct, but if the gentleman will yield, I hasten to point out that this is a year or more hence, and it will give the next Congress ample opportunity to consider the program not only for fiscal 1968 but also for fiscal 1969.

I also would like to add that, as I understand it from existing law and the bill before us, the unused appropriations are committed for subsequent utilization. As I understand it from the 1964 act and the subsequent appropriation bill, there is approximately $55 million still available for subsequent fiscal years.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, does the distinguished gentleman from New York yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, is it possible that this is the bill that was reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee by a vote of 29 to 1?

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This is some procedure.

Mr. MULTER. May I suggest, with all due deference to the distinguished minority leader, that those of us on this side of the aisle can be relied on to sustain the President's program, rather than the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I fail to understand why we cannot have a yearly authorization on this. With other members on the committee I was called to the White House, and we were given a stern lecture against doing what we are trying to do today, that is increasing his authorization request.

Mr. MULTER. Obviously the gentleman is confusing authorizations and appropriations.

Mr. CEDERBERG. No.

Mr. MULTER. This law does not change that. The gentleman wants us to come back each year for an authorization. This kind of program does not lend itself effectively to that procedure. We need an ongoing program authorized for 3 years and examined each year by means of annual appropriations.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I do not want to leave the idea here that the President was talking about appropriations only when we were at the White House. He was also talking about authorizations. He mentioned some in particular—not particularly this one—but education and some other authorizations, and not only appropriations. He expressed a real concern.

I believe we will find out on this motion to recommit whether the Members will stay with the President's budget. He calls it highly inflationary if we go above the amount he requested in the authorization.

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

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

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I will repeat that the gentlemen on this side of the aisle can be counted on, rather than those on the other side of the aisle, to support the President's program.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If the gentlemen are going to support the President, are they going to support the motion to recommit this as supporting the President?

Mr. MULTER. No, if the gentleman will yield further, we will vote against the motion to recommit, because it runs counter to the President's program on this bill by making it a 1 year program.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman explain how it runs counter? I fail to understand.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to explain to the gentleman. It runs counter to the President's program, because the President asked for a 3-year program to permit orderly planning. The motion to recommit, as I understand it, provides only for 1 year.

It is true the President recommended only $150 million, rather than $175 million. The members of the committee were persuaded by the eloquent arguments of the distinguished minority leader on the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] to "bust" the President's budget to that extent in the authorization and Members will vote on it as they see fit.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not believe the committee is so busy that it cannot handle an annual authorization. I recall that we had this question on foreign aid. We went through this. It was changed 2 days later in the Senate, and they went back to annual authorization.

Mr. REUSS. I will tell the gentleman a good reason: When this bill was first adopted, in 1964, it was adopted with a 3-year authorization. That is what we are attempting to adopt today. In a program like this, we have to give the local communities an opportunity to plan. We cannot have an on-again, off-again, stop-start program.

I hope the motion to recommit is voted down.

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

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

Mr. CURTIS. If I am correct, the bill proposed by the committee has an indefinite authorization, not limited to 3 years at all. At least, this ties it down. So it looks like the committee was not paying any attention at all to what the President might have requested.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Moss, 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. 14810), to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize additional amounts for assistance thereunder, to authorize grants for certain technical studies, and to provide for an expedited program of research, development, and demonstration of new urban transportation systems, pursuant to House Resolution 948, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. I am opposed to it in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TALCOTT moves to recommit the bill H.R. 14810 to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "and $175,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1968."

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 205, nays 161, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—205

Abbitt	Fisher	Nelsen
Abernethy	Foley	O'Hara, Mich.
Adair	Ford, Gerald R.	O'Konski
Andrews, George W.	Fountain	O'Neal, Ga.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fulton, Tenn.	Passman
Arends	Fuqua	Pelly
Ashbrook	Gathings	Pickle
Ashmore	Gettys	Pirnie
Ayres	Gibbons	Poage
Bandstra	Goodell	Poff
Bates	Greigg	Pool
Battin	Grider	Purcell
Belcher	Griffiths	Quillen
Bell	Gross	Race
Bennett	Grover	Randall
Berry	Gurney	Redlin
Betts	Haley	Reid, Ill.
Bolton	Hall	Reifel
Bow	Halleck	Reinecke
Brock	Hamilton	Rhodes, Ariz.
Broomfield	Hansen, Idaho	Rivers, S.C.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Hansen, Iowa	Roberts
Broyhill, N.C.	Hardy	Robison
Buchanan	Harsha	Rogers, Fla.
Byrnes, Wis.	Harvey, Ind.	Rogers, Tex.
Cabell	Harvey, Mich.	Roudebush
Callan	Hays	Roush
Carter	Hechler	Rumsfeld
Casey	Henderson	Satterfield
Cederberg	Horton	Saylor
Chamberlain	Hosmer	Schmidhauser
Clancy	Hull	Schneebeli
Clausen, Don H.	Hutchinson	Selden
Clawson, Del	Ichord	Shipley
Cleveland	Jarman	Shriver
Collier	Jennings	Sikes
Colmer	Johnson, Pa.	Skubitz
Conable	Jonas	Slack
Conte	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Calif.
Cooley	Jones, N.C.	Smith, Iowa
Corbett	Kee	Smith, N.Y.
Cramer	Kornegay	Smith, Va.
Culver	Kunkel	Springer
Cunningham	Laird	Stafford
Curtin	Langen	Stanton
Curtis	Latta	Steed
Dague	Lennon	Stratton
Davis, Wis.	Lipscomb	Talcott
de la Garza	Love	Taylor
Derwinski	McClory	Teague, Calif.
Devine	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Dickinson	McDade	Thomson, Wis.
Dingell	McEwen	Tuck
Dole	McMillan	Utt
Dorn	McVicker	Vigorito
Dowdy	MacGregor	Waggonner
Downing	Mahon	Walker, N. Mex.
Duncan, Tenn.	Marsh	Watkins
Edwards, Ala.	Martin, Nebr.	Watson
Ellsworth	Mathias	Watts
Erlenborn	May	Whalley
Evans, Colo.	Michel	White, Tex.
Everett	Mills	Whitener
Evins, Tenn.	Minshall	Williams
Farnum	Mize	Wilson, Bob
Findley	Moeller	Wright
	Moore	Wyatt
	Morton	Wydler
	Mosher	Younger
	Nedzi	

NAYS—161

Adams	Boggs	Clark
Addabbo	Boland	Craley
Albert	Brademas	Daddario
Anderson, Tenn.	Brooks	Dawson
Annunzio	Burke	Delaney
Ashley	Burleson	Denton
Aspinall	Burton, Calif.	Donohue
Beckworth	Byrne, Pa.	Dow
Bingham	Cahill	Dulski
Blatnik	Carey	Dwyer
	Chelf	Dyal
Edmondson	Keogh	Pucinski
Edwards, Calif.	King, Calif.	Reid, N.Y.
Fallon	King, Utah	Reuss
Farbstein	Kirwan	Rhodes, Pa.
Farnsley	Kluczynski	Rodino
Fascell	Krebs	Rogers, Colo.
Feighan	Kupferman	Ronan
Fino	Leggett	Rooney, N.Y.
Flood	Long, Md.	Rooney, Pa.
Fraser	McCarthy	Rosenthal
Frelinghuysen	McDowell	Roybal
Friedel	McFall	Ryan
Fulton, Pa.	McGrath	St Germain
Gallagher	Macdonald	St. Onge
Giaimo	Machen	Scheuer
Gilbert	Mackay	Schisler
Gilligan	Mackie	Schweiker
Gonzalez	Madden	Secrest
Grabowski	Mailliard	Sickles
Gray	Matsunaga	Sisk
Green, Oreg.	Meeds	Staggers
Green, Pa.	Miller	Stalbaum
Hagen, Calif.	Minish	Stubblefield
Halpern	Monagan	Sullivan
Hanley	Morgan	Sweeney
Hanna	Morse	Tenzer
Hansen, Wash.	Moss	Thomas
Hathaway	Multer	Thompson, N.J.
Helstoski	Murphy, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Hicks	Murphy, N.Y.	Todd
Holifield	Natcher	Trimble
Howard	Nix	Udall
Hungate	O'Brien	Ullman
Huot	O'Hara, Ill.	Van Deerlin
Irwin	Olson, Minn.	Vanik
Jacobs	Ottinger	Vivian
Joelson	Patman	Waldie
Johnson, Calif.	Patten	Weltner
Johnson, Okla.	Pepper	Widnall
Jones, Ala.	Perkins	Wolff
Karsten	Philbin	Yates
Karth	Pike	Young
Kelly	Price	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—66

Anderson, Ill.	Flynt	Murray
Andrews, Glenn	Fogarty	Olsen, Mont.
	Ford, William D.	O'Neill, Mass.
Baring	Garmatz	Powell
Barrett	Gubser	Quie
Bolling	Hagan, Ga.	Rees
Bray	Hawkins	Resnick
Brown, Calif.	Hébert	Rivers, Alaska
Broyhill, Va.	Herlong	Roncalio
Burton, Utah	Holland	Rostenkowski
Callaway	Kastenmeier	Scott
Cameron	Keith	Senner
Celler	King, N.Y.	Stephens
Clevenger	Landrum	Toll
Cohelan	Long, La.	Tunney
Conyers	Martin, Ala.	Tupper
Corman	Martin, Mass.	Tuten
Daniels	Matthews	Walker, Miss.
Davis, Ga.	Mink	White, Idaho
Dent	Moorhead	Whitten
Diggs	Morris	Willis
Duncan, Oreg.	Morrison	Wilson, Charles H.
Edwards, La.		

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Cameron against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Daniels against.

Mr. Walker of Mississippi for, with Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Glenn Andrews for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Murray for, with Mr. Cohelan against.

Mr. Matthews for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Corman against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Olsen of Montana.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Moorhead.
Mr. Rees with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. White of Idaho.
Mr. Tuten with Mr. Powell.

Mr. DINGELL and Mr. VIGORITO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 14810, back to the House with the following amendment:

On page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "and $175,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1968."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "and $175,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1968."

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. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 235, nays 127, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

YEAS—235

Adair	Casey	Fallon
Adams	Chelf	Farbstein
Addabbo	Clark	Farnum
Albert	Clausen, Don H.	Fascell
Anderson, Tenn.	Conable	Feighan
Annunzio	Conte	Fino
Ashley	Corbett	Foley
Aspinall	Craley	Ford, Gerald R.
Ayres	Cunningham	Fraser
Bates	Curtin	Frelinghuysen
Beckworth	Daddario	Friedel
Bell	Dague	Fulton, Pa.
Bingham	Davis, Wis.	Fulton, Tenn.
Blatnik	Dawson	Gallagher
Boggs	Delaney	Giaimo
Boland	Denton	Gibbons
Bolton	Dingell	Gilbert
Bow	Donohue	Gilligan
Brademas	Dow	Gonzalez
Brooks	Dulski	Goodell
Broomfield	Dwyer	Grabowski
Burke	Dyal	Gray
Burton, Calif.	Edmondson	Green, Oreg.
Byrne, Pa.	Edwards, Calif.	Green, Pa.
Cabell	Ellsworth	Griffiths
Cahill	Erlenborn	Grover
Callan	Evans, Colo.	Hagen, Calif.
Carey	Everett	Halpern
Hanley	Mathias	Ryan
Hanna	Matsunaga	St Germain
Hansen, Iowa	May	St. Onge
Hansen, Wash.	Meeds	Saylor
Hardy	Michel	Scheuer
Hathaway	Miller	Schisler
Hays	Minish	Schmidhauser
Hechler	Minshall	Schweiker
Helstoski	Mize	Secrest
Hicks	Monagan	Shipley
Holifield	Moore	Shriver
Horton	Morgan	Sickles
Hosmer	Morse	Sisk
Howard	Morton	Slack
Hungate	Mosher	Smith, N.Y.
Huot	Moss	Springer
Irwin	Multer	Staggers
Jacobs	Murphy, Ill.	Stalbaum
Joelson	Murphy, N.Y.	Stanton
Johnson, Calif.	Natcher	Stratton
Johnson, Okla.	Nedzi	Stubblefield
Jones, Ala.	Nix	Sullivan
Karsten	O'Brien	Sweeney
Karth	O'Hara, Ill.	Tenzer
Kee	Olson, Minn.	Thomas
Keith	Ottinger	Thompson, N.J.
Kelly	Patman	Thompson, Tex.
Keogh	Patten	Todd
King, Calif.	Pelly	Trimble
King, Utah	Pepper	Udall
Kirwan	Perkins	Ullman
Kluczynski	Philbin	Van Deerlin
Krebs	Pike	Vanik
Kunkel	Pirnie	Vigorito
Kupferman	Price	Vivian
Leggett	Pucinski	Waldie
Long, Md.	Randall	Walker, N. Mex.
Love	Redlin	Watts
McCarthy	Reid, N.Y.	Weltner
McDade	Reinecke	White, Tex.
McDowell	Reuss	Widnall
McFall	Rhodes, Pa.	Wolff
McGrath	Robison	Wright
McVicker	Rodino	Wyatt
Macdonald	Rogers, Colo.	Wydler
MacGregor	Ronan	Yates
Machen	Rooney, N.Y.	Young
Mackay	Rooney, Pa.	Younger
Mackie	Rosenthal	Zablocki
Madden	Roybal	
Mailliard	Rumsfeld	

NAYS—127

Abbitt	Findley	O'Konski
Abernethy	Fisher	O'Neal, Ga.
Andrews, George W.	Fountain	Passman
	Fuqua	Pickle
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gathings	Poage
	Gettys	Poff
Arends	Greigg	Pool
Ashbrook	Grider	Purcell
Ashmore	Gross	Quillen
Bandstra	Gurney	Race
Battin	Haley	Reid, Ill.
Belcher	Hall	Reifel
Bennett	Halleck	Rhodes, Ariz.
Berry	Hamilton	Rivers, S.C.
Betts	Hansen, Idaho	Roberts
Brock	Harsha	Rogers, Fla.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Harvey, Ind.	Rogers, Tex.
	Harvey, Mich.	Roudebush
Broyhill, N.C.	Henderson	Roush
Buchanan	Hull	Satterfield
Burleson	Hutchinson	Schneebeli
Byrnes, Wis.	Ichord	Selden
Carter	Jarman	Sikes
Cederberg	Jennings	Skubitz
Chamberlain	Johnson, Pa.	Smith, Calif.
Clancy	Jonas	Smith, Iowa
Clawson, Del	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Va.
Cleveland	Jones, N.C.	Stafford
Collier	Kornegay	Steed
Colmer	Laird	Talcott
Cooley	Langen	Taylor
Cramer	Latta	Teague, Calif.
Culver	Lennon	Teague, Tex.
Curtis	Lipscomb	Thomson, Wis.
de la Garza	McClory	Tuck
Derwinski	McCulloch	Utt
Devine	McEwen	Waggonner
Dickinson	McMillan	Watson
Dole	Mahon	Whalley
Dorn	Marsh	Whitener
Dowdy	Martin, Nebr.	Williams
Downing	Mills	Wilson, Bob
Duncan, Tenn.	Moeller	
Edwards, Ala.	Nelsen	

NOT VOTING—69

Anderson, Ill.	Brown, Calif.	Cohelan
Andrews, Glenn	Broyhill, Va.	Conyers
	Burton, Utah	Corman
Baring	Callaway	Daniels
Barrett	Cameron	Davis, Ga.
Bolling	Celler	Dent
Bray	Clevenger	Diggs
Duncan, Oreg.	Landrum	Rivers, Alaska
Edwards, La.	Long, La.	Roncalio
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Ala.	Rostenkowski
Farnsley	Martin, Mass.	Scott
Flynt	Matthews	Senner
Fogarty	Mink	Stephens
Ford, William D.	Moorhead	Toll
	Morris	Tunney
Garmatz	Morrison	Tupper
Gubser	Murray	Tuten
Hagan, Ga.	O'Hara, Mich.	Walker, Miss.
Hawkins	Olsen, Mont.	Watkins
Hébert	O'Neill, Mass.	White, Idaho
Herlong	Powell	Whitten
Holland	Quie	Willis
Kastenmeier	Rees	Wilson, Charles H.
King, N.Y.	Resnick	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Watkins for, with Mr. Bray against.
Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Glenn Andrews against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Diggs with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Farnsley.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Edwards of Louisana.
Mr. Daniels with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Barrett.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Tutten with Mr. Matthews.
Mr. Norris with Mr. Moorhead.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.
Mr. Olsen of Montana with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Roncalio.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. DAWSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 3700) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 14810, to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize additional amounts for assistance thereunder, to authorize grants for certain technical studies, and to provide for an expedited program of research, development, and demonstration of new urban transportation systems, just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 3700

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

AUTHORIZATION

SECTION 1. (a) The first sentence of section 4(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969".

(b) Section 6(b) of such Act (redesignated section 6(c) by section 3 of this Act) is amended by striking out "and to $30,000,000 on July 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "to $30,000,000 on July 1, 1966, to $40,000,000 on July 1, 1967, and to $50,000,000 on July 1, 1968".

ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN TECHNICAL STUDIES AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 2. (a) The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 9 through 12 as sections 12 through 15, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 8 the following new sections:

"GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL STUDIES

"SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States and local public bodies and agencies thereof for the planning, engineering, and designing of urban mass transportation projects, and for other technical studies, to be included, or proposed to be included, in a program (completed or under active preparation) for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensive planned development of the urban area. Activities assisted under this section may include (1) studies relating to management, operations, capital requirements, and economic feasibility; (2) preparation of engineering and architectural surveys, plans, and specifications; and (3) other similar or related activities preliminary to and in preparation for the construction, acquisition, or improved operation of mass transportation systems, facilities, and equipment. A grant under this section shall be made in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary and shall not exceed two-thirds of the cost of carrying out the activities for which the grant is made.

"GRANTS FOR MANAGERIAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States, local bodies, and agencies thereof to provide fellowships for training of personnel employed in managerial, technical, and professional positions in the urban mass transportation field. Fellowships shall be for not more than one year of advanced training in public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education offering programs of graduate study in business or public administration, or in other fields having application to the urban mass transportation industry. The State, local body, or agency receiving a grant under this section shall select persons for such fellowships on the basis of demonstrated ability and for the contribution which they can reasonably be expected to make to an efficient mass transportation operation. Not more than one hundred fellowships shall be awarded in any year, and the amount of any such fellowship shall not exceed an amount equal to (1) 75 per centum of the sum of the costs of education incurred by an individual receiving such fellowship and the amount by which such individual's salary is reduced during the period of his training, or (2) $12,000, whichever is the lesser.

"(b) Not more than 12½ per centum of the fellowships authorized pursuant to subsection (a) shall be awarded for the training of employees of mass transportation companies in any one State.

"(c) The Secretary may make available to finance grants under this section not to exceed $1,500,000 per annum of the grant funds appropriated pursuant to section 4(b).

"GRANTS FOR RESEARCH AND TRAINING IN URBAN TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

"SEC. 11. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to public and private nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist in establishing or carrying on comprehensive research in the problems of transportation in urban areas. Such grants shall be used to conduct competent and qualified research and investigations into the theoretical or practical problems of urban transportation, or both, and to provide for the training of persons to carry on further research or to obtain employment in private or public organizations which plan, construct, operate, or manage urban transportation systems. Such research and investigations may include, without being limited to, the design and functioning of urban mass transit systems; the design and functioning of urban roads and highways; the interrelationship between various modes of urban and interurban transportation; the role of transportation planning in overall urban planning; public preferences in transportation; the economic allocation of transportation resources; and the legal, financial, engineering, and esthetic aspects of urban transportation. In making such grants the Secretary shall give preference to institutions of higher learning that undertake such research and training by bringing together knowledge and expertise in the various social sciences and technical disciplines that relate to urban transportation problems.

"(b) The Secretary may make available to finance grants under this section not to exceed $3,000,000 per annum of the grant funds appropriated pursuant to section 4(b)."

(b) Such Act is further amended—

(1) by striking out "section 10(c)" in section 3(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 13(c)"; and

(2) by striking out "under this Act" in section 13(c) (as redesignated by subsection (a)) and inserting in lieu thereof "under section 3 of this Act".

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

SEC. 3. Section 6 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), and by adding after subsection (a) a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, undertake a project to study and prepare a program of research, development, and demonstration of new systems of urban transportation that will carry people and goods within metropolitan areas speedily, safely, without polluting the air, and in a manner that will contribute to sound city planning. The program shall (1) concern itself with all aspects of new systems of urban transportation for metropolitan areas of various sizes, including technological, financial, economic, governmental, and social aspects; (2) take into account the most advanced available technologies and materials; and (3) provide national leadership to efforts of States, localities, private industry, universities, and foundations. The Secretary shall report his findings and recommendations to the President, for submission to the Congress, as rapidly as possible and in any event not later than eighteen months after the effective date of this subsection."

STATE LIMITATION

SEC. 4. Section 15 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as redesignated by section 2 of this Act) is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That the Secretary shall first reallocate sums not used in any fiscal year within the limitation herein prescribed and may thereafter without regard to such limitation, enter into contracts for grants under section 3 aggregating not to exceed $12,500,000 (subject to the total authorization provided in section 4(b)) with local public bodies and agencies in States where more than two-thirds of the maximum grants permitted in the respective State under this section has been obligated."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966'.

"SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 4(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out 'and $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967' and inserting in lieu thereof '$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967; and $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1968'.

"SEC. 3. Section 6(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out 'and to $30,000,000 on July 1, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'to $30,000,000 on July 1, 1966, to $40,000,000 on July 1, 1967, and to $50,000,0 on July 1, 1968'.

"SEC. 4. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, undertake a study to prepare a program of research, development, and demonstration of new systems of urban transportation that will carry people and goods within metropolitan areas speedily, safely, without polluting the air, and in a manner that will contribute to sound city planning. The program shall (1) concern itself with all aspects of new systems of urban transportation for metropolitan areas of various sizes, including technological, financial, economic, governmental, and social aspects; (2) take into account the most advanced available technologies and materials; and (3) provide national leadership to efforts of States, localities, private industry, universities, and foundations. The Secretary shall report his findings and recommendations to the President, for submission to the Congress, as rapidly as possible and in any event not later than eighteen months after the date of enactment of this Act. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for its preparation.

"SEC. 5. (a) The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as amended by this Act) is further amended—

"(1) by redesignating sections 9 through 12 as sections 10 through 13, respectively; and

"(2) by inserting after section 8 the following new section:

"'GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL STUDIES

"'SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States and local public bodies and agencies thereof for the planning, engineering, and designing of urban mass transportation projects, and for other technical studies, to be included, or proposed to be included, in a program (completed or under active preparation) for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area. Activities assisted under this section may include (1) studies relating to management, operations, capital requirements, and economic feasibility; (2) preparation of engineering and architectural surveys, plans, and specifications; and (3) other similar or related activities preliminary to and in preparation for the construction, acquisition, or improved operation of mass transportation systems, facili-

ties, and equipment. A grant under this section shall be made in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary and shall not exceed two-thirds of the cost of carrying out the activities for which the grant is made.'

"(b) Section 3(c) of such Act is amended by striking out 'section 10(c)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 11(c)'."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist upon its amendment to the Senate bill (S. 3700), and that the House request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PATMAN, MULTER, BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Messrs. REUSS, ASHLEY, WIDNALL, FINO, and Mrs. DWYER.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, either before or after the passage of the bill, and to include therein extraneous remarks.

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

There was no objection.

BARKLEY LOCK AND DAM PROJECT

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, August 20 will be a proud day for Kentucky. On that date the Barkley lock and dam project, named after the late Vice President from Kentucky, will be dedicated by the Vice President of the United States.

Located near the mouth of the Cumberland River, this multipurpose project provides for flood control, navigation improvement, and power production. In addition, the people of this area will enjoy important supplemental benefits in recreation, water supply, and enhancement to industrial development. Its construction has made possible the creation of one of the largest and most beautiful recreational areas in the United States, which will be visited annually by hundreds of thousands of people from all sections of the country.

The foresight, dedication, and hard work of many people made the realization of this project possible. In this connection I include in the RECORD an article by Bill Powell that appeared in the Paducah Sun-Democrat of August 5, 1966:

RESOLUTION BY CLEMENTS WAS A KEY MEASURE

In 1955 Barkley Dam had only a frail foothold in Congress. Legislators had provided $200,000 for the project—it was to be used for what they called "work to commence the planning for construction."

Still in the path of the project, which at that time was to cost an estimated $167,000,000 were many barriers. The program was in a delicate stage; anything could have thrown it off balance or into the limbo of lost projects.

On April 30, 1956, Alben W. Barkley died.

As you know, he fell dead while dramatically addressing a mock Democratic convention at Washington and Lee University.

Soon after the Veep's death—while his last words of "I would rather be a servant in the house of the Lord than to sit in the seats of the mighty" were still ringing in the world's ears—Sen. Earle C. Clements of Morganfield introduced a significant resolution in the Senate.

Actually, it was a joint Senate-House resolution which meant that it had great weight.

The resolution was to name the dam on the lower Cumberland, a delicate project which hadn't come to a head and which had hard days ahead, after Alben W. Barkley.

The resolution was enacted into law May 24, 1956. In its report to the Senate recommending approval of the resolution, the Senate Public Works Committee said:

"The lower Cumberland lock and dam project is located in the district in which the late Alben W. Barkley resided. He was always a strong advocate and supporter of this project.

"The committee believes it fitting and proper that this dam and reservoir bear the name of Barkley Dam and Lake Barkley in honor of the great statesman and beloved American from Kentucky, who so ably served his state and nation in public office for over 50 years. This committee realizes that no engineering structure is capable of symbolizing the greatness of the man Alben W. Barkley but we can honor his life in a modest manner by having this dam and reservoir bear his name."

Initial funds for construction of the dam were made available that same year. An appropriation of $1,100,000 for the project separated it from what they call preliminary or "in the study stage."

The project then rolled along.

It is there now, for all to see. Through June, 1966, a total of $138,516,000 had been appropriated for the project. Now $3,484,000 has been recommended for completion of the great dam.

It is significant—and it should be of interest to those who think the government runs wild on all kinds of expenditures—that the original Barkley Dam estimate was $167,000,000 and that it will be completed for $142,000,000.

Seeing Barkley Dam in every stage of construction, and sweating through the news obligations of bitter relocation and giving up of homes, I believe that the project has been a model in efficiency and economy.

The "saving" of $25,000,000 is a startling contrast to the usual tale—the spending of an extra $25,000,000.

Perhaps Earle C. Clements would be embarrassed by my evaluation of his role in the Barkley Dam program.

But it is clear that his quick thoughtful resolution in honor of Barkley untangled all of the underbrush that lay in the path of Barkley Dam.

The tribute wasn't a maneuver but it had the same effect.

As Clements put through his resolution, which was proper and in perfect perspective, the future of the dam was assured.

After it had the name of Alben W. Barkley, the project had the magic it took for success.

The dedication will be a big occasion.

Earle C. Clements will be on the main platform, as he should be. So will FRANK ALBERT STUBBLEFIELD and Noble Gregory and other Kentucky lawmakers who shared in the effort to make Barkley Dam a reality.

Of these special thanks should be extended to Congressman WILLIAM H. NATCHER. Back in 1955 the House Appropriations Committee deleted the initial appropriation for planning and survey of this project. Had it not been for our good friend and neighbor BILL NATCHER, a member of the Committee, who rose on the House Floor and successfully offered an amendment to restore these funds, this project would have been needlessly delayed and possibly endangered.

The vice president of the United States will dedicate the dam and lake, and the canal connecting the lakes.

I would not be surprised to see 30,000 people there.

Clements, remembering that balmy May after the Veep died, can sit up there on the speakers stand and modestly wonder if all this would have taken place if his resolution hadn't passed back in 1956.

I doubt if it would.

There are turning points in everything. Sometimes they are extremely delicate.

NEW YORK PROGRAM EXCEEDS CONGRESSIONAL INTENT IN MEDICARE LEGISLATION

Mr. STRATTON. 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. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress approved the medicare program. It was considered a very controversial program, and debate was sharp and bitter before the legislation was finally approved. Incidentally I was one who supported medicare strongly. At the same time we approved medicare, Mr. Speaker, Congress also approved, almost without any real debate, title 19 of that legislation. Title 19 was to be a modest extension of the previous Kerr-Mills legislation, and nobody regarded it as even being controversial. It was presented as a modest adjunct to the major controversial medicare program we were adopting. We left it up to the individual States, as we had previously done with Kerr-Mills, to work out the specific details for implementing title 19, assuming the States, as had been the case with Kerr-Mills, would exercise reason and restraint in doing so.

Most States who have taken advantage of title 19 have done exactly that, Mr. Speaker. But one of them, my own State of New York, as I mentioned earlier today in this Chamber, has gone far beyond anything that Congress ever contemplated or than the precise wording of title 19 ever covered. The extent of this New York program, in part financed by the Federal Government and indirectly as well as directly made possible by Federal contributions, goes far beyond what Congress intended, and its total costs are nothing short of fantastic, estimated by the Department of Health,

Education, and Welfare, according to the New York Times, on August 13, to reach $1.4 billion a year by 1970.

The New York Times also reports, Mr. Speaker, that despite these facts the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is soon to approve of this fantastic plan as "reasonable in character," even though it clearly deviates from both the wording and the intent of the law in at least three specific instances. If HEW approves the plan, Mr. Speaker, the New York congressional delegation has been told that this represents a "moral commitment" by Congress to appropriate the very substantial Federal funds that it will require.

In view of the Nation's present financial situation it would of course be ridiculous for anyone to give any assurance that Congress would give any State such a blank check. No one can assure the appropriation of such funds by this Congress, and hence approval of the New York State medical plan by HEW could be seriously misleading to the State of New York and could lead to substantial fiscal troubles within the State if such so-called morally committed Federal funds are not in fact appropriated by Congress.

I have said the New York program goes far beyond both the letter and the intent of Congress in approving title 19 last year. Let me be specific. Here are three serious and crucial divergences in the New York law.

First. The New York program applies to persons generally between 21 and 65, whereas title 19 is specifically limited to persons who are blind, disabled, and to families of "dependent" children as that term is defined in the Federal aid-to-dependent-children program.

Second. The New York program makes some 45 percent of the State population eligible for medical assistance made possible, at least indirectly, by title 19 Federal funds, in contrast to only 4 percent of the population who have been receiving welfare assistance prior to the passage of medicaid. This is clearly and unequivocally not a "reasonable" escalation of welfare benefits under our legislation.

Third. The total Federal share of the cost of the New York State program would appear to, on the basis of the figures reported in the New York Times, represent almost twice the amount actually allocated by Congress and the Department for contributing to title 19 programs across the whole 50 States. This too is clearly unreasonable and excessive in character, and should never be approved or endorsed by the Department.

I have, therefore, asked Secretary Gardner to furnish to me and to any other members of the New York congressional delegation who may be interested the full fiscal estimates of the Department on the costs of the New York plan. I have also asked him to defer any approval of the New York plan at least until our delegation has an opportunity to study these estimates, a cost, by the way, which far exceeds the estimates given to us earlier this year by both New York State authorities and HEW officials.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to examine the New York implementation of title 19 very carefully, and I specifically urge them to approve those amendments to this title 19 law which I have offered in H.R. 15917.

Adoption of H.R. 15917 would, I believe, not only make the kind of unreasonable and excessive implementation of title 19 such as New York has developed impossible, but would outline in greater detail the kind of implementation which Congress intended when title 19 was originally passed last year, unfortunately with hardly a word of dissent or a word of debate.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the telegram I sent to Secretary Gardner and also the August 13 article from the New York Times to which I have referred:

AUGUST 15, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. GARDNER,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.:

Greatly disturbed Saturday New York Times story you plan to approve New York State Medicaid plan implementing title nineteen as "reasonable in character" despite state's massive underestimation of plan's costs and three sharp and distinct deviations from letter and intent of 1965 legislation. Request you present same detailed HEW estimates of cost of New York plan your office presented to Ways and Means Committee to myself and other New York State Members of Congress who may desire such information and that you defer any contemplated approval of New York State plan at least until we have had a chance to study these estimates. New York Times story suggests cost far in excess of those given New York State congressional delegation in May. If Times story correct Congress most unlikely to appropriate Federal contribution you say New York plan will involve and HEW approval would therefore mistakenly suggest to New York moral commitment by Congress to appropriate funds we might well decline to appropriate.

SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
Member of Congress.

COST OF MEDICAID IN 1970 ESTIMATED AT $1.4 BILLION

WASHINGTON, August 12.—Federal officials have told Congress that New York State's program of medical aid for the indigent will cost $1.4-billion a year by the time it is in full-scale operation in 1970.

This figure represents the total cost of providing free medical assistance for the seven million in the state who are eligible to take advantage of it. The cost would be shared by Federal, state and local governments.

The estimate, made by officials of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare at closed hearings of the House Ways and Means Committee, far exceeds any figure provided by Governor Rockefeller in discussing the controversial program.

Mr. Rockefeller has said that the plan, called Medicaid, should cost $532-million in the 1966–67 fiscal year that began July 1. According to the Governor, this would be financed by $217-million in Federal contributions, $171-million from the state and $144-million from the localities.

APPROVAL EXPECTED

About the same number of New York residents will be eligible for assistance under the plan in 1970 as today, but officials assume that more of them will apply for benefits each year as public awareness of the program spreads.

If the Federal figure of $1.4-billion is correct, however, the Rockefeller administration radically underestimated the over-all cost of the program. The state projections had indicated the cost would only increase about $85-million a year due to wider participation.

Federal health officials declined to elaborate on the total cost figure furnished to Congress. They said it was an actuarial estimate that was apparently based on different assumptions and projections than the ones used by Governor Rockefeller.

Federal authorities maintained, however, that the overwhelming potential cost of the New York program was not likely to result in its disapproval by the Health, Education and Welfare Department.

The New York plan has been under consideration by Health, Education and Welfare officials for about two months. They must approve it before the plan can become eligible for the 50 percent share of Federal aid.

As long as any state program meets the requirements of Title 19 of the Medicare Law and is "reasonable" in character, officials say, it should be approved and go into operation.

The New York program has attracted attention because the enabling state legislation and regulations extended medical assistance to persons of considerably higher income than Congress had originally envisioned or any other state had been willing to provide for.

Under the New York plan, a family of four with an annual income as high as $6,000 after taxes would have all its medical expenses paid by the government. Critics have maintained such a family is not genuinely indigent.

Late in the 1966 session, the New York Legislature amended the legislation to reduce the benefits to those eligible. The major change—a deductible feature under which any family would pay the first $100 of its medical bills—would only reduce the total cost by $50 million, Federal officials estimate.

In some upstate communities, Governor Rockefeller's popularity has reportedly declined because of his endorsement of the plan, but some Republicans believe the plan's beneficiaries may outnumber its critics by election day.

TRIBUTE TO JULES DUBOIS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was with great regret that the world of journalism, and indeed, the free world, learned today of the death of Jules Dubois, veteran Latin American correspondent for the Chicago Tribune. According to the Associated Press dispatch, he was found dead of an apparent heart attack, in his hotel room in Bogotá, Colombia.

Jules Dubois was one of the most courageous correspondents ever produced in this country. I knew him well. He had the courage of his convictions. As a newspaperman he provided for South America and this entire continent that kind of courageous coverage that exposed dictatorships and conspiracies to suppress the freedoms of man.

Jules Dubois was the first correspondent to identify Castro as a Communist, and, through his relentless writings and exposures, he called this to the attention of the entire hemisphere and, indeed, of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us are going to miss Jules Dubois and his fearless and penetrating reporting. He has changed the course of history in the South American Continent. It is my fervent hope that the work he started will not go unheeded.

I extend to his family and to the Chicago Tribune my deepest condolences for the loss of a great man, a great reporter, and a courageous journalist.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point the ticker report of the death of Jules Dubois.

The matter referred to follows:

BOGOTÁ, COLOMBIA.—Jules DuBois, veteran Latin American correspondent for the Chicago Tribune, was found dead today apparently of a heart attack in his hotel room. He was 56.

DuBois had come here to report on a conference of the Presidents of Venezuela, Colombia and Chile.

The hotel spokesman said he returned from the conference last night, complained of feeling tired and around midnight asked that an oxygen tent be sent up to his room.

An autopsy may be performed, although the hotel physician attributed his death to a heart attack.

The U.S. Embassy in Bogotá notified the State Department in Washington of DuBois' death.

A Latin American correspondent for the Tribune since 1947, DuBois was a member of the Board of Directors of the Inter American Press Association (IAPA) and was chairman of its Freedom of the Press Committee for 15 years before he resigned last year.

DuBois began his newspaper career as a reporter on the New York Herald Tribune in 1927. In 1929 he went to work for the Panama American. There followed various assignments on a number of Panama newspapers before he joined the Chicago Tribune.

He was editor of the Panama Times 1931-32, editor and publisher of the Panama Free Press in 1940 and assistant to the president and publisher of the Star and Herald in 1946-47.

During his IAPA term, DuBois championed the cause of press freedom throughout the Americas. He often engaged in vigorous campaigns against dictators who clamped government controls over newspapers, broadcasting stations and other news media.

DuBois was almost always on the move throughout Latin America and he was known in every capital. In recent years he had made his home in Coral Gables, Fla.

INJUNCTION AGAINST HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, unless this body challenges the decision by U.S. District Judge Howard F. Corcoran in issuing a restraining order against the hearing by the House Un-American Activities Committee, then Congress may as well abdicate all of its responsibilities to the executive and judicial branches. His decision constitutes a blatant disregard for the rights of Congress and the interests of the American people.

It is obvious that this decision is just another step by the Federal judiciary in protecting groups who are sworn enemies of this Nation. Judge Corcoran's decision to obstruct the work of a standing committee of the House is a boost to the Communist Party and other more revolutionary groups, who are dedicated to overthrowing this Government.

Congress should seriously consider his removal from the bench. His unprecedented order is obviously a manifestation of his desire to enjoin legally constituted action by Congress.

Despite the decision by the three-judge special court to overrule his decision, that court declared it would consider any future moves to curtail the work of the committee at any time.

This is completely fallacious reasoning by the special court. Any attempt by a court to interfere with the investigative arm of Congress should be viewed with alarm. If Judge Corcoran's decision, or any related decision, is allowed, we will witness the end of any semblance of federalism in this country.

I cannot stress too greatly how serious the problem of antiwar demonstrations has become. The American people must be made aware of the obvious Communist influence which is behind these demonstrations against our war effort. If there has ever been an area that required an investigation by the Un-American Activities Committee, this is it. While our men are giving their lives for freedom in the jungles of Vietnam, these so-called peaceniks, prompted by forces of subversion, are undermining the very structure of our Government. If any of my colleagues are of the opinion that these groups are advocating nonviolence and are not dedicated to the violent overthrow of our system of government, I would invite them to witness as have I the performance of these revolutionaries during hearings now taking place before the committee.

PRESIDENTIAL VERSUS CONGRESSIONAL DECISIONMAKING

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a column by John Chamberlain in the Washington Post of August 13 is an articulate statement about a disturbing, but not surprising, phenomenon in American politics. The question Mr. Chamberlain asks is "Whither Power Advocates?" and it is a question worth considering. As long as the decisions being made behind closed doors without fair procedures or democratic processes were to their liking, the advocates of Presidential power and executive government were quite content. They were not disturbed by the way decisions were made down on Pennsylvania Avenue by the Federal bureaucracy, or up in the academic cloisters on the banks of the Charles River.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times in the past about the two competing theories of the role of Congress in American government. There are those who argue that the Congress is a sounding-board, where legislation results from pressures exerted outside of the Congress. To these thinkers, Congress existed to ratify judgments made elsewhere. When Congress dissented from the judgments of the bureaucrats, economic oligarchs, and academics, the reason had to be congressional obstructionism caused by antiquated procedures and malapportioned electoral districts. The reason could not be that the judgments were mistaken, or ill advised. Congress was a mere obstacle, to be evaded or coerced into accepting the wisdom of others.

There is another competing theory of the role of Congress, which my summer interns tell me is not even seriously considered in political science courses at some of the finest colleges and universities in our country. In this alternative view, Congress is essentially a study and deliberative body. Congressmen are sent by the people to study the issues and use their best judgment in considering proposed legislation. The essence of this study process is fair, open congressional hearings, where those who are convinced of the soundness of their judgments can be confronted with the arguments and facts of the other side through cross-examination. I would argue that this is the way the best decisions can be made, for, in this process, more of the wisdom of the society can be gathered than any other way that I know.

Mr. Chamberlain is to be congratulated for pointing to the change of heart of the presidential power advocates. I only wish that this change of heart might mean that these thinkers are convinced of the value of the congressional study process for wise decisionmaking. I hope I do not sound too pessimistic when I say that I doubt it. I am afraid that the reason they have seen the light is that they have felt the heat from the decisions of a President whom they happen, for the moment, to disagree with. I doubt that they would see the value of congressional procedures if the President were twisting arms to implement decisions they liked. But the present experience is valuable for the dangers of presidential power it exposes to those theorists who had previously been oblivious to them. Perhaps, they will now think twice before adding to the present discretionary powers of the President, for these are powers that can be exercised without any deference to the study and deliberative processes of the Congress.

Once again, I want to congratulate John Chamberlain for his contribution to the lagging dialog on the role of Congress in our Government and society.

Under unanimous consent, I introduce this column into the RECORD:

WHITHER POWER ADVOCATES?

(By John Chamberlain)

It was only two short years ago that the liberal intellectuals, led by John F. Kennedy's friend and biographer, James MacGregor Burns, were complaining that the Goldwater Republicans constituted a "Congressional Party" that was anachronistic in the modern age. The need, so the liberal intellectuals insisted, was for a strong presidential power to lead and compel Congress to do what it takes to meet complicated problems, both internal and external.

We haven't been hearing so much along these lines recently; indeed, Mr. Walter Lippmann, who has tended to support a strong presidential system ever since the days of Woodrow Wilson, has just taken off on a long vacation with a warning that something should be done to restrain the power of Lyndon Johnson.

Liberals of all types and varieties are speaking in the new Lippmann manner. For example, the famous Mario Savio, generalissimo of the campus "revolution" at Berkeley, Calif., who once welcomed presidential power when it was used to curb the States Righters of Alabama and Mississippi, has been describing himself of late as a "philosophical anarchist" and professing sympathy for libertarian conservatives who voted unsuccessfully for Goldwater. Savio speaks of our "traditional liberties" being "eroded by the unwarranted growth of the Federal Government."

In between Lippmann and Savio there are scores of ADA-ers and what-not who liked Lyndon Johnson when he was twisting Congressional arms to force through domestic legislation, but who hate him now that he insists on supporting friends of freedom in distant parts of the "one world" that liberals used to be for.

If today's issues weren't so serious, the philosophical somersaults of our liberal intellectuals would make good musical comedy fodder for the Morrie Ryskind who wrote "Of Thee I Sing." When the "Congressional Party" was dominated by the likes of Bob Taft all we heard from the liberals were complaints about Senatorial do-nothingism and "obstruction." But now that the Congressional Party is headed by Senator FULBRIGHT, with WAYNE MORSE acting as his able lieutenant, we only hear about the terrible way in which the White House is "escalating" the war in Vietnam without asking the "advice and consent" of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The National Conference for New Politics, which was recently set up by a group ranging from Grenville Clark of the World Federalists and Mark DeWolfe Howe of the Harvard Law School to Stokely Carmichael of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and Dick Gregory, the Negro entertainer who wants to be mayor of Chicago, is going into action this autumn with one objective: to break the presidential power of LBJ. What we need, say the NCNP organizers, is a "new politics" designed "to reverse the tendency of our politics toward the monolithic conformism of 'the great consensus,' and to revive the free-swinging politics of traditional American democracy."

These are wonderful words, but they come from people who have never in the past been particularly concerned about supporting the traditional Madisonian system of checks and balances that maintained free-swinging individualists in Congress. No doubt the words are sincerely meant at the moment. But conservatives and true libertarians who have all along supported the "Congressional system" as against James MacGregor Burns' "Presidential system" had better not count on any permanent new allies on the liberal left. The "New Leftists" will be for "free-swinging politics" until they get their own man in the White House. If and when that day comes, we shall hear no more from them about "Administrative usurpation." Instead, we shall be hearing much about a "consensus" for an accommodation with the likes of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh and a "convergence" with the Communists everywhere.

We have political science departments in virtually every American college. But judging by the behavior of their liberal graduates, all they seem to teach is that principles depend on whose ox is gored.

AHEPA CONVENTION

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join other Members of the House in welcoming to Washington for their 44th international convention representatives of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.

This fine organization has made outstanding contributions to America by promoting and encouraging good citizenship and active participation in social, civic, and political activities.

AHEPA has not only served this country by teaching its members to be aware of the duties and responsibilities they have as citizens, but it has assisted newcomers from Greece to become adjusted to their new country while maintaining pride in their native land. It has also helped the victims of natural disasters all over the world.

The members of AHEPA certainly deserve commendation for their many good works, and I join in paying tribute to this fine Greek-American organization.

THE 1966 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK HIGHLIGHTS SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been most encouraging and inspiring to read the reports from all over the country concerning the observance of the 1966 Captive Nations Week. In every respect—proclamations, press coverage, local committee functions, TV and radio programs, and expanded American public interest—the 1966 week has surpassed all other years.

The obvious meaning of these results is multiple. Anyone reading these reports cannot but conclude the following: First, ever-increasing numbers of Americans do not buy, in conscience and intellect, the policy of playing down the captivity of close to a billion people because it is naively felt that the totalitarian Red regimes can be appeased into ways of peaceable evolution and eventual freedom; second, we are at great costs losing time in the cold war and the Red totalitarians are gaining it as we neglect the advantages provided by the powerful deterrent against war and cold war oppression and for peace and freedom; namely, the captive nations in toto; third, our relative official neglect of the captive nations casts a long and deep shadow of doubt on our politico-moral leadership in the world at large, with words of freedom, national independence, self-determination assuming more and more a hollow ring; and fourth, the urgent need for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations is realized now, more than ever before, as we jump from one illusion to another in the rapid succession of our short-run policies. For example, not too long ago some made considerable noise about the Sino-Soviet Russian rift and sought to capitalize on it in Vietnam and elsewhere. We do not hear much of this now as Russian material support of the Hanoi regime far exceeds that of the Red Chinese.

Mr. Speaker, we again urge the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. It cannot be said that the compelling reasons for such constructive and necessary action have not been clearly stated and elaborated upon. I, and numerous colleagues on both sides of this House, sincerely hope that the unfolding record of this movement will not show that this plea fell upon deaf ears at this critical moment in our history. Far too often in our history we have missed the boat; what had to be done was neglected and, later, we paid a heavy price for it.

As examples of the breadth and diversity of the 1966 Captive Nations Week observance, the following selected items deserve the attentive reading by every Member of this body and by every alert American citizen. I request that these items be appended to my remarks: First, a resolution by the American Legion in Michigan; second, the captive nations news release by the Department of Public Events of the City of New York; third, the statement of Americans To Free Captive Nations on the week; fourth, the News From China release on the week; fifth, the accounts in the India Free News and Feature Service, featuring "Forget the Captive Nations" and "The Truths and the Growing Week" by Lev E. Dobriansky; sixth, a letter to the editor in the July 29 issue of the Washington Post and three pointed replies to the letter, one which was highly deleted in the August 14 issue of the Post; seventh, an article by Robert Morris on "Captive Nations Week" in the August 4 issue of The Wanderer; eighth, a letter to the editors of the Washington area papers on the week; ninth, a Washington Post July 8 editorial on "Up With Idel-Ural" and a reply by Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University and chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee; tenth, news reports on the week in the August 11 issue of America; and eleventh,

an article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer on "What Would Happen If Captive Nations Revolted Against U.S.S.R.?" in the August 13 issue of Human Events:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN LEGION INTER-POST COUNCIL, ON AMERICANISM, GENESEE COUNTY, MICH., JULY 13, 1966

Whereas, the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the process of representative government, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas, this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas, the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas, since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas, these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas, it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas, it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such people through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence; Now, therefore be it

Resolved, that The American Legion Inter-Post Council on Americanism of Genesee County, Michigan, recognizes the week of July 17, 1966, as "Captive Nations Week", and invites the people of Genesee County to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Mayor and City Commission of The City of Flint with the request that they proclaim the week of July 17, 1966, as "Captive Nations Week", and urge appropriate ceremonies and activities.

DONALD L. LYSHER,
Chairman.
JAMES PEMBERTON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

MAYOR LINDSAY PROCLAIMS "CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK"

Mayor John V. Lindsay has designated the week of July 17–23, 1966 to be observed as "Captive Nations Week" in New York City, it was announced today by Commissioner John S. Palmer of the Department of Public Events.

At City Hall on Tuesday, July 19, at 11:00 a.m., the Mayor will formally present his proclamation to the Chairman of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, Mr. Vaclovas Sidzikauskas. Assisting in the ceremony will be Dr. Edmund Gaspar, Secretary General of the Assembly; Mr. Christopher Emmet, Chairman of the American Friends of the Captive Nations and Msgr. John Balkunas, President of the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent.

A group of delegates from the above organizations complemented by girls attired in native costumes will also participate in the ceremony.

Captive Nations Week expresses the support of the American people for the restoration of freedom to oppressed countries now under dictatorships.

The City's proclamation is in line with a resolution adopted by Congress urging "Captive Nations Week" as a national observance.

Text of the mayor's proclamation follows:

Whereas: the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the 3rd week in July of each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence; and

Whereas: the people of Eastern and Central Europe, as well as those in other parts of the world, are being denied fundamental human rights in pursuing their own destiny; and

Whereas: the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to tyranny and aggression; and

Whereas: the freedom-loving peoples of captive nations look to the people of the United States for leadership in attaining their freedom and independence,

Now therefore, I, John V. Lindsay, Mayor of the City of New York do hereby proclaim the week of July 17–23, 1966, as "Captive Nations Week" in New York City, and call upon our citizens to observe this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of New York to be affixed.

STATEMENT OF AMERICANS TO FREE CAPTIVE NATIONS, INC., ON CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1966

We support the Public Law 86–90 of the Captive Nations Week resolution of the U.S. Congress which expresses sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the independence of the nations of the world such as: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechia, Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Viet Nam and other nations against Communist tyranny and Red Moscow and Red Chinese foreign rule, and urge the re-establishment of their national freedom and state independence. Slovakia should also be recognized as an independent state.

To warn the Western world against supporting Titoism, which is the Trojan horse of Communism, and to support the re-establishment of the freedom and national independence of the Croatians, Serbians, Slovenians, and Macedonians, who are now condemned to live under Tito's regime of Communist tyranny.

We fully support the U.S. government efforts to put an end to the Soviet Russia and Red China aggression in South Viet Nam whose purpose is to destroy its national freedom and state independence, and to enslave not only its people but other nations in Asia, thus using their defeat as a springboard for seizure of the whole world into Communist slavery.

We warn our government and the whole free world against the policy of so-called co-existence which aims at the recognition by the free world of the status quo of Red Russia and Red China conquests as basis for the subversion action in the free world and for their further expansion to enslave free countries.

We stand for the peace in the whole world, but we want the just peace that guarantees freedom from all nations and countries. We believe that their peace must be by all means protected, otherwise every appeasement, every concession to the Communist aggression inspires them to further expansion which leads to a new inevitable world's war. The peace can be saved if Soviet Russia and Red China will be constantly aware that we are alert and determined to defend our peace and freedom.

We state that freedom and independence of the free countries in the world are threatened by Communist colonial imperialism. In our time of downfall of the colonial empires and rising of the national independence states, the vast Communist colonial empire, under the name of U.S.S.R., still remains; it continuously threatens the whole world and the free countries. This empire exploits brutally not only non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R., but also nations of so-called "satellites."

Therefore, we request the United Nations, the U.S. Government and the U.S. representatives in the United Nations to put on the agenda of its General Assembly the problem of the Soviet-Moscow colonialism in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaidjan, Byelorussia, Bulgaria, Czechia, Cossackia, East Germany, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Poland, Roumania, Slovakia, North Caucasia, Turkestan, Ukraine, and in other countries subjugated by Communist imperialism such as Albania, Cuba, Tibet, North Vietnam and North Korea enslaved by Red China. We condemn such colonialism and ask to exclude all Communist governments from the United Nations, and in their stead to admit the authorized representatives of the captive nations.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
NEW YORK, *July 1966.*

[From news from China, daily news report from Taipei provided by the Chinese Information Service]

TAIWAN PLANS OBSERVATION OF "CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK"

TAIPEI, July 16.—Various programs will be held in the Republic of China starting tomorrow to mark the annual "Captive Nations Week".

The main theme of this year's activities will be refuting the appeasement advocacies in the United States and calling for destruction of Chinese Communist nuclear installations.

All free nations will also be asked to render full support to South Vietnam to seek a total victory in its anti-Communist struggle.

A mass rally, to be attended by representatives from all walks of life of the nation, will take place at the Taipei City Hall on the morning of July 23.

Presided over by Ku Cheng-kang, president of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist

League, China Chapter, the rally will adopt resolutions in support of the Vietnamese people and the suffering people on the Chinese mainland.

Similar mass rallies will be held on the offshore islands of Kinmen (Quemoy) and Matsu, and in other major cities of Taiwan.

Mainland refugees and freedom seekers who have escaped from the Chinese mainland to Taiwan in the past years, will gather for a meeting at the Liberty House in Taipei Monday afternoon.

They will issue a joint statement, calling on the United States to support the Republic of China in recovering the Chinese mainland, overthrowing the Peiping regime and delivering the mainland populace from oppressive Communist rule.

Intellectuals, students, foreign students in Taiwan and professors will hold separate meetings starting tomorrow to mark the event.

Cathedrals, churches, Buddhist temples, mosques and all other religious establishments throughout the island will conduct services for all those people who have fallen victim to Communist atrocities.

The "Captive Nations Week" was initiated by the United States in 1959. It is marked every year in the third week of July.

[From Free News & Feature Service, July 26, 1966]

FORGET THE CAPTIVE NATIONS? THE TRUTHS AND THE GROWING WEEK

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Fortunately, since 1959, the world-wide observance of Captive Nations Week has steadily grown, and the basic truths about Soviet Russian imperialism, genocide and colonialist exploitation in the U.S.S.R., as well as the oppression of all the captive peoples by their totalitarian governments, are reaching more and more Americans. Although the White House unfortunately has played down the Week in recent years, our Governors, Mayors and citizens have broadened the annual observance.

By 1965, half of our States issued official proclamations, and practically every major city did likewise. Over one-third of the House of Representatives and close to one-third of the U.S. Senate have become members of the National Captive Nations Committee, which guides the annual observance. Local Captive Nations committees have sprung up in every section of the country. The Week is now observed overseas. . . ."

This year, the third week of July marks the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. During this week Free people will again raise their voices to honor the enslaved half of the world. They will emphasize again the things that must be done if the long list of captive nations—from Cuba to Hungary to Ukraine to North Vietnam is not to be extended and if our sins of omission today are not to result in unnecessary sacrifices of American life and treasure tomorrow.

BUILDING BRIDGES OF UNDERSTANDING

One of the chief themes of the 1966 Week is the building of bridges of understanding with the captive nations—the people themselves, rather than with the illegitimate regimes that hold them in bondage and politico-economic slavery. The bridge of understanding can only be one link in the mutual struggle for freedom—their freedom regained and ours preserved. To believe that by arriving at "understandings" with the Communist rulers we shall be furthering the freedom of the captive nations is not only an illusion but also an affront to common political sense. In addition, our wishful thinking about the early end of the Cold War—in itself a striking achievement of Moscow's "peaceful coexistence" policy—has blinded us to the realities of the Red Empire and has exposed us to further illusions about "mellowed Communists in Moscow and Warsaw," "independent Communists in Bucharest and Belgrade", and "the growing nationalism among satellite Communist regimes." On the contrary, a little exercise of logic itself would demonstrate that the power center of the Red Empire is the Soviet Union and all other parts even including Red China, depend for their ultimate survival upon this center. Moreover, if more of our people took the trouble to read the U.S. Senate study on The Soviet Empire (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965) they would find these illusions shattered as the story of current Russian genocide, colonialism and basic Stalinism is unraveled for them.

The crucial fact is that our people are not being told the full truth about people of the captive nations and their plight in the totalitarian Red States. Unpardonable ignorance, a morally irresponsible indifference, and restraining fears are frequently the ingredients of omission that in the long run exact a disproportionate cost. On May 26, 1966, President Johnson unequivocally stated, "The United States cannot condone the perpetuation of racial or political injustice anywhere in the world." Nowhere in this world is such injustice greater and more ruinous than in the Red Empire of captive nations.

Those of us who have been active in Captive Nations Week have opposed measures which tend to perpetuate the control of Communist regimes over the Captive Nations. Such measures would include the liberalization of trade with Eastern Europe, the promulgation of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty and proposals to admit Red China to the U.N. The 1966 Captive Nations Week is an appropriate time to stress our support of positive measures concentrating on the freedom of the captive nations. Among them, we might include the support of public and private "Freedom Academies," creation of a special Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations and the focusing of world attention on Sino-Soviet imperio-colonialism. We will further the cause of world freedom by never forgetting all the Captive Nations—those in the Soviet Union, in Central Europe, in Asia and Cuba.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 29, 1966]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: STRANGE CAPTIVES

Every year since 1959 Congress has devoted part of its time during the third week of July to commemorate Captive Nations Week. This year has been no exception. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the week beginning July 18 is filled with speeches by Senators and Congressmen lamenting the loss of freedom by the captive nations, and praising their virtues. Outside the halls of Congress, and possibly outside the groups who promoted it, there is little celebration of the event.

The odd thing about the captive nations is that a few of these areas never existed as independent states, while the geography of some is a mystery.

Cossackia is one of the captive nations. Where is Cossackia? Or where was it? The fact is that Cossackia, and some companion captive nations, were creations of the Nazi Foreign Office—a part of the administrative plan for ruling Europe during the thousand-year Reich.

Surely, there must be better ways of fighting communism than glorifying and perpetuating the work of the Nazis.

LEON J. STECK.

WASHINGTON.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST

(NOTE.—Parenthesized sentences were not printed by the Washington Post in its August 14 issue.)

Sir: (In priding yourself as an organ of liberal reporting, would you accord me the privilege to comment on the July 29 letter of Leon J. Steck titled "Strange Captives.")

(That' Mr. Steck knows little or nothing about the captive nations, the movement itself which is celebrated internationally with respect and solemnity, the history and geographic locations of the captive nations, and Cossackia, which he chose as his forte, is quite evident.

(If he were really familiar with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as he so eagerly wants to imply, he would have read the short history of the Week in a comprehensive article titled *The Traditional Captive Nations Week* and published in the RECORD of July 18 (pp. 15961–15965). He would also have learned that the movement has been on a steady increase every year since 1959. This year was no exception with more Governors and Mayors proclaiming it than ever before. Local captive nations committees have been established from Vermont to California, from Washington to Florida. The Week is also widely observed in Sweden, Australia, the Republic of China, Turkey, West Germany and many other countries.

("The odd thing" is not that some of the captive nations ostensibly "never existed as independent states"; the odd thing is that the letter writer is unaware of their past existence, yet decided to write on the subject.)

Anyone familiar with East European history knows that Cossackia has been in existence for a century-and-a-half and the term itself is inscribed in history. (For the writer's information,) the area is east of Ukraine and above the Caucasus. His statement that Cossackia and other captive nations were "creations of the Nazi Foreign Office" is an outworn fiction of Moscow propaganda (that seems to be perpetuated by some circles here.)

(If he is as interested in fighting communism as he seems to imply, then indeed, there is a better way and this is not by flattering its objectives and ultimate goals of world conquest but through the captive nations. The evidence as indicated in part by the article quoted above shows that Moscow and its puppets fear this way the most.)

VERA A. DOWHAN.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 9, 1966]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: MORE ON CAPTIVES

Captives are strange, as Mr. Steck's letter noted on July 29. Most also are unhappy and anxious to obtain the same independence and civil rights which so many people here and around the world seek. Why deny people of Cossackia or Idel-Ural a right to at least free discussion and dialogue, and a vote upon the kind of government they want for themselves?

Mr. Steck, indeed, seems to be a better student of the Nazi Foreign Office than of Russian imperialism. Cossackia, located in the North Caucasus, and Idel-Ural, located between the Volga and the Urals, are national groups which existed centuries before Hitler created his own version of Marxism and called it National Socialism.

Of course, if Mr. Steck can point out better ways of fighting communism than pointing out that Communists in power oppress the people and deny them freedoms they want, let him suggest such better ways.

DONALD L. MILLER.

WASHINGTON.

AUGUST 8, 1966.

THE WASHINGTON POST,
1515 L Street NW.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: In the Washington Post, on July 29, 1966, there was a letter to the editor titled "Strange Captives", and signed by Mr. Leon J. Steck.

Mr. Steck's statements in his letter do not correspond to the historical truth. Mr. Steck claims that some of the captive nations never existed as independent states, while the geography of some is a "mystery" to him.

However, all this is only a "preamble" to his letter, which is written only to say that "Cossackia is one of the captive nations," but "Where is Cossackia? Or—where was it?"

"The fact is," states Mr. Steck, "that Cossackia, and some companion captive nations, were creations of the Nazi Foreign Office—a part of the administrative plan for ruling Europe during the thousand-year Reich."

Is this the fact?—No! Absolutely not!

"Where is Cossackia? Or where was it?"—It is where the Cossacks lived and still live.

Who are the Cossacks?—According to old Russian sources, the Cossacks are one of the Slavic nations.

To be brief, in the New York Public Library there is a book by E. F. Zyablovsky titled *Newer Geography of the Russian Empire,* printed in Moscow in 1807 "with the permission of the Censor Committee of Moscow University." The third part of this book deals with the nationalities of Russia of that time. Here we find the following: I. *Russians*—the ruling nation in the Russian State; 2. *Cossacks*—Don Cossacks, Hreben Cossacks or Terek Cossacks, Volga Cossacks, Ural Cossacks, Black Sea Cossacks (inhabiting the lower Kuban River and the Azov Sea), and others; 3. *Poles . . .*"

What is Cossackia? Cossackia is the country of Cossacks.

Has there ever been Cossackia?—Of course, there has!

In the same New York Public Library there is another book, titled *The History of the Don Soldiers, Part I,* written by Aleksey Popov, the Director of Schools of Don Soldiers. Published in 1814 in Kharkov University, this book is dedicated to the Count M. I. Platov, the Don Cossack Otaman.

On page 3 of this book we read that the Don Soldiers "from ancient times were called Don Cossacks, and their land—Cossackia."

So, as we can see, it was "a little" before "the Nazi times!"

As to the geography of Cossackia, in this respect there should be no "mystery" either. Thus, for example, the Chicago Corn Exchange was very well acquainted before World War I with the geographical location of Kuban, which is a part of Cossackia. Any fluctuations in the Kuban harvest were reflected on the Chicago Exchange and even unstable weather-factors as rain at the wrong time were noted by it.

I, as an active participant of Cossack events of our times, should add another important Cossack occurrence: In January 1920 in Yekaterinohrad (as it was called then) in Kuban, the Cossack's Constituent Assembly "Supreme Circle of Don, Kuban, and Terek" was summond, which on January 24, 1920, decided to create a Cossack Union State (Cossack Federation or Cossack United States).

I was a member of that Constituent Assembly and a member of its "Constitution Commission."

Thus, there is no "mystery" about Cossack actions, as well as about Cossack geography.

Mr. Steck writes that "a few of these areas never existed as independent states." I would like to direct his attention to the following: At present there are more than 30 African states—members of the United Nations. Out of this number at least 20–25 states as late as 5–6 years ago were not independent (and had never been before), and also their names were not known.

So, let us Cossacks, a nation with the history of independence, but which had lost it some 250 years ago to a stronger neighbor, have an equal chance with the Africans in this era of "decolonialization".

Respectfully yours,

IGNAT A. BILYJ.

[From the Wanderer, Aug. 4, 1966]

AROUND THE WORLD: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(By Robert Morris)

Captive Nations Week is a tradition that makes most of our leaders, particularly in government and in churches, squirm. Its existence is testament to the greatest moral abdication of contemporary history. It exposes the pharisaical tendencies of our so-called civil rights leaders. It is something that our most vocal spokesmen would like to see fade away.

But it is here with us to remind us of our obligation to our fellow man all over the world. The people in all Communist countries are indeed captive peoples. They would all, if they had a democratic framework, vote themselves a different form of government. These people have not only lost some particular civil liberty, such as some of our minorities have here, but they have lost their civil liberties in their totality.

Nor can a case be made that these people are not our brothers in the great fraternity of men to whom we have a heavy obligation by divine command.

Yet most of our government leaders, some of our civil rights leaders and particularly many of our churchmen will writhe with uneasiness or become indignant when the subject comes up.

It is incomprehensible to me how such men as Martin Luther King can crusade for equality and civil liberties for his people and yet brazenly advocate bondage for the people of China or Vietnam, which he unquestionably does when he advocates recognition of Soviet China or our withdrawal from South Vietnam. He has advocated both of these and thereby has put himself directly in an inconsistent posture.

But when you analyze it, this inconsistency manifests itself in so many of the performances of the Liberal Establishment.

I would like to suggest that a real touchstone of sincerity for all spokesmen in the area of civil liberties is their attitude toward Captive Nations Week. If they want the tradition abolished and the poor people in bondage forgotten for an unforeseeable time, they should not be given a voice in the field of civil rights.

JULY 16, 1966.

SIR: For the eighth consecutive year the President of the United States has issued a proclamation designating the third week of July (July 17–25) as "Captive Nations Week". The Captive Nations Resolution (Public Law 86–90) established by a joint resolution of Congress and forming the basis for the Week, requests the President to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

As one might expect, the iniquitous rulers in the Kremlin are particularly disturbed by the continuing Captive Nations Week observances in the United States and other nations of the free world. The image the Kremlin rulers attempt to create showing themselves to be genuinely interested in peace and helping to relax tensions by giving greater "freedom" to their satellites is suddenly dissipated when they are confronted by the Captive Nations Week observances and possible ramifications following therefrom. The barbarity of their nature is revealed as they—in the most vile and derogatory terms—denounce the President, Members of Congress, and participating Americans for proclaiming and supporting Captive Nations Week. And why the bitter tirades and denunciations? The reason becomes apparent after a brief examination of Public Law 86–90.

The significant feature of the Captive Nations Resolution is that it recognizes and specifically names not only Central European nations commonly regarded as being captive including Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Rumania, and the like; but also recognizes and names approximately a dozen non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union including Ukraine, Lithuania, Armenia, and others.

Increasing awareness of the realities and myths regarding the Soviet Union in the free world, in large part due to the implementation of the Captive Nations Resolution is indeed a source of consternation for Moscow. More people in the free world are beginning to realize that the Soviet Union is inhabited by more non-Russians than Russians; that the mineral and industrial wealth of the Soviet Union to a large extent lies within the boundaries of the non-Russian nations without which Soviet Russia would be a third rate power; that the non-Russian people of the so-called "Soviet Republics" continue to have an intense desire to be free and to have the right of self determination which rights were forcibly taken from them by Soviet Russia shortly after they had declared their independence following the collapse of the Czarist Russian Empire; that therefore, the monolithic Soviet Union concept continually advanced by Moscow represents nothing more than a colossal myth when confronted by these enduring realities.

Most frightening to the Kremlin rulers, of course, is the possibility that the growing knowledge of the truth regarding Soviet Russian imperio—colonialism will eventually be factored into our foreign policy determinations.

The desire of the people of the captive nations, both inside and outside the Soviet Union, to secure their independence constitutes the most powerful deterrent to war and the best hope for a just and lasting peace among nations.

Sincerely,

WALTER PRETKA.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 8, 1966]

UP WITH IDEL-URAL

Knowing well that the best way to fight communism is to blow hard on it, the Congress in 1959 "authorized and requested" the President to designate the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. Ever solicitous of the Executive's geographical shortcomings, the Congress identified the nations thereby to be blessed. Its list included not only such ancient and recognized lands as White Ruthenia and Turkestan but historic Cossackia and storied Idel-Ural too.

The President has unaccountably delayed in issuing the prescribed annual "Captive Nations Proclamation." In recent years he has even failed to name the nations for whose benefit he was issuing the proclamation. We trust, nonetheless, that Congress' fervor for the freedom and independence of Cossackia and Idel-Ural will receive its due.

A REPLY BY DR. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY AND CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE TO THE WASHINGTON POST'S JULY 8 EDITORIAL "UP WITH IDEL-URAL"

The editorial is not without some measure of intellectual humor, mixed with obvious ingredients of sarcasm. When a number of

people asked for my reaction to it, I simply replied that "The editors of this organ should continue writing about Idel-Ural, Cossackia and other integral parts of the Soviet Union. In time they will educate themselves and many of their readers. And this will be all to the good." In this respect, the apparently irritated editor has done us all a great favor.

As usual, the editorial is studded with factual inaccuracies and poor judgment. But this, too, is part of the process of education; time in, the condition will be overcome.

Now for the points. Plainly, the best way to fight "communism"—in reality Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and the Red Chinese one, too—is to blow hard on it, with firmness, a certitude of one's own position, and with a determined vision of its defeat and demise.

Second, the President did not "unaccountably" delay issuing his Captive Nations Week proclamation. In fact, he timed it very well on July 8, the historic date of the announcement of our Declaration of Independence and his announcement of the establishment of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

Third, to state that in recent years the President has even failed "to name the nations for whose benefit he was issuing the proclamation" is grossly untrue and typical of the paper's editorial comments. One need only to read all the Presidential proclamations from Eisenhower's in 1959 to Johnson's in 1965 to establish the untruth of such assertions. The references to the captive nations have always been general and all-inclusive.

Finally, the editor needn't worry that Congress will misplace his trust in its fervor for the independence and freedom of all peoples, including those of Cossackia and Idel-Ural. The President's proclamation was comprehensive to include all; Congress' determination to have all nations enjoy the blessings of freedom has never been less. It's comforting to note the editor's expression of trust and concern. Yes, indeed, Up With Idel-Ural!

[From America, Ukrainian Catholic Daily, Aug. 11, 1966]

NATIONWIDE OBSERVANCES OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

NEW YORK, N.Y.—At least 35 States and mayors of scores of cities throughout the United States issued proclamations urging statewide and local observances of this year's Captive Nations Week.

Listed below is a partial list of states that heeded President Lyndon B. Johnson's call to observe the week of July 17–23 with "appropriate ceremonies and activities":

Governors and states proclaming Captive Nations Week included: George C. Wallace, Alabama; William A. Egan, Alaska; Samuel P. Goddard, Arizona; Orvil E. Faubus, Arkansas; Edmund G. Brown, California; John A. Love, Colorado; John Dempsey, Connecticut; Charles L. Terry, Jr., Delaware; John A. Burns, Hawaii; Harold E. Hughes, Iowa; Otto Kerner, Illinois; Roger D. Branigin, Indiana; Edward T. Breathitt, Kentucky; John H. Reed, Maine; J. Millard Tawes, Maryland; John A. Volpe, Massachusetts; George Romney, Michigan; Warren E. Hearnes, Missouri; John W. King, New Hampshire; Richard J. Hughes, New Jersey; Jack M. Campbell, New Mexico; Nelson A. Rockefeller, New York; Dan K. Moore, North Carolina; William L. Guy, North Dakota; James A. Rhodes, Ohio; Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon; William W. Scranton, Pennsylvania; John H. Chafee, Rhode Island; Robert E. McNair, South Carolina; G. Clement, Tennessee; John Connally, Texas; Calvin L. Rempton, Utah; Philip H. Hoff, Vermont; Mills E. Godwin, Jr., Virginia; Warren P. Knowles, Wisconsin.

A proclamation was also issued by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The mayors of a large number of American cities also marked Captive Nations Week by signing proclamations, often attended by delegations of representatives of the Captive Nations, Ukrainians prominently among them.

BOSTON MARKED CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

BOSTON, MASS.—"Our country's abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty and human dignity makes it appropriate and proper that we manifest to the peoples of the captive nations our sympathies and prayers for their freedom and national independence, and that we recognize and encourage constructive actions which foster the growth and development of these rights," was stated by Governor John A. Volpe of Massachusetts in his proclamation issued on the occasion of the Captive Nations Week.

Mayor John F. Collins of Boston in his proclamation, after enumerating all captive nations which lost their independence through direct and indirect aggression of Russian Communists, urged Bostonians to "dedicate their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world."

INFORMING THE PUBLIC

In keeping with President Johnson's statement of "building bridges of understanding" with the captive world, special emphasis was put on informing the public, through newspapers and radio, about captive nations. In addition to press releases and copies of proclamations, each major daily in Massachusetts, as well as in Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Maine, received a special letter for publication in the "letters to the editor" column. As of this writing, The Boston Herald (Boston, Mass.), The Standard Times (New Bedford, Mass.), Manchester Union Leader (Manchester, N.H.), and The Hartford Times (Hartford, Conn.) carried the letter.

ACTION ON THE FLOOD RESOLUTION

In separate letters from the Boston UCCA, Massachusetts Congressmen were urged to initiate action in the House Rules Committee to act upon the pending Flood Resolution (H. Res. 14), proposing the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

NEW ENGLAND COMMITTEE FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS

This year's observance was sponsored by the New England Committee for Captive Nations, which consists of American, Latvian, Lithuanian, Hungarian, Polish, and Ukrainian representatives of Greater Boston and vicinity. The Boston Chapter of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is represented by Mr. Orest Szczudluk, its Vice President. The Committee is also planning a big rally and motorcade which will take place in October.

[From Human Events magazine, Aug. 13, 1966]

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF CAPTIVE NATIONS REVOLTED AGAINST U.S.S.R.?

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

"What would happen if five captive nations of East Europe revolted against their Russian-imposed regimes at the same time?"

This was the question that I put to several fellow guests at the recent annual Captive Nations Week dinner here in Washington.

My thought was so far removed from current thinking that even refugees from those countries seemed stunned. Then each asked for an explanation. "You mean, Mr. Mowrer?"

"I am supposing that a 'little war of liberation' breaks out in each of, say, five or more captive nations, on the same day, possibly by agreement among the patriots. Would the Soviet Union try to suppress them? If it did, could it treat all five as it treated Hungary back in 1956? Also, I am asking [of each refugee leader among those questioned] whether your people are ready for such a revolt."

Here are some replies: "The Polish people are anti-Communist and the Soviet Union forced communism upon them in part, thanks to clever exploitation of their hatred of Nazi Germany. Let the Russian troops withdraw with no chance of returning and communism in Poland will not last a week."

My Czechoslavakian friend said: "We are a less passionate people than, say, the Poles. Our forte is passive resistance. You remember the Good Soldier Schweik of the novel. In 1948 a number of people were ready to give communism a try. But what happened? The Soviets systematically milked our industry, buying at a low price, selling us oil at an extravagant figure.

"The stooge Communist government made no effort to keep our once magnificent industries in good shape, still less to modernize them. In consequence, Czechoslovakia, which once had a living standard second only to that of Germany, is now in permanent economic crisis. Ninety per cent of the people would rebel tonight if they saw a chance of success, meaning no Soviet intervention."

From another leading refugee: "We Bulgarians had a historical friendship for Russia which made Russian-imposed communism more palatable at first. Now after 20-odd years, the mass of Bulgarians are not only savagely anti-Communist but anti-Russian as well."

A fourth: "Edgar, we Hungarians got our lesson in 1956. We drove out our oppressors and begged for Western assistance. You know what we got: nothing! The Hungarian people are ready for a new revolt at any time—but only if they are sure of American assistance. We see no more chance of that from this Administration than from those of Eisenhower and Kennedy."

I insisted. "Suppose five captive nations revolted simultaneously regardless of outside assistance, what would, and what could, the Soviets do?"

Each of the four gave virtually the same answer. "My people will not revolt without being confident of outside assistance, which, with Europe in its present defeatist mood, means American assistance.

"Nonetheless, you are right—if five captive peoples rose against communism at the same time, particularly if Russo-Chinese tensions had grown sharper, the Russians would be incapable of dealing with more than one or two of them. The others would recover their freedom. Then of course, it would be up to you Americans to see that they keep it—by say, moving in your NATO forces from Germany. Unhappily, I see no sign of even that much will for liberation on the part of your Administration. Do you?"

I had to admit that I saw little or none. Some U.S. officials are in such terror of new revolts by the captive nations that they talk—only half seriously, of course—of assisting the Soviets in repressing them if they occur!

Nonetheless, I put a last question to myself: 'If the United States can risk escalation and nuclear destruction in defense of the South Vietnamese, why does it fear to take the same risk in order to restore freedom to suffering peoples for whose plight FDR was at least partly responsible?"

ARREST OF MIHAJLO MIHAJLOV BY YUGOSLAVIA GROUNDS FOR REVIEW OF AMERICAN AID TO TITO

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-

man 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent arrest by Yugoslavia police of Mihajlo Mihajlov again demonstrates the weakness of the already questionable theory upon which much of the Johnson administration's policy toward Eastern Europe is based. The theory is that we should work to make independent from Moscow such Communist nations as Poland, Yugoslavia, and Rumania, because an independent Communist state, in which the people have a certain degree of internal freedom, serves our national interest by weakening the ideological hold of international communism.

Thus the administration wishes to aid these countries not because we expect their votes in the United Nations or military and political support from them, but to make them economically independent of the Soviet Union, to normalize their relations with the West and thereby enable them to extend a degree of liberty to the people of Eastern Europe.

This policy has obvious appeal, and as pointed out in Foreign Affairs in January 1965, in an article entitled, "Communist Rule in Eastern Europe," by John M. Montias, it sometimes appears to work. But, the premise upon which it is based is challenged by the actions of men such as Marshal Tito, Communist leader of Yugoslavia. Last week he gave a dramatic demonstration of police state control. It came shortly after the House had rejected my amendment to limit U.S. credit to Yugoslavia under the Food for Freedom Act.

On June 9, the House approved, over my objection, a committee amendment under which Tito's police state is eligible for 40-year credit on food purchases—with 10 years of that time at only 1 percent interest and the balance at 2½ percent interest.

In a period when American citizens have to pay 6 percent interest and more for money they borrow, why should these same citizens, as taxpayers, be required to finance at 1 and 2½ percent interest Communist regimes that deny press freedom?

It is one thing to authorize attractive credit terms for countries which protect the basic rights of their own citizens—like India, for example, but quite another to authorize such terms for a Communist country.

At present Yugoslavia can get only 20-year cutrate credit under the Public Law 480 program—food for freedom—and, in my book that is 20 years too long.

Tito, by the arrest of Mr. Mihajlov, showed that things really have not changed much in Yugoslavia.

Mr. Mihajlov had announced plans to convoke a conference in Zadar to launch an independent sociopolitical periodical which would provide balance to the otherwise one-party press in Yugoslavia. It was a specific challenge involving press freedom. Despite his belief that his proposed periodical is entirely legal under the Yugoslav Constitution, he was arrested and lingers today in jail.

Freedom of the press is of course basic to any liberalization of a totalitarian regime, and the imprisonment of Mr. Mihajlov is dramatic evidence that Marshal Tito still operates Yugoslavia as a garrison state. The United States should carefully review its entire aid program to Yugoslavia, especially the program under Public Law 480. The U.S. taxpayers should not be required to finance a police state government which denies basic rights to the people of Yugoslavia.

The New York Times in an editorial, August 10, sought to justify the arrest by stating that it testified to fear in Belgrade that an opposition magazine such as the one planned by Mr. Mihajlov could become the nucleus for a politically significant organized opposition party in the future.

The arrest, said the Times, showed that Yugoslavia has moved "part of the way from totalitarianism" in that he previously was able to publish articles critical of the Soviet Union. That this was permitted is only natural, since Marshal Tito is himself publicly critical of the Soviet Union at times, and Mr. Mihajlov was merely expressing what Marshal Tito has for many years held out as public policy. The Times believes we can draw some comfort from the fact that, first, Mr. Mihajlov was not banished, and, second, he did, by the arrest, attract international attention to his cause.

The subtle distinctions between banishment and lingering in prison without trial, perhaps even for many years, escapes me. The end result of both is the same: denial of human freedom. While it is true that Mr. Mihajlov attained his goal of worldwide publicity for his efforts to achieve a genuine democracy in Yugoslavia it is questionable whether he receives any personal satisfaction from this. In a matter of a few days his arrest and the attention it brought will have passed from the front pages of the major newspapers, and he and his efforts will have been forgotten. But Mr. Mihajlov will remain in prison. Were he free, then he could achieve in a much more lasting and permanent measure the goal for which he strives, social democracy in Yugoslavia.

The Washington Post has correctly stated the issue involved:

> Mihajlo Mihajlov offered his government a hard but fair test of its fidelity to its own principles. By arresting him, the government failed the test.

If Tito really wants to deserve financial aid from U.S. taxpayers, he should turn over a new leaf by releasing Mihajlov and permitting him to operate a truly free press.

If Tito does not do so, the Congress should rescind 40-year attractive credit terms for food and cancel all other forms of aid to Yugoslavia.

PRIVATE AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a recent report of the Council for Financial Aid to Education states that during the 1964–65 school year private gifts to colleges and universities amounted to approximately $1.56 billion dollars. With the ever-increasing tendency to look to the Federal Government for financial help, the knowledge that the private sector is still enough concerned with our educational institutions to contribute this substantial sum is certainly reassuring. As I have stated before, there is legislation pending before Congress which would further aid private contributors to assist the institutions of their choice. By the use of tax credits and the tax sharing or tax retention plan, additional funds could be channeled into the educational field without the Federal Government being involved.

Private efforts to fund educational institutions must be encouraged, and for this reason I include the editorial from the Chicago Tribune of August 16 entitled, "How Private Colleges Help Themselves," in the RECORD at this point:

HOW PRIVATE COLLEGES HELP THEMSELVES

In January, 1965, when President Johnson asked Congress to provide about 800 million dollars a year in aid to colleges and universities, he said that private sources and states simply could not do the job and that "federal aid is essential."

Despite a murmur of "amens" from many hard-pressed college presidents, Mr. Johnson vastly underestimated the determination of private colleges to find their own help and the willingness of private sources to provide it.

The Council for Financial Aid to Education, a business group, has reported that in the school year 1964–65 private gifts to colleges and universities amounted to no less than 1.56 billion dollars. This was about six times what they received 10 years earlier. Assuming the same rate of growth, gifts in the school year just ended will approach 2 billion dollars.

A few examples should speak for themselves. The University of Chicago is seeking 360 million dollars in 10 years—the highest goal ever set by any college. Harvard led the do-it-yourself financing procession in 1960 by raising 82.5 million dollars. M.I.T., taking the cue, set out to obtain 66 million and got 98 million. The University of Southern California set a 20-year goal of 106 million dollars and reached it in five years. Stanford has raised 113 million dollars, Brandeis 76 million, Cornell 73 million, and Princeton 61 million.

The will to help themselves is not confined to the big institutions. Little Tougaloo college, a Negro school in Mississippi, is out for 30 million dollars in 10 years. When the Ford Foundation turned down an appeal from Rockford [Ill.] college, its president, John Howard, told the magazine Business Week, "we went right ahead and raised the money anyhow."

Rockford is one of the colleges which have been firmest in their determination to avoid Federal handouts in the form of "assistance." Mr. Johnson may deny that such assistance leads to federal control, but the Supreme court has settled the matter more authoritatively. "It is hardly lack of due process," it ruled in 1942 in a case involving

a farmer, "for the government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

Once a system of subsidies is broadly established, there will be any number of bureaucratic agencies eager to kibitz with ideas about whom the colleges should admit, whom they should hire as teachers, and what they should teach.

James M. Hester, president of New York university, which is on its way toward a 100-million-dollar goal, attributes the greatness of American education to "healthy competition between public and private colleges."

"We are proving," according to him, "that there is sufficient regard for this dual system to provide support for private institutions with high standards."

The figures suggest that he is right. Even Mr. Johnson seems to have had second thoughts, judging from his failure to press for money for everything that he promised and his more recent desire to shift the student loan program to private funds. He should let private capital show what it can do before providing the Trojan horse which will ultimately and inevitably carry government educationists, social planners, and other meddlers onto the campuses of the private colleges.

THE 44TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ORDER OF AHEPA

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my greetings to the 46,000 members of the Order of AHEPA who are in Washington this week for their 44th annual convention. I want to do a rather unusual thing and list six of them who are from San Diego and to express to them a special welcome. They are: Chris Stassis; Basil Curtis; John Sotiros; George Koulaxizes; Mike James, and Maneuel Xenedes.

In case a few Members are confused, the word AHEPA stands for American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. It has chapters in 49 States and in all Canadian Provinces, in Australia, the Bahamas and, of course, in Greece.

The objectives of AHEPA—and of its auxiliary organizations, the Daughters of Penelope, the Sons of Pericles and the Maids of Athena—are simple. They are to encourage and promote the loyalty of the members to the country where they are citizens, while promoting a better understanding of Hellenic culture. To this end AHEPA seeks to instill a due appreciation of the privilege of citizenship; to encourage active participation in the political, civic, social and commercial fields; to oppose political corruption and tyranny and to promote good fellowship and altruism.

Once before, in 1952, AHEPA held a convention in Washington, D.C., and its last convention was in Athens, Greece. I know that we are happy to have them here again in this city we like to hope is as enlightened as historic Athens.

Personally, I wish to extend a heartfelt welcome to Kimon A. Doukas, supreme president of AHEPA and to all the many men and women who meet in Washington to discuss, plan, and pray for the activities of this worthy organization.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE FLORENCE P. DWYER, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON THE DEATH OF AARON G. BENESCH, FORMER ASSOCIATE EDITOR OF THE NEWHOUSE NATIONAL NEWS SERVICE

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report to the House the death this morning of a man known to many of our colleagues as one of the ablest, fairest, and most truly professional journalists who have covered Congress—Aaron G. Benesch, former associate editor of the Newhouse National News Service and Washington correspondent of the Newark Star-Ledger.

When he retired last December 31, Aaron Benesch had completed more than 50 years of service in one of the most demanding and vital of our professions—50 years that spanned every aspect of journalism, from copy boy to reporter to national correspondent to news executive.

In the course of his outstanding career, he won the affection and respect of all with whom he came in contact, colleagues and public officials alike.

It was my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to know and work with Aaron Benesch during his years as correspondent for the Newark Star-Ledger. He was always fair and objective, a skillful writer, and a penetrating observer of politics and government in Washington. He was also a very good friend.

A native of St. Louis, Aaron Benesch began in the newspaper business as a $3-a-week copy boy on the old St. Louis Star. Later, he reported on the activities of the Missouri State Legislature. His coverage of national politics goes back to 1928 and the Republican National Convention in Kansas City which nominated Herbert Hoover for President. He also worked for the old St. Louis Times, where he served, among other capacities, as managing editor.

Aaron first came to Washington in 1951 as Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. He returned to St. Louis in 1953 for a 4-year stint as managing editor of the Globe-Democrat. He came back to Washington in 1957 with the Newhouse National News Service as associate editor of one of the largest news bureau in the Nation's Capital and as correspondent of the Newark Star-Ledger, one of the principal members of the Newhouse organization.

As one who was intimately involved with New Jersey affairs at that time, Aaron very generously served in the role of historian of the New Jersey State Society.

At his retirement party late last year, Aaron Benesch was privileged to hear at firsthand how very highly he was regarded by those with whom he worked. People from every area of government and journalism in Washington attended the reception and many came from distant places to honor this fine gentleman and great reporter and editor. Many others sent messages expressing their esteem and affection.

Among the tributes paid to Aaron Benesch was this one from former President Harry Truman:

> You have put in all of 50 years in the hectic field of journalism and that is a long time even in a normal field of operation. I hope your transition from over-activity to retirement is as comfortable for you as it has been for me.

For Aaron Benesch, journalism was a demanding and rewarding world. He gave it his best. He mastered it and served it well. He brought honor to his profession.

To Eva Benesch, his wife and close companion, and to all his family, I offer my deepest sympathy at their great loss—a loss we all share.

MANCHESTER UNITED FUND REVIVES WORLD WAR II CUSTOM; COMMUNITY LEADERS GIVE PERSONAL FAREWELL TO SERVICEMEN

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of the United Fund, community leaders of Manchester, N.H., have revived the World War II custom of saying a personal farewell to men departing for military service. I hope this practice will be adopted by all other communities in the country during this period of war.

In this way, the whole community expresses the hundred different poignant feelings of farewell, good luck, and support that are so hard to put into words. At the same time, the presence of these leaders on these occasions serves to remind the community itself of our commitment to defend freedom and what it costs to do so.

Manchester is a departure point for our whole area. I would like to put into the RECORD a short article appearing in the Manchester Union-Leader, July 26, describing the first of these sendoffs, including the names of the 26 men and their hometowns in New Hampshire and Vermont. Godspeed to them and our thanks to Mr. Albert Mattison of the United Fund, who originated the sendoff idea, and to Mayor Vallee of Man-

chester and the other officials who so willingly carried it out.

The article follows:

SENDOFF GIVEN 26 ENLISTEES

Mayor Roland S. Vallee, members of the Manchester Board of Aldermen, and others braved the weather at Grenier Field yesterday to give an official farewell to 26 enlistees leaving by plane to start their military careers.

Others on hand were George Connell, general manager of the Union Leader and a member of the farewell advisory committee; Albert Mattison, executive director of the United Fund of Greater Manchester who originated the revival of the World War II custom; Philip DeRing, acting public relations director of the local United Fund; and military officials.

Enlisting in the Army and being sent to Ft. Dix, N.J., were: Roy A. Tucker, Walter J. Lord, Bradford B. Felton, Jack F. Morin, Ronald H. Adjutant, Dan A. Sheehan, John A. Robertson Jr., Richard G. Godbout, and Kenneth R. McCann, all of Manchester; Frank J. Sullivan of Nashua; Peter B. Chapman and Michael S. Chwater, both of Portsmouth; Douglas B. Foster of Keene; and Richard R. Viens of Berlin.

Phillip A. Burbank and Ralph Batten Jr., both of Portsmouth, both began a tour in the Air Force.

The following Vermonters also left to begin Army service: Clifford N. Davis, William M. Flint, Danny H. Bedell, and Sidney A. Waite Jr., all of Barre; Francis C. Rivers, Philip M. Germaine, and John C. Bolduc, all of Burlington; and Donald E. Leclair, Joseph R. Gaborialut, and Robert A. Bengston, all of St. Johnsbury.

NEEDED: A CULTURAL EXCHANGE CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, en su mensaje al Congreso del mes de Febrero urgiendo la aprobación de la Acta Internacional de Educación, el Presidente Johnson nos urgió aumentar a un grado universal la tarea de mejorar la educación de nuestra gente.

En este diá yo quisiera enfocar nuestra atención sobre una area—una area en particular—en ese proyecto de superacion.

To those of my colleagues—and the Official Reporter of debate—who experienced some frustration during the first minute of this speech, you have my profound sympathy. The feeling that flows from an inability to understand is an awful one. Perhaps you recognized the language as Spanish. Perhaps you could identify one or two words, but still could not understand my message.

With this experience in mind I now ask you to use your imagination to project yourselves into another situation. Pretend you are 5 or 6 years old and arriving for your first day of school. You speak English, the language of your parents. But everyone around you speaks Spanish. You are laughed at, teased, and held up to disdain. As if this were not humiliating enough, you are now told by your teacher that you must henceforth communicate in the classroom only in Spanish, a language you cannot understand, a language which you may come to understand slowly but which you will always speak with a thick, and to many of your classmates, a humorous accent. On your first day of school you have suffered a humiliating defeat—the first of many yet to come.

If you can imagine this, my distinguished colleagues, you can perhaps appreciate the terrible pressures placed upon an American child of Mexican descent by our rigid, Anglo-oriented school system. For the first few years of his tender existence he is raised in a Spanish cultural tradition. He understands Spanish. His parents speak it. The first words he hears and the first words he speaks are Spanish. He begins to develop what could be truly a bilingual ability.

But that ability is suddenly, ruthlessly squashed by a system geared to a monocultural, monolingual society which proceeds to strip the child of his heritage, his dignity, his pride, and his very personality. He must then struggle to assimilate another culture—the Anglo-Saxon. This battle he fights throughout grade school only to learn when he reaches high school that he has been the victim of a cruel, ironic joke.

He now finds that he is expected to learn another language. But it is too late. The pressures of grade school have left him with a stunted ability in both languages and both cultures. Worse than that, the system has left him, after many humiliating defeats, with a spirit broken of pride and the desire to go on.

The results have been tragic, as is shown in our 1960 census:

The median scholastic achievement level of the Mexican-American student in the Pacific Southwest is far behind that of his Anglo-American classmates.

The census showed that in Arizona, the Mexican-American completed a median 7 years of school, nearly 4 years less than his Anglo-American classmates.

In California, my own State, I am sad to say that the Mexican-American completed a median 8.6 years, 3½ less than his Anglo-American classmates.

In Colorado, the Mexican-American finished 8.1 years, exactly 4 years less than his classmates.

In New Mexico, he completed 7.7 years, nearly 4 years less than his classmates.

And in Texas, with its 2 million Mexican-Americans, he completed a mere 4.7 median years of education, less than half the education received by his Anglo-American classmates.

San Antonio, Tex., with its high Mexican-American population has the most depressed wage of any metropolis in the Nation.

A 1965 special census survey in East Los Angeles, which has perhaps the largest concentration of Mexican Americans in the United States, showed that the earning power of the people living there has actually decreased in recent years, in grim contrast to the earning power of other ethnic groups in our society.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, we are squandering one of our country's greatest resources, and yet we have never needed our Americans of Latin American heritage more than we need them right now.

Latin America, with its 28 nations and 200 million people, today should be looking to us for leadership in education. The President has set forth as one of our great foreign policy goals helping to educate the underdeveloped nations of the world. And we should do that. This Nation should take the lead in international education, especially in our own hemisphere, and I shall suggest a manner in which we can do that shortly.

But how can we expect to participate in educating Latin Americans when we have not done the job of educating our own countrymen who are of Latin American descent. Therefore, if we are to pursue the President's long-term goal of helping our Latin American neighbors educate their people we had better get busy educating our own.

We need to bring to bear on this problem the resources, the programs and policies that will encourage State efforts in this critical area of concern. We need to continue and expand the beginning that has been made under Project Headstart. We need to consider the kind of constructive proposal that the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], has put forth in his legislation for "Project Good Start." This program would follow through on Headstart continuing to give those children who need it the extra support and encouragement through the elementary grades. We need to establish programs which will train teachers to deal specifically with the problems of the bilingual student and programs which would assist him in perfecting, not destroying, a precious talent.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, our first step in taking the lead in education in this hemisphere would be to give top priority to see that our own people who are of Latin American descent get the opportunities and the education to which the rest of us have access.

Our next step, Mr. Speaker, should be to search out the avenues in education which we could pursue in becoming an effective catalyst to bring about cultural and political understanding among American Republics of the North and South.

Personally, I feel that one such avenue stands out. That would be the creation of a cultural interchange center to establish new lines of north-south communication, to invite new understanding and new rapport in common commitments toward common goals, and to bring organization and support to the many diverse efforts now being made by colleges and universities, by governments, and private foundations, and by the dedication of individuals to bring about harmony of purpose and action in our hemisphere.

The people of California, including its nearly 2 million Mexican and Latin Americans, are anxious and willing to initiate such an effort.

In recent weeks, I have discussed the need for a cultural interchange center with persons both from our State and other States.

Individually, they envision many things that such a center could do—but the sum of their visions is that it could create an atmosphere for progress in our hemispheric relations, that it could cement the good intentions of hemispheric leadership into action programs evolving from coordinated study and coordinated project planning, and it could allow us to harness the human resources of nearly 2 million Spanish-speaking people in California alone, plus several million others throughout our Nation, into a positive, cohesive force.

In working toward the creation of such a center, the United States could become the catalyst to bring about cultural and political understanding among American Republics of the north and the south. Today such understanding is still a long way from reality.

Many American nations to our south have numerous cultural values, such as language, which tend to fuse them. Because of this common Hispanic and Indian cultural heritage, they share an innate understanding of each other's concerns.

But effective communication between our Nation and our sister American Republics is often stopped short—in spite of the best intentions on the part of both parties—because of a lack of trust or "simpatia" brought about by our different cultural frames of reference.

As a nation that is basically Anglo-Saxon in heritage, we sometimes find it difficult to perceive the needs of our neighbors as they perceive them.

Conversely, they often misintepret our forward, outgoing approaches as being aggressive and overbearing.

If we are to work effectively and cooperatively with our neighbors, we must establish a base for understanding. This is to our benefit as much as it is to theirs. Together, with a program of international education, we in the Americas can work as a mighty force for world betterment, for the implementation of meaningful, cooperative constructive ventures. Cultural interchange on a significant scale must take place. I can think of no more effective means to bring about understanding than a program or programs which would allow the creative minds of the United States to interact with the creative minds of Mexico and Latin America.

Some programs aimed toward this end have already been initiated. However, the number of participants is pitifully small. According to the latest statistics available from the Office of Education, only 323 Latin American students were admitted to our colleges and universities in the scholastic year 1964–65 with U.S. Government financial assistance under the exchange program. Under the same program, only 69 students from the United States went to schools in Latin America.

Other exchange agreements, involving sister city participation, "Operation Amigos" in San Diego; the Peace Corps; AID; U.S. Office of Education and U.S. Information Agency, have proven at a grassroots level that there are many rewards to mutual understanding.

Last February, our President pointed out that education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes, and that it must be at the heart of our international relations.

With Mexico and Latin America, there is a special path for us to follow to achieve the trust and rapport which we seek.

This is where our 5 million Americans of Latin American descent can provide the educational and cultural link which we need.

I urge that we step boldly into cooperative educational programs with Latin American countries, but that we do so fully cognizant of our past errors, both at home and across the border. Also, I urge that we call upon the talents of our own loyal Mexican Americans to help us set the guidelines and form the policies which will allow a program of cultural interchange to grow and broaden us all.

In my State of California, there are many Mexican-American educators who are totally qualified to administer such a program. Many of them have been fighting the battle of better education for the bilingual, bicultural child for decades. Until recently their voices have been muted by the standard bearers of the status quo, educational dust collectors who oppose change on general principle—who think that interchange is a one-direction street.

The Mexican American is in a unique position to help us identify and develop educational projects of value to all the peoples of the Americas. We must use him, not for his sake, but for the sake of all of us. He is our bridge between two great cultures.

It is important, in undertaking any such project, that we realize that we are not embarking on a sentimental project of good will and conviviality. We are making a solid investment in the future.

A cultural interchange center could serve to encourage human betterment through the provision of a basis for further action in national and international development and programs of advanced education. It could provide scholarships to students from Mexico, Central America, South America, and the United States, with special interests and special abilities which could be harnessed to foster intercultural harmony. It could disseminate knowledge and create new knowledge. It could serve as a coordination center for the entry of Latin American students to the United States, and the exit of North American students to the countries south of us. It could provide a demonstration center for creative, new techniques in such areas as bilingual, bicultural schools.

We are entering an era where the man with one language and one culture will be at a disadvantage in world society. This man will not be able to represent his country, to present his government's attitudes and goals, effectively as a monolingual, monocultural being.

The United States needs to develop hundreds of such citizens, individuals who are truly functional in two languages and two societies, if it is to make an impact on Latin America.

Conversely, it needs to acquaint potential Latin American leaders with our country, our culture, our goals, and responsibilities as a nation of world influence.

Exchanging persons, allowing them to study the modes of their neighbors, encouraging them to grow into positions of leadership in fostering better intrahemispheric communication, is probably the least expensive and most effective means of achieving the kind of unity of purpose that must come to our hemisphere.

Capitalizing on the human resources of every nation in the Americas, including our own, we are creating a dual man—one who is fully functional in both the Anglo-American and Hispanic-Indian societies. We are shaping and sharpening his experiences and knowledge in both cultures.

Through education, we are giving the promising young men and women of our hemisphere the cultural mobility which they must have if they are to weave together the great people and the great cultural assets of the United States and Latin America.

I envision a cultural center which would encourage educational interchange between these two continents, which would harness the dormant natural talent we have in California and other States of the Southwest, and which would coordinate this interchange.

I feel that U.S. leadership is wanted and needed for such a center to become a reality. I know the people of my State of California would be willing to do everything within their power to bring about such a unique and beneficial center.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN].

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise in support of proposals offered by a colleague who so ably represents a county adjoining my own.

The building of a cultural interchange center is certainly a creative solution for lessening the gap that separates the two great cultures of North and South America. Even though we are neighbors in the same hemisphere, the nations of South America and the United States often fall victim to the tensions and mistrust that feed upon a lack of communication and understanding.

The creation of a cultural interchange center is a positive, advantageous venture when judged by the standards of our foreign and national self-interest. Such a center, dedicated to education and communication, would do much to bring into harmony the cultural and political goals of the two great Americas. Only by constructing a firm foundation of understanding can all the nations of the Western Hemisphere work together to solve our common problems in a meaningful way.

Domestically, we would have much to gain. The State of California is fortunate to have a resource as valuable as its 2 million Mexican-American citizens. These citizens, whose roots are to be

found in the cultures of both English- and Spanish-speaking nations, can perform a meaningful service in helping us establish the guidelines the center will follow and the goals it will hope to achieve.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we would be guilty of negligence if we did not take advantage of this creative solution for both increasing understanding and communication between the nations of North and South America, and harnessing into a constructive force the talent and energy of our own Mexican-American citizens.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from California for a valiant attempt at the Spanish language at the beginning of his talk, and to commend him very highly for his facility in the Spanish language.

Mr. Speaker, and the gentleman from California, I would like to say briefly, after accepting the fact that you have brought to us a problem which is prevalent in the United States, that we in the State of Texas have attempted to somewhat alleviate that problem in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I was very happy that the gentleman from California mentioned the Headstart program, because we felt that the beginning of the Headstart program was in Texas when I had the privilege of serving in the State legislature, and of helping pass a bill called the preschool English legislation, by which we attempted to teach those children in the schools who did not speak the English language fluently the basic 400 words of the English language before they entered the first grade, so that they would be fluent, at least, in the basic vocabulary of the English language when they entered the first grade.

Second, the other point that the gentleman from California brought out is to this effect: We in this country should feel proud to have neighbors who look to us for leadership—but there are some Members of this Chamber who would like for us to be entrenched in our country with a wall surrounding it, and disregarding the fact that we have neighbors outside this country—this philosophy should have gone down with the prehistoric ages. But unfortunately we still have some who believe in that philosophy. However, we have to live with the people who are our neighbors, and the best way to understand them is to speak their language.

Mr. Speaker, the bulk of them try to speak our language. English is taught in practically every school to which one can go in the Western Hemisphere. That is the first foreign language that they attempt to teach their children.

So, Mr. Speaker, in this hemisphere with all but three of the Republics speaking the Spanish language, I think it would be very fortunate for us if we could more easily communicate, not in government to government, or that our President should speak with their President, although our President and his First Lady do attempt to do so, but that the people in the communities in this country should do that, and it is spreading.

Mr. Speaker, I have visited four places in Fulton, Ky., and Fulton, Tenn.—they are twin cities right on the border, where they have a banana festival, and they invite people from all of the countries that produce bananas in the Western Hemisphere to participate in the festival.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] is very familiar with what they have done in California. We are doing the same thing in Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the gentleman from New Jersey that I participated in a Spanish Day at the Newark schools, where all of the students gathered to have Spanish dances, and songs, in which all of the people of Newark participate. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New Jersey for that.

So, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] is bringing to us and to me a problem, and I believe is suggesting, as the gentleman usually does, a very excellent solution to the problem that we face, and for that I commend the gentleman.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, may I say to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], Desde mi corazon, muchisimas gracias, Señor DE LA GARZA.

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

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

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, may I join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA], in his expressions, I being a resident of a border State myself.

I realize so very definitely and so graphically the need for better communications between the members of the Western Hemisphere. I do not think that anything could be more meaningful in obtaining solidarity of the Western Hemisphere than we should learn to communicate to a great extent with our neighbors to the south. Not only would it help us economically in our business dealings, in our trips to and from our neighbors to the south, but by learning more of their language and being able to communicate with them, then by the same token we can learn more of their culture, we can learn more of their own emotions, we can become so much better friends.

Lack of communication is the barrier that stands between us at the moment and if we are to further a people-to-people program, then certainly the first step should be that we give more emphasis to learning the language of our neighbors and thereby becoming a real community of nations in this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in this effort.

Mr. HANNA. I thank my colleague.

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

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to rise to commend my colleague from California for presenting in his own inimical way a problem that certainly is deserving of a great deal of attention. I would say this for two reasons. First of all, the gentleman from California served very ably in the field of education and as the chairman of the Education Committee in the Assembly of the California Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, just having returned from the World Forestry Congress in Madrid, Spain, where there were some 91 countries in attendance, the one thing that was left in my mind and that left a great impression on my mind was the fact that we from the United States, even though we had the largest delegation, seemed to expect everyone to speak the English language.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that we were somewhat embarrassed by the fact that we are not multilingual or at least bilingual. So I think the gentleman's remarks are not only timely but I think, as both of the gentlemen from Texas have expressed, certainly if we are going to promote hemispheric solidarity, the one thing that is absolutely mandatory is to be able for us to have the proper ingredients of communication. This can only be accomplished if we have the bilingual and multilingual capacity.

Mr. Speaker, I want again to extend my appreciation to our colleague for bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. HANNA. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HANNA. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my colleague from California [Mr. HANNA] for so forcefully bringing to the House of Representatives the problems that the Mexican-American children face when they enter school.

You can easily imagine, Mr. Speaker, the boredom and, more important, the frustration of a 6-year-old child who knows only Spanish and is suddenly forced to spend several hours a day listening to English. The child is expected to be content with this situation. He is expected to read and write English, which in many respects is foreign to him, in the same amount of time that an English-speaking child learns to read and write the English language to which he has been exposed since birth. Of course, the Mexican-American child, unless he is especially gifted, cannot do this. He, therefore, remains in the same grade or goes on to the next grade unprepared. Finally in desperation and exasperation he drops out of school.

My colleague Mr. HANNA has already given us the sad statistics on the number of Mexican-American dropouts. I would like you to consider the problem by picturing the life of one boy living in our complex society with only an eighth grade education. How will he get his job? Will he be able to complete a simple income tax form? Will he have

enough understanding to pass the written test for a driver's license which may mean livelihood for himself and his family? Will he be able to read the newspapers and magazines dealing with the current events of the day? In short, what will he do in his leisure hours? And finally, who will be his friends? It is quite obvious that it will not be the professional person or the intellectual of our society but others like himself who may find solace together as they endure existence in the pockets of poverty of our society.

What is the solution to this problem? One very obvious solution is equal educational opportunities. The Mexican-American child must be taught English before he is forced to enter a classroom where only English is spoken. This answer seems so obvious that I should be embarrassed to point it out. I am not, however, because the lack of any widespread effort in this direction indicates that the need for such a preschool program has for generations been ignored.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer afford to ignore this great social need. None of us deny the importance of an education. We must not then deny the Mexican American his opportunity to obtain an education by refusing to adjust our school systems to his special needs.

Mr. HANNA. I thank the gentleman and all the gentlemen for their very cogent remarks. It seems clear and stark that we have a great opportunity to change what has been looked upon as a weakness into a strength. As has been pointed out here, we must recognize that we are moving forward into a multilingual world, and we are not outside that world, as the gentleman from Texas has said. Therefore, we should take our strength out into that world and utilize what we have here as basic resources. Certainly there can be no better ambassador into the Latin-American countries than well-educated Latin Americans who have the strength of a pride in the heritage that they have from their past and an added strength of heritage they have received in the United States.

It is with this double strength that they can go forward in the name of our country and do our work. But we need to initiate and promote the institutional approaches both for the problem within and the problem without.

I hope that the suggestions that I have will receive the attention and consideration of all of the Members of the House.

BRITAIN TODAY AND THE UNITED STATES TOMORROW: A PREVIEW OF WHAT IS TO COME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, if ever a nation had a golden chance to look into a crystal ball and see the fate which lies ahead, we in the United States have that opportunity now. By the simple expedient of taking a searching look at the situation in Great Britain today, we can see the United States a few years from now.

As a result of a shocking number of parallel actions, Great Britain has preceded the United States into economic chaos, but there is small comfort in it for us, because our Nation is hot on her heels. We seem determined to make the same mistakes.

Examine for a minute, the parallels:

Great Britain and the United States have both consistently overspent their budgets since World War II. Red ink has flowed like wine in both countries.

Great Britain and the United States have borrowed and borrowed until neither our currency nor theirs is worth half of its former value. The pound, devaluated scarcely a dozen years ago, is under heavy pressure again.

Great Britain is wallowing in the ineptness of medicare, which they, at least, call by its correct name, socialized medicine. Our venture is just now beginning; we have learned nothing from their failure.

Our gold reserve is at an all time low, with not half enough in the vaults of Fort Knox to satisfy the foreign dollar credits.

Wages have risen here in the United States at a ratio comparable to that of Great Britain and, at the same time, productivity has not kept pace.

Ask the British housewife how far her pound goes at the grocery store and then compare her answer to that of the housewife here at home. You will find their answers are exactly the same.

It used to be a rule of thumb that, once taxation passed the 33⅓-percent mark, a government could not survive for long. Our present tax level here in the United States is beyond that point already and heading higher. It is common knowledge that, as soon as the November elections are safely passed, the administration will pressure the next Congress for tax increases that could run close to 10 percent more than we are paying today.

With our two nations running side by side, both at breakneck speed down the road to socialism, it is inevitable that the two nations will come to the same end unless we reverse our course. In Great Britain today, prices and wages have been frozen, sales taxes have been increased, downpayments on some items, already at an exorbitant rate, are increased to a point of unreachability for most Britons. Other restrictions are planned and are sure to come.

The first major decline of the British pound came just 2 years after the stock market crash in 1929 here in the United States. Foreign investors began wholesale withdrawals from London banks for the simple reason that they felt Britain could not continue on the gold standard. They were right, because about 30 days later, Britain went off the gold standard.

In the wake of World War II, the United States and Britain undertook the impossible task of banking the world. The difference between this Nation and Britain, however, was that our postwar boom kept our economy afloat. Britain, however, chose to take another hitch in its belt and allow their war-damaged and, by then, outmoded industrial machinery to deteriorate further. As a result, the pound was further devalued about 25 percent to its present value of just under $2.80.

For a time, profits from foreign investments hid from view the plight of the pound, but as the Commonwealth and other foreign nations' industry got back on its feet, less and less demand was made for British sterling. Today, nonsterling countries are lending the Commonwealth three times as much capital as does London. In the fifties, with a world shortage of credit, other countries bid higher than Britain could afford to go and, even though interest rates in London have been raised systematically, the tide could not be stemmed. Like the depositors in any bank, the traders have withdrawn whatever money they judge Britain has overextended.

This is a repeat of the situation in 1956 when there was a run on London because it was obvious that Britain did not have the resources to wage the Suez war. Again in 1961, the run began to accelerate and once again in 1964. Only the intervention and support of the United States saved the pound. Again this month, confidence in Britain's ability to raise production without inflation has dwindled and the scramble is on again.

The British people have been asked to rise to the occasion and furnish the money needed to bolster the collapsing pound. They have been asked to do so by submitting to new and more extensive controls, prolonged austerity, and industrial stagnation.

The handwriting is on the wall. The United States and the dollar are on this same rollercoaster. Sole blame cannot be laid to Vietnam either.

To fail to see what lies ahead of us is self-blindness and, for those of us here in the Congress who have the major responsibility to correct our course, it is a cruel hoax to pretend that the inevitable will not happen. It has always been my belief that if you want to know something about the road ahead you should ask the man coming back.

We have loaded social-welfare program after program onto the backs of the people in the past decade. No scheme is so lunatic as to fall on deaf ears here in the bureaucracy, even to a guaranteed wage. Of course there is inflation. There will continue to be inflation until the administration lessens its demands and the Congress stops giving in to every Socialist scheme that occurs to any and every half-baked bureaucrat.

Britain, in the death throes, is making an effort to dampen the fires their own improvidence started and fed. The question is, properly: Is this too little and too late? It may not be too late for the United States to learn a lesson from what is happening over there. If it is not too late, then this administration and this Congress should thank God for being provided this object lesson and should set about doing whatever needs being done to put our own house in order.

If we do not, then the economic wizards who do not believe in fiscal responsibility had better begin preparing some good stories to tell the people when wages, prices, dividends, and incentive are all frozen here in this country. The people will want to know why and the answers had better be good.

THE TIGHT MONEY MARKET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the continued inactivity of the Johnson administration has caused a most serious crisis to continue without an attempt at control or abatement. I refer to the almost total lack of response by the President to cope with the most serious problem of inflation and the tight money market.

In the Berkshire Eagle of July 18, the nationally syndicated column of Rowland Evans and Robert Novack said:

President Johnson telephoned Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. (Joe) Fowler soon after he arrived in Texas early in July that the time had come to do something about the lack of mortgage money and the crippled housing industry.

Mr. Johnson himself wants to keep in the background.

The President is now suffering from the lack of a clear, consistent economic policy combining both fiscal and monetary measures.

Several weeks have passed since Mr. Johnson's call to Secretary Fowler yet the situation is still deteriorating.

The weekly index of Business Week magazine for last week showed there is a trouble spot in the current index—the monthly construction figures. Overall, total construction is still 4.9 percent ahead of a year ago.

But construction levels are dropping, especially in comparison to activity earlier this year. Residential building is now 9 percent below a year ago. In May, the figure was only 2.6 percent below its year-ago level. Total construction for the month of June was at the lowest level in 8 months.

The figures from the Business Week index are being confirmed in other surveys of the construction industry.

In my contact with the people in the construction industry and allied fields, both here and in Massachusetts, I find a great deal of concern over the lag in construction which has resulted from the inability of families to secure financing or to secure it at a reasonable rate.

A printer in the Washington area who sells architectural materials and whose printing business is closely connected with the construction industry informs me that a few months ago he was understaffed by 32 employees and that he could not find people to fill the jobs. Today he is overstaffed and would have no difficulty in securing additional employees if he needed them.

When a bank, as a recent national magazine pointed out, had their switchboard operator tell prospective borrowers that the bank is not making any additional construction loans at this time, we are in trouble.

In the Boston area a recent survey showed there has been a decline in overtime for ready-mix concrete distributors and masons. This means there are fewer foundations being laid and naturally fewer homes being built.

A survey by the Builders Association of Santa Clara and Santa Cruz Counties distributed by my colleague from California, CHARLES GUBSER, shows a decline in employment from September 1, 1965, to July 1966 of 57.4 percent for carpenters, teamsters, operating engineers, cement masons, and laborers. A 39-percent decline in office employment and a 41-percent dip in executive staffing.

It is estimated that there was a 50-percent reduction in mortgage lending by savings and loan associations during May 1966 compared to May 1965.

Last year during the peak months of the building season, loans ran approximately $2 billion per month. It is estimated that for the current year, loans will run slightly over $1 billion per month. Commitments to purchase mortgage loans were considerably less than 50 percent in May 1966 compared to May 1965.

During the first 4 months of 1966 there were over 37,000 fewer construction loans than the first 4 months of 1965. Some knowledgeable people in the area feel there will be further shrinkage in this market in the second half of 1966.

What do all these assorted figures and percentages tell us? They only serve to confirm what builders have known for some time—homebuilding and homebuying, one of the Nation's largest industries, is faced with a major slump.

The cause, most people seem to agree, is the inflationary fiscal policies of the Johnson-Humphrey administration.

One of the most inflationary fiscal policies followed by the administration was the passage of the Participation Sales Act of 1966.

This measure, forced through by the Democratic majority, gave authority to the Federal National Mortgage Association—FNMA—to sell participations in a pool of Government-held financial assets or loans, which could total $33.1 billion.

The Republican members of the committee considering this measure were not presented with a copy of the bill until a half hour before the committee hearings began. Then only 2 hours of hearings were held.

The Republican members of the committee were denied the right to call any witnesses. Moreover, not one witness from the unions, farming, business, or banking communities was called. At the conclusion of the totally inadequate hearings the committee was called into immediate executive session and in less than 30 minutes the bill was ordered reported—1 day after President Johnson's call for this legislation was received by Congress.

As far back as May 10, the House Republican Policy Committee warned that:

The home mortgage market is in a state of turmoil and confusion. Home construction is at a dangerously low level. If the FNMA participation sales are authorized, the FHA and GI mortgages, and other home mortgages as well, will become less and less attractive to investors. In order to meet competition and obtain home mortgage financing, higher home mortgage financing costs will have to be imposed. As a result, the prospective home builders or buyers will be forced to carry an additional financial burden.

On June 23 two sales were made under the Participation Sales Act. The first was for $350 million of participation certificates of assets of the small business obligations trust at an interest rate of 5.75 percent with maturity varying from 1 to 5 years. The second sale was of $180 million in participation certificates of assets of the Government mortgage liquidation trust with an approximate interest rate of 5.40 percent with a maturity of 13 to 15 years.

By these sales, the administration is competing for the available money. Interest rates are the highest in the last 40 years. The rising demand for credit by the Federal Government and business has drawn funds away from credit-sensitive industries such as homebuilding.

Despite the fact that personal consumption has leveled off, plant and inventory expansion continue at a record pace as a hedge by industry against the continuing inflationary cost spiral.

The only remedy offered by the Johnson-Humphrey administration has been support for an ill-conceived effort to place a statutory interest ceiling rate over time deposits in banks and savings and loans institutions.

This finger-in-the-dike approach will will not create new savings nor direct additional funds to the homebuilding industry. On the contrary, it could drive personal and corporate savings from banks and savings and loans to government bonds, Federal agency issues, or the stock market—thereby further compounding the homebuilding problem.

The President can not continue his present practice of assuming credit for every achievement and passing the buck for every failure, as he recently tried to do with regard to federal spending. This time he must stand on his own record. His record of indifference and of keeping hands-off while a major crisis develops.

Since the administration seems to be gripped by inactivity in this area, I want to urge the President to adopt the measures recommended recently by the House Republican Policy Committee.

First. Slash nondefense, nonessential domestic spending. Not just in regard to appropriations, but also with respect to new program authorizations which trigger the appropriations process.

Second. Reduce point discounts on FHA and VA home financing through administrative adjustments of rates to more realistic levels. Five and six point discounts—$1,500 on $25,000 home mortgage—are stifling home financing and wiping out personal savings.

Third. Suspend any further issues of FNMA participation sales other than for VA and FHA pooled housing mortgages.

When the participation sales bill was being debated, the President was warned that this multibillion dollar budgetary gimmick would place severe strains on the private credit market and push up interest rates to record levels. Experience with the program has fully confirmed these fears.

Fourth. Enact the Republican initiated proposal to grant FNMA additional borrowing authority in a prudent and legal manner.

Fifth. Remove FNMA's $15,000 administrative limitation on purchase of mortgages under its secondary market operations.

Sixth. Appoint an emergency Presidential fact-finding committee on the homebuilding crisis to report its findings in sufficient time for congressional consideration prior to adjournment of the 89th Congress.

These are stern measures. However, the ever-deepening homebuilding crisis demands that immediate and effective steps be taken. This "do not open until after election" tag must be removed from this problem.

AARON G. BENESCH

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart. A dear friend, not only to me but to many in this Chamber, a courageous and kindhearted newspaperman, Aaron G. Benesch, is no longer with us. His passing leaves us deeply saddened, yes, but there is a warmth in our hearts, and a twinkle in our eye for having known him. For Aaron was a person who, through a long and distinguished career in a rough and competitive field, maintained at all times a dignity of self, a wry sense of humor, and above all, a kindness of spirit that endeared him to all who knew him.

Aaron, who was a native of St. Louis, started out in 1913 as a $3-a-week copy boy on the old St. Louis Star. He later served as the Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Globe Democrat, and, back in St. Louis, as managing editor of the Globe Democrat and the old St. Louis Times. In 1957 he returned to Washington as a member of the Newhouse National News Service, and was serving as associate editor at the time of his retirement on December 31, 1965.

Aaron's coverage of national politics went back to the 1928 Republican National Convention in Kansas City that nominated Herbert Hoover. And since 1957, he had been a frequent visitor to the offices of the New Jersey congressional delegation. In fact, Aaron, who wrote regularly for the Newark Star Ledger, became an adopted New Jerseyite, serving for a time as historian of the New Jersey State Society.

The outpouring of friends at Aaron's retirement party, and the scores of wires and letters from Congressmen, Senators, people throughout the Government, and newspapermen from all over the country who had worked with him, were an eloquent testimonial to a distinguished journalist and gracious gentleman. I think the sentiments of former President Harry S. Truman at that time were indicative of the feelings of us all:

> You have put in all of 50 years in the hectic field of journalism and that is a long time, even in a normal field of operation. I hope your transition from overactivity to retirement is as comfortable for you as it has been for me.

Unfortunately, Aaron was not able to long enjoy the relative calm of his retirement, or the pleasure of being able to spend more time with his lovely wife Eva and their daughter and her family. To them I extend my deepest sympathy, and the knowledge that their great loss is shared by all who had the good fortune to be touched by the joie de vivre that filled Aaron Benesch.

TRANSPORTATION, SALE, AND HANDLING OF DOGS AND CATS FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have long been interested in legislation for the protection of laboratory animals and have sponsored legislation in this field over several years. I am very happy that Congress has at last taken action. It is a great pleasure to me to cast my vote for H.R. 13881. The conditions which have been exposed in the animal supply trade to laboratories require immediate reform. The theft of pets and the inhumane treatment of animals bound for the laboratories cannot be tolerated.

H.R. 13881 is a bill primarily designed to regulate animal suppliers. But in the Senate it was amended and in its present form it now contains sections applying to the laboratories themselves. These I consider to be weak and inadequate. For several years I have sponsored comprehensive laboratory legislation and am thoroughly familiar with the subject.

I should like to remind the House that there are something like 11,000 laboratories in this country; that more than a quarter of a million people are engaged in biomedical research; that annual expenditure for this research is approximately $2 billion a year; and, finally, that upward of 100 million animals are consumed by biomedical research every year.

There are many critical problems which require a legislative remedy but I cannot agree that the coverage of the present bill is little more than a token gesture.

Only 2,000 of the 11,000 laboratories will be covered; only 5 million of the hundreds of millions of animals will benefit from this coverage; and, lastly, the coverage itself is extremely limited. The Secretary is directed to promulgate standards for the care, handling, and treatment of these 5 million animals but these standards apply only until actual research begins, with the determination of when research has begun left to the research facilities. Personally, I fear that many of these animals will not be covered because in many facilities, I am told, animals are involved in the process of research throughout their stay in the laboratory.

Mr. Speaker, may I reiterate that the laboratory coverage of H.R. 13881 is little more than a token gesture.

H.R. 10050, introduced by me over a year ago, not only sets standards for housing and care but deals with many other matters. Standards for the proper administration of anesthetics and of pain-relieving drugs during aftercare are required. The science of statistics must be brought to bear in determining the number of animals necessary to be used in a given experimental series. Needless duplication is eliminated. Tissue cultures and less sensitive forms of life must be substituted for higher forms whenever possible.

The swelling mass of scientific information must somehow be brought under control so that every investigator may have the full benefit of work already done in his field.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in voting for the animal dealer provisions of H.R. 13881 and want to express my hope and earnest desire before this body that comprehensive laboratory legislation which is so badly needed for the protection of these hapless animals will soon follow.

REMARKS ON THE ORDER OF AHEPA

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's Capital is privileged this week to have the opportunity to host the 44th Supreme Convention of the Order of AHEPA. I know that all of us want to wish a very hearty welcome to the thousands of Greek descents who are gathering here.

The American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association is an organization which bears living witness to the great cultural richness and democratic spirit which took root millenniums ago during the Golden Age of Greece. It is an energetic association with 1,125 local chapters in 49 of our States, the Bahamas, Canada, Australia, and Greece. It is an association which strives to enrich its members through fellowship, through instruction in the tenets of good government, through increased understanding of the attributes and ideals of

Hellenic culture, and through the development of a high moral sense.

The Order of AHEPA encourages its members to responsible, active participation in the privileges of citizenship. It is devoted to education and the search for new channels to facilitate the dissemination of culture and learning. It is responsible for one of our finest people-to-people efforts in its work to maintain strong and friendly ties with the citizens of Greece. AHEPA is a large-scale example of good citizenship in action.

The AHEPA was organized in 1922 as a national secret society by a small group of Greeks in Atlanta, Ga. But membership was not limited to those of Hellenic descent alone. Two of our greatest Presidents, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, our esteemed Vice President, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and many of our congressional colleagues have been welcomed as members in this outstanding organization.

Its early aims were to bridge the gap between Americans and Greeks and to help the latter absorb the American culture through contacts, naturalization, and other appropriate means. It offered a friendly, helping hand to the new immigrant. The organization grew rapidly. Today, the AHEPA program has expanded to include active support of Greek educational and religious activities, as well as encouragement and aid to a broad spectrum of civic and charitable projects. They have lent notable support to the political, civic, social, and commercial endeavors of their communities. But they have not forgotten the land of their ancestors. AHEPA's contributions to Greece have been marked by herculean effort.

Following World War II's devastation of Greece, AHEPA built seven health centers, two hospitals, a girls' shelter home, a preventorium, and an agricultural college, not to mention the countless other relief projects and worthy causes in Greece which have been bolstered by the helping hand of AHEPA.

The determined, and energetic Hellenic spirit which goes hand in hand with the aims of AHEPA has been one of the world's greatest benefactors. And the legacy of Greece and her people has made far richer the heritage of all of us. We are delighted to be able to welcome this 44th supreme convention to our Capital City.

TENNESSEE LOOKS AHEAD WITH NEW LAND USE PROGRAMS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the people of Tennessee are working hard to develop our resources of land and water. One hundred percent of the farms and ranches in the State are included in organized soil conservation districts, and over 5,363,000 acres of land are covered by basic soil conservation plans.

These plans recognized fully the changes that are occurring in Tennessee, as elsewhere, in the use of land and water resources. For instance, in my district, in Hickman, Lawrence, and Stewart Counties, among others, many farmers are now offering farm vacations, converting croplands into golf courses and farm ponds, and generally entering the field of income-producing recreation.

This is a particularly apt use of land in Tennessee. Our climate, natural beauty and traditional hospitality—when combined with planned recreation—offer visitors a truly refreshing outdoor vacation. In many cases, also, the use of land for recreation is better for that land than constant cropping and, at the same time, provides the owner with higher income. This is one example of how soil conservation districts, with the technical assistance of the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service, keep abreast of the times with new solutions to the perennial problem of how to both conserve and wisely use our natural resources.

Another development I note in my district is the increasing appreciation, by nonfarm people, of the value and importance of land and water resources. More and more urban people are realizing they depend on land owners and land users not only for food and fiber, but also for good drinking water, for new suburbs and even for flood protection. Soil conservation districts contribute to proper land use in rapidly developing areas by, among other ways, cooperating on soil surveys and working on small watershed projects.

I have met with many soil conservation district leaders, and I am impressed by their dedication to the unglamorous, unpaid, but essential task of wise land use. I think they must feel, as did an early conservationist, Gifford Pinchot, that "a nation deprived of liberty may win it; a nation divided may reunite, but a nation whose natural resources are destroyed must inevitably pay the penalty of poverty, degradation, and decay."

Tennessee became known as the "Volunteer State" because our people volunteered so willingly in this country's wars. Today, their descendants continue to fight for their land both in battle overseas and in peacetime conservation projects here at home. I salute the volunteers of both kinds. They are both working for a better Tennessee and a better United States.

DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, once again, my respected colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has evidenced his interest in keeping our membership informed of facts surrounding the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric power power project authorized by Congress last year.

I am compelled to refute the arguments offered by Mr. CLARK because he has failed to consider all the facts.

In his most recent attack on this project, so important to the citizens of Maine, our colleague from Pennsylvania presented a statement by Mr. Charles Hardy, a vice president of the Brotherhood of Utility Workers of New England, Inc., and an excerpt from the Utility Stock Valuations Report of the financial concern of McDonnell & Co.

I have been puzzled for a long time by the bitter opposition of the private power companies of New England to this project even though I have assured them that Dickey does not constitute a threat to their cozy empires. The McDonnell report admits that "the threat of a public power complex is more apparent than real," and further, that "this project will play a limited but important role in producing the power which New England will require in the years to come."

The McDonnell report also states that the future outlook for utility operations is excellent and expressed the belief that industry plans for more extensive power pooling and installation of larger and larger generating units will finally bring favorable utility economies to New England.

To keep the record straight, my colleagues should know that the New England private utilities had no great plans for improving utility economies until the Dickey project was authorized. Nor, before Dickey, was there any assurance that the electric bill of the New England businessman and homeowner would be reduced.

Mr. CLARK's second "expert" infers that only the private utilities and their employees understand the industry. Mr. Charles Hardy, vice president of the Brotherhood of Utility Workers of New England Inc., has charged that certain Members of Congress are being deliberately misled by claims of the amount of support for the Dickey project that exists within various union groups.

Mr. Hardy portrays himself to be an economist, expert in analyzing the hills and valleys of charts and graphs and able to fix their causes and predict their effect on the livelihood of the members of his union.

I submit that workers in textile plants, shoe factories, papermills, woodworking shops, tanneries, and elsewhere are expert enough in the field of economics to realize that the high electric power rates of Maine and New England have inhibited industrial development. The managers of their firms know this also. And that is why the overwhelming majority of organized labor has backed the Dickey project.

Finally, Mr. Hardy attacks the proposed Federal power "yardstick" as having no digits for taxes. Surely as an

economist he must know that private utilities pay no taxes. These are passed along to the consumer as part of his monthly bill.

Mr. CLARK renews his call for more study of the Dickey project, obviously on the grounds that it would be easier to study it to death than to defeat it on its proven merits. He states that he is joined in his point of view by "segments" of organized labor, the Association of Chambers of Commerce, by the private utilities of New England, the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, and the Appalachian Mountain Club.

The motive of the private utilities is clear: They want nothing to challenge their empires, their monopolies, their hold on the economic development of Maine and New England.

The Association of Chambers of Commerce has, historically, shown itself to be against many progressive and valuable projects which might never have come about had their existence depended upon the support of this organization.

The judgment of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston is balanced by that of the U.S. Department of Interior, the Federal Power Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, several congressional committees, and Congress itself which has seen fit to authorize this project.

The opposition expressed by the Appalachian Mountain Club is difficult to comprehend because authorization of the Dickey project has meant that the famed Allagash River could be preserved in a wild state. No other conservation group, in Maine or elsewhere, has come out in opposition to the Dickey project. So it is strange that the only opposition from conservationists came from Boston, some 500 miles from the Dickey site.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their attention. I have welcomed this opportunity to correct the record.

AIRLINE STRIKE SETTLEMENT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my hope that as a result of collective bargaining labor will obtain a fair and just settlement of its dispute with the airlines.

I know that all Members applaud the tremendous effort made by the unions and the airlines to resolve their differences and achieve a settlement without the necessity of any congressional action. Therefore, I am sure that we all hope the settlement agreement is ratified on vote of the local members.

Both sides, however, after 40 days of strike are fully aware that at some point the public's convenience and necessity will demand an end to the severe hardships which continuation of the dispute would work on innocent sectors of our Nation's economy. Severe interruption of interstate commerce, in this case 60 percent of all passenger air miles is of justifiable concern to the Congress.

If the parties do not reach a final agreement, we will very shortly have before us a most complex and trying issue. The definition of the limits of freedom in collective bargaining is both the anguish and the glory of democratic government, and is best left with the disputants, if possible. The Government, however, cannot afford to unduly delay action to define those limits when groups directly concerned cannot set their own limits.

The strike, which concerns us all, was called only after all available means provided by present law had been exhausted. The machinists union clearly had no alternative but to strike for what it believes to be a fair and equitable settlement.

It has been alleged that profits of the five airline companies involved doubled from 1964 to 1965, and during the first half of this year they rose by another 30 percent; earnings from the airlines' capital have resulted in profits ranging from 16 to 20 percent.

Mr. Speaker, during much of the period that the airlines were growing and investing heavily in capital, the machinist's union exercised restraint in its request for wage increases. The increases it received from the last settlement could scarcely be termed large.

In fact, gains in actual buying power advanced by only about 2 percent per year for machinists union members in the five airlines from 1960 to 1965. During this same period there was an average annual increase in productivity of airline employees of 7.4 percent per year. This is about twice the rate of advance in employee productivity in the economy as a whole.

These and other statistics show that there are certainly two sides to the airline dispute.

The mantle of unpopularity, however, falls, as always, solely on the shoulders of the union members. They are the ones who, under present law, are forced to choose to strike if they cannot get a fair agreement. Thus in the public's mind they are charged with ignoring public convenience and necessity.

It is for this reason the unions took their case to the public as is evidenced by advertisements appearing in our local press, one of which I will read to my colleagues, because it expresses the feelings of the local unions who, after all, are the heart of the labor movement:

[From the Miami Herald, Aug. 5, 1966]

WE'RE SORRY FOR THE INCONVENIENCE, BUT THE PUBLIC IS ENTITLED TO KNOW—

Who are the striking members of the International Association of Machinists? We are 35,000 strong in a union representing more than 1,000,000 members. We are your friends, your neighbors, and your relatives. We contribute to the United Fund, the Heart Fund, and other worthy charitable and civic causes. We donate blood, serve as scout troop leaders . . . and when our country or freedom was threatened, we fought and bled in three wars, and members of our families now fight for freedom in Viet Nam.

WHAT WE DO

We are dedicated to keep America's planes flying . . . with a quality safety factor second to none. We are the mechanics and service people who test, fuel, load and ready planes for their flights. We work hard to assure the maximum safety of planes and to earn a living for our families.

WHAT WE GET PAID

What's the reward for our dedication and hard work? We get from $2.05 to $3.52 per hour. For this, under strict government regulations, we must also take the risk of a fine of $1,000 to $10,000 or a year to ten years in jail, or both, if we are responsible for the unairworthiness of a plane.

INCENTIVE SHARING WITH GREEN STAMPS

Airlines are making record profits. Executive and stockholders are piling up unprecedented financial benefits. What do the airlines believe is our fair share? Typical of the airlines is Eastern Airlines' plan. This plan provides for large stock options and cash incentive bonuses up to a maximum of $200,000 a year for those who already receive swollen salaries. How do we benefit in a period of rising profits and the increased productivity we have contributed to the aviation industry while inflation increases the cost of everything we buy? We're the low men on the totem pole. To ease the erosion of our income in 1965, we were offered an incentive with a so-called "Share the Excellence" program. What does this pay off? It pays off in Green Stamps instead of extra cash. Banks won't take Green Stamps for mortgage payments. We can't buy food with stamps and we can't pay the doctor or tax collector with Green Stamps. Oh yes! If we are awarded Green Stamps, we are required to report their value as extra income to Internal Revenue!

WHAT DO WE WANT?

We originally asked for a 15% increase in pay and certain fringe benefits common in this and other industries. This was later modified by our negotiators to a 5% increase for 1966, a 5% increase in 1967, and a 4% increase in 1968. Is this a reasonable request? In the past three years Federal employees have received a 15% increase. The City of Miami Beach approved increases up to 14.5% for its employees. The City of Miami has authorized substantial increases for its employees, and Metro has increased employees' salaries by 10%. Congress did all right, too. They voted last year to increase their salaries $10,000 a year. All we want is a fair living wage and decent working conditions, too.

WHO RUNS OUR UNION?

We elect our officers by secret ballot in free election. We, the members, tell our officers what we want. We make our own decisions whether to accept the proposals presented by our negotiators. We decide by the ballot whether to accept settlement proposals or continue the strike. The members of the International Association of Machinists run the union.

IS COMPULSORY SERVITUDE THE ANSWER?

We have been threatened with special Congressional punitive legislation . . . which would force us to continue working for low pay and poor working conditions under the constant threat of being fined or jailed if we fail in our job of keeping planes flying safely. Carry such an unconstitutional concept to its ultimate end and we would not be permitted to quit or retire unless we received permission from the Federal Government. It could happen to you, too.

Is this what we fought three wars for in this century and are now fighting for in

Viet Nam? Is this the kind of regimentation and deprivation of liberty of choice and conscience that the majority of Americans want? Is compulsory servitiude the answer? We think not. That's why we've brought these facts to you. Yes, we're real sorry for the public's inconvenience, but there are two sides to any labor dispute and it's only fair that you, the public, understand how it looks from our point of view.

AIRLINE MAINTENANCE LODGE 702, THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS AND AEROSPACE WORKERS.

However, Mr. Speaker, considering the damage to the public and the substantial interruption of interstate commerce, after a strike of 40 days, time has been and is a vital factor to the rest of the public. Accordingly, I trust that the settlement as negotiated can be ratified as a fair and equitable settlement.

AARON BENESCH

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I received the sad news this afternoon that Aaron Benesch, recently retired associate editor of the Newhouse National News Service, passed away after a short illness. This announcement will be accepted, I know, with great sorrow by his many friends and admirers throughout the country.

Aaron Benesch was the $3 a week copy boy for the old St. Louis Star who rose to be associate editor of one of the largest and most respected news reporting services in the country. He was a newspaperman for 50 years, reporting the facts as he saw them and as they were. Above all, he was fair and possessed of an integrity that set an example for all who knew him.

There are two lines from one of Abraham Lincoln's favorite poems by William Knox which describe life as, "Like a fast-flitting meteor, a fast-flying cloud, a flash of lightning, a break of the wave," like these, Aaron Benesch has passed all too quickly. Throughout his active life Aaron was before everything a kind man, a family man, and a man with a deep love and respect for his fellow human beings.

By his death we have lost a dear friend and an outstanding newspaperman. I cannot express my deep sympathy to his gracious wife, Eva, and his family. We are together at a loss for words.

STREET SCENE: SUMMER WORK PROJECT KEEPS TEENAGERS BUSY

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a story which appeared in a recent issue of the Los Angeles Times. It concerns a project called Street Scene, which is now operating in my district.

Street Scene is funded through the EYOA and is designed to solve some of the problems faced by young adults in economically depressed areas. It is a program which is achieving positive results through positive action.

I am proud to insert in the RECORD, for all to read, the story of Street Scene:

SUMMER WORK PROJECTS KEEP 55,000 TEENAGERS BUSY

(By Jack Jones, Times staff writer)

In the Pacoima, Wash., area, between the "turfs" of rival Negro and Mexican-American youth gangs, a young work crew with a 50–50 ethnic mix was cleaning the trash out of the yard of a welfare recipient.

"You'd be surprised how much these guys really feel about the community," said Ernie Dillard, 28-year-old director of the North Valley Youth Center, where a summer anti-poverty project called "Street Scene" is headquartered.

"We sure as hell haven't ended all the problems, but we've got some of them working together for a change."

"Street Scene" is operated by Project Pacoima, a citizens' group formed to involve gang-oriented youngsters and young adults in community organization for positive purposes.

KEEPS TEEN-AGERS BUSY

With a $66,000 federal grant through the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency, it is a small part of a $2.3 million local summer crash program to keep teen-agers busy during the sweltering, otherwise idle months.

The overall county program, including operation of 150 Teen Posts for recreation and cultural activities, touches 44,000 young people.

In addition to this, 3,152 teenagers have been hired by the Neighborhood Youth Corps (at $1.27 an hour for a variety of jobs for the summer only) at a cost of $1.2 million.

Added to Neighborhood Youth Corps enlistees already on the payroll before summer began, the EYOA estimates that 55,000 county teenagers and young adults are busy (part time, at least) under summer anti-poverty programs.

Included:

1. Operation Champ—The largest of the package. Supervised by the Los Angeles City Schools and involving 18,000 youths from ages 5 to 18 in recreation and work programs.

2. Recreation Sports Leadership Training Program under County Department of Parks and Recreation for 200 youths.

3. Summer Educational Tutoring Program for 656 youths on probation, ages 17–24.

4. Work Experience and Training for Services Project under supervision of Special Services for Groups; training in community services work for 1,650 youths 16–24.

5. Community Leadership Training Program operated by Ocean Park Greater Parish, for 200 youths in Venice area.

6. Youth Adult Leadership and Community Development Project under the Community Services Organization, for 144 young people 18–24.

The list goes on . . .

Outside EYOA-supervised programs, there are other efforts to cool off the summer.

One of these is a $320,000, 10-week recreation and education program sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor and the Watts Labor Community Action Committee for 2,100 Watts area youngsters 7 to 21.

The 14–21 age group—the Community Conservation Corps—earn money for clearing vacant lots and turning them into "vest pocket" parks.

While older boys and girls are clearing the lots and acting as teaching aides, 7- to 13-year-olds are to be enlisted in a uniformed Watts Cadet Corps under the CCC to learn discipline, reading skills, and a sense of responsibility.

Afro-American cultural heritage training sessions are being designed as part of this program to instill pride in the young Watts residents.

Street Scene is only one segment of the summer crash program, but Project Pacoima director Carl May and Street Scene director James Sherman are determined not to let it die with the summer.

SEEK MORE FUNDS

They are going to Washington, D.C., to seek year-around funding . . . from the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Ford Foundation, from any public or private agency that will listen to them.

Sherman, 24, a tall Negro and former construction worker who shares with many of his nearly 60 work crew members an unpleasant former relationship with the law, says:

"I'd sure hate to see the bottom fall out of this thing just as it's starting to go. We got a lot of these guys starting to take on responsibility now. The changes in attitude have been definite. A while back the Negro didn't come into San Fernando and the Mexican didn't come to Pacoima. There's some bickering, but it's not like it used to be."

Street Scene crew members are about evenly divided between Negro and Mexican-American. Work crews are mixed so that their members learn to work together.

Young men 18 to 25 years old get from $1.75 to $2 an hour for such jobs as yard cleanup for needy persons who can't do the work themselves, cockroach extermination in impoverished neighborhoods, etc.

One crew is building a bathroom for a Pacoima Head Start site to bring it up to code requirements. Staff members are organizing block clubs and youth clubs in an effort to motivate the entire community to help solve its difficulties.

A crew of eight young women go from home to home, finding out what problems exist and trying to put helpless persons in touch with the proper agencies.

"We've got to be sure we're helping somebody who really needs it," says Dillard. "We got a call from a lady in Encino the other day. She wanted us to come cut her lawn."

At North Valley Youth Center, 753 Arroyo Ave., an old industrial building taken over and being enlarged with volunteer help to replace the former center burned by arsonists on Memorial Day, County Human Relations Commission consultant John C. Hamby says:

"This is really a positive thing. Some of the Mexican-Americans have been a little reluctant, because they've been so isolated, but they're beginning to see that if they work together they'll get ahead.

"Amazingly, these kids have a lot of ideas. They've just never been in situations before to bring them out. They're very creative . . ."

REMOVE TAX ON REIMBURSED MOVING EXPENSES

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation (H.R. 17012) to remove the taxpayer's inequitable burden of reporting certain reimbursed moving expenses as income. Under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 an employee must report as income the entire amount he received from his employer as reimbursement for indirect moving expenses. While the code provides that direct moving expenses are not reportable as income, certain costs such as house-hunting trips, expenses in the sale and purchase of a home, and costs incurred for hotels and motels while awaiting occupancy in the new residence are taxed as income. I am convinced that these "indirect" costs are as much a business expense, when related to a transfer in the principal place of work, as "direct" expenses.

My bill sets forth guidelines, limitations, and qualifications, and is designed to offer a legitimate tax deduction. Further its construction prevents the development of undesirable tax loopholes for reimbursement which are truly income. It is my intention in filing this bill to remove the existing inequities, and indeed I am certain that this will be concurred in by the Congress when this legislation comes before the Members.

LET US MEET OUR RESPONSIBILITIES—LET US MEET THE NEED FOR TAX REFORM

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my continuing analysis of our Federal tax system, I would like to recommend to my colleagues an excellent article on tax reform by Joseph A. Pechman, of the Brookings Institution, which appeared in the April 10, 1966, issue of the Washington Post. I believe Mr. Pechman has pointed out clearly the need for a thorough reform of our Federal tax system.

I am firmly convinced that Congress has a sober responsibility to take prompt action to return integrity and equality to our tax system of the many proposals for reform which I, and others, have made. I believe a most appropriate place to start is with the oil depletion allowance. As Mr. Pechman correctly states, this "giveway" to the large oil companies means that percentage depletion can—and does—exceed the original amount invested by a substantial amount. The time for ending this loophole and the many others which are totally inconsistent with our democratic principles is long overdue.

The article follows:

TAX SYSTEM GOOD, BUT NEEDS KEY REFORMS

(By Joseph A. Pechman)

(NOTE.—Joseph A. Pechman, one of the country's noted tax experts, is Director of Economic Studies for the Brookings Institution. Pechman's views as expressed in this article are his own, and are not necessarily presented as the views of Brookings. His book, "Federal Tax Policy," will be published later this year.)

The taxpayer's reluctance to part with his hard-earned money is perfectly understandable, but much of the grumbling heard around April 15 is not only intemperate but wrong. The fact is that the United States has one of the best tax systems in the world—if not the best.

It rates high by all main criteria: productivity, fairness, consistency with economic goals, and ease of compliance and administration.

No one can question the system's productivity. Last year, federal, state, and local government revenues amounted to about $185 billion.

Yet our taxes are by no means the world's highest. Taxes range between 30 and 35 per cent of gross national product in Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United Kingdom as compared with about 27 per cent for the United States.

Judgments about fairness are highly personal, and there is disagreement on this point. Our system places great weight on individual and corporation income taxes which are progressive, that is, they place the largest burden on those who have the greatest ability to pay. The major criticism of the system is that it provides special advantages that reduce taxes for some people and businesses and not for others in the same economic circumstances.

The economic potency of the tax system can hardly be disputed. In 1964, the Federal Government reduced taxes by 11 billion ($15 billion at present income levels) in a successful attempt to stimuate private spending. If needed, taxes will be raised this year or next to reduce spending and help avoid inflation.

Such heavy reliance on income taxes would be impossible without good compliance and administration. Few countries can equal our record in this respect. Out of every Federal individual income tax return filed, 3 out of every 4 have no errors. Only about 6 per cent of the income that should be reported does not show up on tax returns, and the Internal Revenue Service picks up quite a bit of this unreported income. The entire Federal tax machinery costs less than 1 per cent of the amount collected. State and local tax administration is not as good as Federal, but it is improving.

If the tax system scores so well, why does it generate so much controversy, dissatisfaction, and emotion? Part of the grumbling reflects the natural distaste for paying taxes, but there are also real and deep-seated differences of opinion about tax policy.

The issues involve difficult, technical questions of law, accounting, and economics, with important implications for the welfare of every citizen and for the vitality of the economy.

The Nation's biggest and best source of revenue is the individual income tax. The close association between a man's taxpaying ability and his income is commonly accepted.

The main trouble with the present tax is that large amounts of income have been allowed to escape taxation by means of various special provisions and deductions.

The accompanying chart shows the practical effect of erosion. If the total income reported by taxpayers were subject to the statutory rates, taxes would begin at 14 per cent on the first dollar of income and rise to 70 per cent in the top brackets. But nobody pays these rates. After allowing for all special provisions, the maximum average rate in any income class is less than 30 per cent.

Exemptions are most important in the lowest classes, deductions at the top. The capital gains provisions are also most important at the top, while income splitting gives the largest benefits to persons with incomes between $20,000 and $100,000.

An ideal personal income tax is easy to define, but unlikely to be enacted. Every modification would touch a tender nerve. Some who would scream the loudest are not the "fatcats" caricatured in the cartoons; many of the most expensive eroding features of the law favor the lower and middle-income classes. Nevertheless, reforms that broadened the base of taxation would make it possible to reduce tax rates for all and improve the fairness of the tax.

The most irrational and expensive provisions are the deductions for contributions, interest, medical expenses, taxes, and other personal expenditures that cut out billions of dollars from the tax base.

Deductions for state income taxes protect taxpayers against excessive rates. There is also some justification for continuing the deduction for sales and income taxes as a device to encourage further state use of these taxes to raise the revenues they desperately need. But there is no excuse for deducting gasoline taxes, which are levied to pay for benefits received by highway users.

The present method of computing the deduction for charitable contributions is highly questionable. Limiting the deduction to contributions in excess of, say 2 or 3 per cent of income would encourage larger than average gifts to charity and save close to $2 billion of revenue each year.

Revision of capital gains treatment is the most urgent business on the tax reform agenda. Profits from sale of assets held more than 6 months are taxed at only half the regular rates up to a maximum of 25 per cent, but even this tax may be avoided indefinitely if the assets are transferred from one generation to another through bequests. In the case of gifts, capital gains are taxed only if the assets are later sold by the recipient. As a result, billions of dollars of capital gains are subject to low rates or are never taxed.

Capital gains receive favored treatment for two reasons: First, full taxation of a large realized gain accumulated over many years would be unfair unless the impact of the graduated rates were moderated; second, too high a rate on capital gains might lock most security holders into their present portfolios. The first of these problems could be solved by averaging capital gains over the period they were held. The "lock-in" effect would be moderated by such an averaging provision and also by taxing capital gains when assets are transferred, either by gift or at death. Both changes would reduce the advantages of holding onto assets whose values had risen.

The tax exemption of interest on state and local government securities is unfair because it benefits only the wealthy, and inefficient

because the interest saved by the states and local governments is only about 60 percent of the $1 billion annual revenue loss to the Federal Government. If state-local bond interest were taxed, the revenue could be used directly to help the states and local governments.

The Federal income tax has been particularly solicitous of the aged. Taxpayers over 65 years of age have an additional exemption of $600, pay no tax on their social security or railroad retirement pensions, and receive a tax credit on other retirement income (if their earnings are below $1524).

There is every reason to help the aged through public programs, but the tax system is a bad way to do this. It would be better to eliminate these deductions and use the revenue to increase social security benefits for all aged persons.

Some needed income tax reforms would reduce Federal revenues. The most important are an increase in exemptions and the introduction of a negative income tax.

The present $600 per capita exemption has not been altered since 1948, when consumer prices were 25 percent lower. In 1964, a minimum standard deduction was added, providing $300 for the taxpayer and $100 for each additional exemption up to a maximum of $1000, but the starting levels of taxation are still below the official poverty levels.

Policy makers hesitate to raise exemptions because this would be expensive. An increase from $600 to $700 per capita would cost $3 billion per year; an increase to $800 would cost $5.5 billion. An alternative might be to double the minimum standard deduction, which would help those in greatest need at an annual cost of less than $2 billion.

The negative income tax is a new subject of public discussion, although it has been discussed by economists and social welfare experts for many years. An individual would add up his income and subtract his exemptions and deductions: if the result were negative, he would be entitled to a payment from the Government.

Because the various Government and private welfare programs do not reach all the poor, the negative income tax would be an excellent method of supplementing them. Its major advantage is that it would not discourage the poor from seeking income-earning activities as much as present welfare programs often do.

Many people still regard the negative income tax as a radical innovation, and a number of difficult problems need to be resolved before it becomes feasible. Not the least of these is its relationship with the positive income tax, and with the present welfare programs. However, the concept is worth serious attention and is being given close study in Washington.

The corporation income tax produces a large amount of revenue (about $30 billion this year) that would be hard to replace with any other tax. Without it, a substantial part of the individual income would be permanently lost from the tax base through retention of earnings by corporations.

Opponents contend that it reduces corporate saving, encourages debt at the expense of equity financing, and discourages the use of corporate capital. However, the share of the national income originating in the corporate sector has risen from 58 per cent in 1929 to almost 70 percent in recent years.

The so-called double taxation of dividends is a baffling issue. In theory, income earned by corporations is taxed under the corporation income tax and again under the individual income tax when it is paid out in dividends. This double taxation exists only if the corporation income tax is not shifted in the form of higher prices.

Even if it is agreed that double taxation exists, there is no easy solution. Currently, individuals are not taxed on the first $100 of dividend income, but this is a makeshift arrangement which satisfies no one. The best solution would be to lower corporation income tax rates when circumstances permit. This would automatically reduce the double taxation of dividends equally for all stockholders regardless of their other incomes, and would not complicate the tax law.

The toughest issue involves percentage depletion for oil, gas, and other minerals industries. These allowances are similar in many respects to depreciation. The difference is that the amounts written off as depreciation are limited to the cost of the asset, but percentage depletion can—and does—exceed the amount invested by substantial amounts. In addition, an immediate write-off is permitted for certain capital costs incurred in exploration and development, providing a double deduction for capital invested in these industries. Most economists who have studied the matter have concluded that present allowances are too generous.

Consumption taxes are not popular in the United States. General sales taxes are used by state and local governments, but even when they are taken into account, consumption taxes are less important here than anywhere else in the world.

The Federal Government has relied exclusively on selective excises for consumption tax revenues. These taxes are among the first to be raised in a national emergency, and they linger on and do considerable damage to the economy for years afterward. Excises are bad taxes because they discriminate arbitrarily against consumption of the taxed commodities. The only defensible excises are sumptuary taxes, which help offset the social costs of certain articles of consumption, like liquor and tobacco, and user charges, which compensate for special identifiable benefits received by individuals and firms from public services.

If consumption taxes are needed for revenue purposes, a general tax such as the retail sales tax would make more sense than selective excises. But consumption taxes are most burdensome for low-income taxpayers and have less automatic flexibility than the income tax.

A new method of taxing consumption that has attracted interest of late is the value added tax, which is imposed at a flat rate on the "value added" by each firm (gross receipts less the cost of materials purchased from other firms). It is similar to a retail sales tax, except that it is collected piecemeal as the commodity makes its way through the channels of production and distribution.

Basically the issue is the degree of progression in the tax system. Proponents of a Federal sales tax or of a value added tax wish to reduce progression. My own view is that the general consumption tax should not be used by the Federal Government unless the potential of the income taxes has been exhausted, which is unlikely if the base is broadened and the rates are further reduced.

Payroll taxes were introduced during the 1930s to pave the way for the social security system. The tax for old age, survivors, disability, and hospital insurance now amounts to 4.2 per cent each on employers and employes on earnings up to $6,000, and will reach 5.65 per cent by 1987. This type of tax was used to emphasize the element of "contribution" by the employe.

Social security is a tremendous achievement, but the use of payroll taxes to finance it is increasingly being questioned. These taxes, which now exceed $20 billion a year, are regressive and discourage the use of labor.

The simplest method of correcting some of the inequity would be to raise the limit on earnings subject to tax and eventually to remove it entirely. The tax would then be a flat percentage of earnings, which would still be regressive with respect to total income but much less than under present law. A second method would be to blanket employee contributions into the individual income tax, either directly or through a credit for payroll tax against income. A third method would be to halt further increases in the payroll taxes and pay for future benefit increases from the general fund.

Unemployment insurance is financed by a 3.1 per cent tax on payrolls of employers of 4 or more persons up to $3000 per employee. State trust funds are set up from which benefits are paid, but these funds are inadequate in some states during recessions. Provision should be made for Federal assistance to extend benefits automatically when unemployment becomes serious. This can be accomplished through increases in the Federal tax or through contributions from the general fund. Preferably, the entire system should be financed out of general taxes because individual firms have little control over employment.

The Federal Government levies an estate tax with rates that go up to 77 per cent and a gift tax which is set at three quarters of the estate tax rates. The exemptions are $60,000 under the estate tax and $30,000 for all gifts during an individual's lifetime plus $3000 per donee per year.

In theory, estate and gift taxes are excellent taxes. In practice, their yield is disappointing—only a little over 2 per cent of Federal cash receipts—and they have little effect on the distribution of wealth. They can be avoided by distributing gifts at the lower gift tax rates, by setting up trusts, and by other methods.

The estate and gift tax rates are high enough: a complete overhaul is needed to eliminate the avenues of escape and to tax equal amounts of transfers equally.

The State and local segment of the national tax structure is its most dynamic element. Before the Vietnam buildup, State and local expenditures were 60 per cent of Federal cash expenditures and more than twice as much as nondefense expenditures. Whereas the Federal Government reduced tax rates 15 per cent between 1961 and 1965, state and local tax rates increased sharply and are continuing to go up. State and local governments will continue to be hard-pressed as their financial needs continue to grow.

Most of the additional revenue will be raised by the states and local governments themselves. Long-standing traditions against moderate income and sales taxes are breaking down, and 26 states now have both. The recent adoption in three states of a credit against the income tax for sales tax paid suggests that regressivity of the sales tax can be moderated effectively. Deductibility from the Federal income tax should make income taxation at the state level more acceptable. However, states that permit the deduction of Federal taxes from their own state income tax bases lose much more revenue than their taxpayers save.

The crisis in city finances is dramatically illustrated by the plight of New York City. Cities will have to raise their own taxes, but they will also need all the help they can get from the state and Federal governments. In many parts of the country, administration of the property tax—the mainstay of local tax systems—remains weak; but experience has shown that state governments, if they take a strong hand, can force improvements in the quality of local assessment practices and procedures.

Whatever their own efforts, states and local governments will continue to rely on Federal assistance which already provides 15 per cent of their revenues. Most of this aid comes from conditional grants for welfare, housing, urban renewal, pollution control, and other programs in which the Federal Government has a vital interest. But additional aid will be required to close the gap between their growing needs and their fiscal capacity.

General purpose grants to the states have been suggested as a means of providing additional Federal help. Detail of the proposals differ, but in general they would return a fixed percentage of the Federal individual income tax base to the states, with the understanding that these growing revenues would be shared with the local governments. The funds would be disbursed on a per capita basis, with a small percentage reserved for special distribution to the poorest states.

Such general purpose grants are strongly opposed by those who wish to control the allocation of Federal funds in great detail because they have little faith in the willingness or ability of state governments to use the funds wisely. However, in a tax system which restricts the states and local governments to the least desirable and responsive tax sources, a general-purpose Federal grant system makes good sense as a supplement to conditional grants.

I reserve for last a discussion of the relationship between tax reform and the new economics. The basic proposition of the new economics is that fiscal policy—which includes both tax and expenditure policy—must be used vigorously and promptly to achieve the basic goals of full employment, a high rate of economic growth, and stable prices.

The most serious obstacle to the use of fiscal policy in this way has been the legislative process. Passage of major tax bills may take the better part of a year or longer. Many tax experts and nonpartisan citizens groups have recommended that the President be authorized to make temporary changes in tax rates. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson made such a proposal (limited to tax cuts), but Congress has resisted any such infringement on its constitutional taxing powers. It is clear, in the current situation, that if the power had been given, the President might well have used it already to fight inflation.

The United States tax system is a good one, as tax systems go, but substantial reforms are needed. Such reforms would make the system more equitable and also permit a significant reduction in tax rates for all taxpayers. For example, individual income tax rates could be lowered by at least a third if a broad definition of taxable income were adopted. Such reforms would pave the way for more vigorous and effective use of tax policy to maintain full employment, price stability, and dynamic economic growth.

URGENT NEED FOR TAX REFORM

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions in the past year I have presented factual evidence supporting my proposal to begin reform of our Federal tax system by lowering the oil depletion allowance. Today, I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House an excellent article on this subject by George Spencer, editor of the Gasoline Letter which is a weekly publication for small businessmen in petroleum marketing. The article points out that in 1965, 20 major U.S. oil firms had an average U.S. tax rate of 6.3 percent and several paid nothing at all in spite of expanding profits. This giant giveaway to wealthy corporations is contrary to the basic principle of equality in our democratic system.

It is contrary to our democratic system, when the hard working farmers, workers, and small businessmen each year pay in taxes a higher percentage of their money than do vast corporate organizations.

I want to commend Mr. Spencer for standing up to these powerful corporate interest groups and I urge my colleagues to join me in eliminating privilege from our tax system.

This evidence once again illustrates the need for prompt passage of my bill, H.R. 12993, to lower the oil depletion allowance. I might add, that this is not the only area where tax reform is needed, but it is the most urgent.

The above-mentioned article follows:

Twenty majors had 6.3 percent U.S. tax rate in 1965 SEC figures show—some paid nothing at all despite big net incomes.

U.S. income taxes of 20 largest oil firms last year rose to $360 million or 6.3 percent of their income before taxes.

In 1964 and 1962 the rate was 4 percent and 5 percent in 1963.

The federal corporate tax rate is 48 percent.

Official figures reveal that the 20 largest firms together paid federal income taxes totaling less than 23 percent of the largest company's income before taxes.

Several big companies were able to skip paying federal taxes completely despite big profits.

In that happy group were Union (Pure), Sinclair, possibly Marathon and Atlantic (Richfield).

The tax figures show dramatically the value of the 1965 mergers of four big refiners.

A Union Oil executive told security analysts that the Union-Pure merger benefitted from the synergistic effect, two plus two equalled four.

For three years before the merger Union had paid 13, 18, and 15 percent of its income as federal income tax.

Pure Oil had $2.5 million, $1.5 million and $629,000 tax credits in the same years.

The year before the merger Union made $87.5 million and Pure $32.2 million while last year the combined income before taxes was only $119 million or about the same as the two made a year earlier.

But after taxes in 1964 the two had a net profit of $98.6 million while last year the figure jumped to $123 million with Union racking up a juicy $3.8 million tax credit instead of having to pay Uncle Sam taxes on its $119,214,000 profit.

Considering the $3.8 million bonus, Union's after taxes profits gained to 103 percent of the income before taxes. This is not in any way to slight the job done by Sunray DX.

Although Sunray's federal tax dropped from a $7.1 million bonus credit in 1964 to a whopping U.S. tax bill of $353,000 or 0.8% of its profit, Sunray still ended up with a $38.6 million profit after taxes or 99% retained after taxes.

ATLANTIC-RICHFIELD CITED

But all other companies have to stand back in awe of Atlantic-Richfield, the tax masters.

For at least three years before the merger, Atlantic had paid no federal income tax despite profit before taxes of $61 million, $56 million and $61 million.

Richfield had paid $6 million (16.6%), $1.3 million and gained a $629,000 credit in 1964.

But here's where the synergistic effect threw the clover over the wedded bliss:

PROFITS OF MARRIAGE

The year before the knot was tied, the two raked in a combined income before taxes of $87 million.

Together they took in $105 million in 1965.

But the after tax comparison is more enlightening.

The 1964 after tax total was $68.5 million. The 1965 profits after taxes had mushroomed to $90.1 million.

BIG TABLE NEXT WEEK

More comparisons like this will be available next week when TGL publishes the combined taxes and profit figures for 1962–1965 in one table.

In case you're wondering about those oil industry figures that show the refiners pay almost as much taxes as other manufacturing companies, the refiners combine foreign and U.S. taxes and simply call the figure "provision for income taxes."

HOW SECRET IS KEPT

This deception taken to its extreme gives Standard Oil (N.J.), the world's largest oil company, the appearance of paying $423 million in 1962 when in fact Uncle Sam only got $8 million and the rest went to other nations and a few states.

But when the companies make detailed reports to the Securities and Exchange Commission they have to break down their U.S. and foreign taxes.

Only Marathon Oil has been able to avoid this breakdown, for reasons TGL was not able to establish.

MARATHON PLAYS COY

We know that Marathon, like other Lybian operators, was hit with a big tax there last year (note the effect on Conoco's taxes).

Thus we list all of Marathon's taxes as foreign since it doesn't reveal its U.S. tax figures.

The last year in which records are available (1962) show Marathon won a $2.2 million bonus credit (no tax and the credit applicable back three years or ahead five) on a $36 million profit.

We can only assume Marathon's shyness is based on very low or no income taxes to the federal government.

MEANING FOR MARKETERS?

The significance of these figures—in marketing at least—is that some marketers claim

the low taxes on big international refiners provide wads of tax-free cash for overbuilding service stations and on occasion below "cost" sales.

Following are the figures for 1965, published—as far as we know—for the first time:

20 largest oil companies Federal tax, 1962–65

Rank in size	Year	Net income	Federal tax	Percent	Foreign, some States' tax	Percent	Income after tax	Percent
Standard (New Jersey)	1962	$1,271,903,000	$8,000,000	0.6	$423,000,000	33	$840,903,000	66
	1963	1,584,469,000	69,000,000	4.3	496,000,000	31	1,019,469,000	64
	1964	1,628,555,000	29,000,000	1.7	549,000,000	33	1,050,555,000	64
	1965	1,679,675,000	82,000,000	4.9	562,000,000	33	1,035,675,000	62
Texaco	1962	546,371,000	13,000,000	2.3	51,700,000	9	481,671,000	88
	1963	615,768,000	10,250,000	1.6	58,850,000	12	545,668,000	88
	1964	660,761,000	5,500,000	.8	77,900,000	11	577,361,000	87
	1965	726,198,000	10,000,000	1.3	79,500,000	11	636,698,000	88
Gulf	1962	488,351,000	19,389,000	3.9	128,871,000	26	340,091,000	70
	1963	540,065,000	30,870,000	5.7	137,842,000	25	371,353,000	68
	1964	607,343,000	52,443,00	8.6	159,781,000	26	395,118,000	65
	1965	655,727,000	53,559,000	8.1	174,935,000	26	427,233,000	65
Socony Mobil	1962	379,339,000	8,300,000	2.1	128,700,000	33	242,339,000	63
	1963	437,352,000	23,000,000	5.2	142,500,000	32	271,852,000	62
	1964	464,660,000	27,700,000	5.9	142,800,000	30	294,160,000	63
	1965	508,016,000	33,900,000	6.6	154,000,000	30	320,116,000	63
Standard (California)	1962	348,181,000	5,800,000	1.6	28,600,000	8	313,781,000	90
	1963	356,568,000	2,900,000	.8	31,600,000	8	322,068,000	90
	1964	393,188,000	8,300,000	2.1	39,600,000	10	345,288,000	87
	1965	455,425,000	9,000,000	1.9	55,200,000	12	391,225,000	86
Shell	1962	173,555,000	7,200,000	4.1	8,680,000	5	157,675,000	91
	1963	211,575,000	19,100,000	9.0	12,623,000	5	179,852,000	85
	1964	213,575,000	2,800,000	1.3	12,585,000	5	198,190,000	92
	1965	234,031,000	26,600,000	11.3	13,876,000	6	193,555,000	83
Standard (Indiana)	1962	168,843,000	3,105,000	1.8	3,381,000	2	162,420,000	96
	1963	208,022,000	22,182,000	10.6	2,748,000	1	183,092,000	88
	1964	204,817,000	8,486,000	4.1	1,480,000	.7	194,851,000	95
	1965	263,098,000	39,578,000	15.0	4,248,000	2	219,272,000	83
Phillips	1962	158,320,000	48,000,000	30.3	3,365,000	2	106,955,000	67
	1963	160,954,000	52,000,000	26.2	3,491,000	2	105,463,000	65
	1964	152,197,000	32,229,000	22.2	4,950,000	3	115,018,000	74
	1965	165,876,000	31,745,000	19.1	6,415,000	4	127,716,000	77
Cities Service	1962	84,143,000	20,773,000	24.7	3,185,000	3	60,185,000	71
	1963	101,976,000	20,188,000	21.4	4,283,000	4	77,505,000	74
	1964	113,405,000	27,925,000	24.7	967,000	.8	84,513,000	74
	1965	137,118,000	[1] 33,000,000	24.0	976,000	.7	104,118,000	76
Continental	1962	73,477,000	1,065,000	1.4	3,335,000	5	69,077,000	94
	1963	99,665,000	9,143,000	9.2	3,157,000	3	87,365,000	88
	1964	112,009,000	8,725,000	7.7	3,175,000	2	100,109,000	89
	1965	142,051,000	6,865,000	4.8	39,035,000	27	96,151,000	68
Sun	1962	66,395,000	[2] 200,000	0	13,400,000	20	53,195,000	80
	1963	79,976,000	1,300,000	1.9	17,460,000	22	61,216,000	77
	1964	88,577,000	2,400,000	2.7	17,670,000	20	68,507,000	77
	1965	113,405,000	10,300,000	9.0	18,220,000	16	84,835,000	75
Union	1962	59,421,000	8,000,000	13.5	5,500,000	9	45,921,000	77
	1963	73,028,000	13,100,000	17.7	6,000,000	8	53,928,000	74
	1964	87,564,000	13,300,000	15.2	7,200,000	8	67,064,000	77
	1965	119,214,000	[3] 3,800,000	0	0	0	123,014,000	103
Standard (Ohio)	1962	37,235,000	9,275,000	25.0	3,738,000	10	24,222,000	65
	1963	54,008,000	15,225,000	28.1	4,896,000	9	33,887,000	62
	1964	70,252,000	21,150,000	30.2	5,334,000	7	43,768,000	62
	1965	82,848,000	15,225,000	18.3	4,896,000	6	49,711,000	60
Sinclair	1962	57,936,000	0	0	10,586,000	18	47,350,000	83
	1963	71,036,000	1,200,000	0	9,532,000	13	62,704,000	88
	1964	66,444,000	[2] 3,119,000	0	10,531,000	15	58,736,000	88
	1965	67,173,000	[3] 0	0	15,299,000	23	61,374,000	91
Marathon	1962	36,064,000	[2] 2,200,000	0	205,000	.5	37,889,000	105
	1963	50,058,000	([4])	0	933,000	2	49,125,000	98
	1964	63,220,000	([4])	0	2,844,000	4	60,376,000	95
	1965	97,416,000	([4])	0	37,345,000	38	60,071,000	62
Atlantic	1962	61,110,000	0	0	14,844,000	24	46,266,000	75
	1963	56,747,000	0	0	12,734,000	22	44,013,000	78
	1964	61,081,000	0	0	14,005,000	22	47,076,000	77
	1965	105,299,000	0	0	15,188,000	14	90,111,000	86
Tidewater	1962	35,191,000	228,000	.6	2,387,000	6	32,576,000	93
	1963	42,795,000	[2] 63,000	0	3,384,000	8	39,474,000	92
	1964	40,508,000	377,000	13.7	4,426,000	11	35,705,000	88
	1965	60,397,000	58,000	.9	3,783,000	6	56,556,000	94
Ashland	1962	24,324,000	6,201,000	25.8	2,799,000	11	15,324,000	63
	1963	28,769,000	10,556,000	37.7	104,000	.3	18,109,000	64
	1964	36,385,000	9,672,000	26.8	2,977,000	8	23,735,000	65
	1965	50,594,000	15,500,000	30.6	2,440,000	5	31,594,000	63
Sunray	1962	41,203,000	3,850,000	9.3	1,152,000	3	36,201,000	88
	1963	49,727,000	6,533,000	13.3	1,328,000	3	41,886,000	85
	1964	29,357,000	[2] 7,115,000	0	1,290,000	4	35,182,000	120
	1965	43,367,000	353,000	.8	1,572,000	4	38,592,000	99
Pure	1962	27,680,000	[2] 2,546,000	0	1,276,000	4	28,950,000	107
	1963	28,582,000	[2] 1,212,000	0	27,000	.01	29,767,000	106
	1964	32,282,000	[2] 600,000	0	164,000	.5	31,518,000	98
	1965							
Skelly	1962	22,674,000	1,260,000	5.7	250,000	1	21,164,000	96
	1963	27,479,000	3,025,000	7.7	275,000	4	24,179,000	89
	1964	26,601,000	785,000	1.2	275,000	2	25,551,000	98
	1965	39,995,000	5,625,000	14.0	375,000	.9	33,995,000	85
Richfield	1962	36,615,000	6,000,000	16.6	0	0	30,615,000	83
	1963	29,767,000	1,300,000	4.4	$773,000	3	27,894,000	94
	1964	26,255,000	[2] 629,000	0	5,429,000	21	21,455,000	82
	1965							
Total:								
1962		4,198,161,000	164,500,000	4.0	838,891,000	20	3,194,770,000	76
1963		4,908,386,000	246,660,000	5.0	950,540,000	19	3,649,849,000	74
1964		5,179,036,000	240,529,000	4.0	1,064,383,000	20	3,873,836,000	74
1965		5,746,923,000	360,008,000	6.3	1,189,303,000	20.6	4,196,911,000	73

[1] $7,000,000 investment credit.
[2] Credit.
[3] At least $9,500,000 credit.

[4] Marathon is the only large oil company that has been able to conceal its domestic income taxes in the Securities and Exchange Commission files. We phoned Girard Jetton, Marathon's tax chief and asked the U.S. figures, but he said it's a secret. Since the firm probably doesn't want to keep secret the smallness of its foreign taxes, it's assumed the U.S. tax is small and all of Marathon's income taxes are listed as foreign.

TRAFFIC AND HIGHWAY SAFETY LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER].

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will consider legislation this week which has been designed to help bring a halt to the most shameful waste of human and economic resources in our Nation.

The traffic and highway safety measures on the calendar are a result of proposals introduced by a number of Members of Congress from every area of the country, without partisan consideration, and they represent months of concentrated effort by individual members and the respective committees.

The widespread support in Congress for a coordinated Federal-State program aimed at the rapid increase in automobile deaths on our highways is evidence of the growing concern of the American people about this critical problem.

More than 70,000 men, women, and children, including almost 1,300 in my own State of Iowa, have suffered violent death in traffic accidents since the 89th Congress convened on January 9, 1965, and we cannot neglect our responsibility to take action now to reverse these tragic trends.

These accidents are costing the American people well over $8 billion a year—more than the total expenditures of the Federal Government last year for all health, welfare, and manpower programs combined, including the economic opportunity program.

And those figures do not include the incalculable losses in terms of the value of human lives. Traffic accidents are the most common causes of death in the age group from 5 to 30, and it is this age group that possesses the greatest potential for contributing to our economy and our society.

We are spending millions on public health programs—research, treatment, prevention, and hospital construction—as well we should. Yet the 1,700,000 individuals injured in traffic accidents since 1964 equal the number of total beds in all U.S. hospitals for the same year—a tremendous public health problem.

We are increasingly concerned about air safety—as well we should be. The 727 has occupied national attention over the past several years, yet if a 727 fully loaded, crashed every day, the number killed in a year would be 20,000 less than the traffic toll for 1965. We spend $100,000 per victim to investigate air crashes. We spend 5 cents per victim to investigate auto crashes.

We are concerned about the safety of our servicemen in conflict and spend billions to protect and support them—as we must. Yet in a period from January 1961 to January 1965, while approximately 2,000 military men were killed in combat in Vietnam, more than 6,900 servicemen were killed in motor vehicle accidents on the public roads.

These shocking statistics are sad evidence of the fact that we can no longer hesitate to focus national attention on automobile and traffic safety and to direct the best national leadership and coordination ability to stemming the toll of destruction and tragedy on our highways.

It is for this reason that I introduced legislation at the beginning of this session of Congress to facilitate a greater coordination of information and activities related to traffic safety, to insure the widespread application of existing knowledge in the area, and to promote a more uniform acceptance of proven safety standards throughout the Nation.

The only way we can effectively meet this critical problem is through the combined efforts of Federal, State, and local governments, private industry, and the individual behind the wheel, and our action here this week can mark a major step forward in this mutual commitment.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KASTENMEIER (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

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. CONTE (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CULVER (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FUQUA (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA), for 30 minutes, on August 17, 1966; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA), for 60 minutes, on August 24, 1966; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. DULSKI.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 17, 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:

2646. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of manpower utilized to administer the military assistance program for Japan, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2647. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements of Federal home loan banks supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the year ended December 31, 1965 (H. Doc. No. 467); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

2648. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2649. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain retired and other personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2650. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of possible savings by discontinuing the purchase of public liability insurance covering acquired property, Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2651. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of savings available by using more economical fuels for heating at certain field stations, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2652. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Agency during fiscal year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1853. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5392. A bill to terminate the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1854). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7648. A bill to authorize long-term leases on the Papago Indian Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No.

1855). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. 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 in Hawaii, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1856). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 17081. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 17082. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 17083. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 17084. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 17085. A bill to provide that Columbus Day shall be a legal holiday for officers and employees of the United States in each State in which such day is designated as a legal State holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 17086. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 17087. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954: to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 17088. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 17089. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to authorize assistance, under State plans for medical assistance, for certain persons who are not otherwise eligible therefor but who provide care or services essential to the well-being of needy individuals receiving assistance under such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 17090. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal office building in Mansfield, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 17091. A bill to promote the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by modernizing practices of the Federal Government relating to the inspection of persons, merchandise, and conveyances moving into, through, and out of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 17092. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 17093. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 17094. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 17095. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 17096. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 17097. A bill to promote the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by modernizing practices of the Federal Government relating to the inspection of persons, merchandise, and conveyances moving into, through, and out of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 17098. 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. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 17099. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 17100. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 17101. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs, make the use of appropriations under the act more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under the act, and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any year, extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 17102. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, to authorize a Federal parking system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 980. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recognition of certain civilians who serve in Vietnam and other combat areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NIX:

H. Con. Res. 981. Concurrent resolution to provide for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

496. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of Guam, relative to funds for the Guam Economic Development Authority for the implementation of Guam's economic development, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 17103. A bill for the relief of Wanda Glowacka and her son, Ryszard Piotrowiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17104. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Trakas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 17105. A bill for the relief of Biagio Colatosti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17106. A bill for the relief of Natalino Colatosti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17107. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Tamburello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 17108. A bill for the relief of Martina Zubiri Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"No Progress" Report on the 200-Billion-Electron-Volt Accelerator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 16, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, although the Atomic Energy Commission denies it has reached its long delayed decision on siting the 200 Bev. accelerator, I am convinced that its five members already have come to an informal consensus regarding one of six sites they have been considering. I do not know which one it is and there is likely to be more lengthy delay before a formal decision is announced. This is despite the fact that no more than 2 to 3 weeks' last-minute checking is left to do and a decision could be accomplished by the first part of September.

Due to cost escalation from the delay in siting and during construction I estimate the giant circular, 1⅓ mile in circumference, atom smasher will cost 10 to 20 percent more than the $370 million estimate being used by the AEC. The cost could go as high as one-half billion dollars. Other pertinent statistics on this new scientific tool for probing deep into subatomic secrets are: Time to design and build, 6 to 8 years; operating staff, 2,000 people; annual operating cost,